

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

11 March 2020

**AUTHOR/S:** Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

---

**Application Number:** S/2896/19/FL

**Parish(es):** Duxford

**Proposal:** Construction of a 168 bedroom hotel with ancillary facilities, associated access, gates, car parking (including reconfigured conference centre car parking), cycle parking and landscaping.

**Site address:** Imperial War Museum, Royston Road, Duxford, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB22 4QR

**Applicant(s):** Propiteer Hotels Duxford Limited

**Recommendation:** Approval

**Key material considerations:** Principle of Development  
Character and Appearance of the Area  
Heritage Assets  
Trees and Landscaping  
Biodiversity  
Highway Safety  
Flood Risk  
Neighbour Amenity  
Safety

**Committee Site Visit:** 10 March 2020

**Departure Application:** Yes

**Presenting Officer:** Karen Pell-Coggins, Senior Planning Officer

**Application brought to Committee because:** This application has been referred to the Committee on the basis of officers current assessment of the sensitivity or significance of the proposals and it is of Local Interest and a Departure.

**Date by which decision due:** 13 March 2020

### Executive Summary

1. The proposal seeks the erection of a 168 bedroom hotel on the Duxford Imperial War Museum site which is a special policy area that is located outside of any village framework and in the countryside. The site is situated within the conservation area

and comprises a number of listed buildings. It is considered the finest and best preserved example of a fighter base representative of the period up to 1945 in Britain.

2. The development would support the existing conference centre on the site and would introduce a commercial development to gain funds to ensure that this nationally important site remains viable in the future.
3. The development, as amended, subject to conditions is not considered to adversely affect the character and appearance of the countryside and landscape character, trees and landscaping, biodiversity, highway safety subject to a review of the Temprow growth figures, linsig junction modelling and mitigation, flood risk, neighbour amenity or any other material planning considerations. The development would result in less than substantial harm to heritage assets, but the public benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh this harm.
4. Members are therefore requested to support the application.

### **Planning History**

5. S/1254/03/F - Change of Use and Extensions to Officers Mess to Form Hotel - Approved  
S/0590/92/F - Extension and refurbishment to provide leisure and overnight accommodation for conference centre and establishment of private fitness club - Approved

### **National Guidance**

6. National Planning Policy Framework (2019)  
National Planning Practice Guidance  
National Design Guide 2019

### **Development Plan Policies**

7. **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018**  
S/1 Vision  
S/2 Objectives of the Local Plan  
S/3 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  
S/5 Provision of New Jobs and Homes  
S/7 Development Frameworks  
E/7 Imperial War Museum at Duxford  
E/20 Tourist Accommodation  
HQ/1 Design Principles  
HQ/2 Public Art and New Development  
NH/2 Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character  
NH/4 Biodiversity  
NH/14 Heritage Assets  
CC/1 Mitigation and Adaption to Climate Change  
CC/3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments  
CC/4 Water Efficiency  
CC/7 Water Quality  
CC/8 Sustainable Drainage Systems  
CC/9 Managing Flood Risk  
SC/9 Lighting Proposals  
SC/10 Noise Pollution  
SC/11 Contaminated Land

SC/12 Air Quality  
TI/2 Planning for Sustainable Travel  
TI/3 Parking Provision  
TI/8 Infrastructure and New Developments  
TI/10 Broadband

8. **South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents**  
Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction - Adopted January 2020  
District Design Guide - Adopted March 2010  
Listed Buildings SPD - Adopted July 2009  
Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD - Adopted January 2009  
Duxford Airfield Conservation Area Appraisal - Adopted May 2007  
Trees and Development Sites - Adopted January 2009  
Landscape in New Developments - Adopted March 2010  
Biodiversity SPD - Adopted July 2009  
Health Impact Assessment - Adopted March 2011  
Cambridgeshire Flood and Water - Adopted November 2016

### Consultations

9. **Duxford Parish Council** – Supports the application, as amended, subject to consideration for improved pedestrian / cyclist access between the site and the railway station. Request that the application goes to the Planning Committee.

They originally raised concern as follows: -

Recommends refusal based on design, appearance and materials. The Parish Council would very much like to see alternative options in this regard, as presently deemed aesthetically unappealing.

Separately, the Parish Council would like to ask if any potential S106 monies would be used to either:

- i) Improve the motorway junction for pedestrians / cyclists, as very dangerous presently.
- ii) Improve the motorway junction vehicular access to IWM.

10. **Whittlesford Parish Council** – Supports the application.

11. **Planning Policy Officer** – Has no objections. Comments that a revised National Planning Policy Framework was published February 2019. National policy in the NPPF includes the presumption in favour of sustainable development at the heart of the planning system. This sets a clear expectation on planning authorities to plan positively to promote development and create sustainable communities.

Paragraph 80 of the NPPF places significant weight on the need to support economic growth and productivity. While paragraph 180 also advises that planning decisions should ensure new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development.

The Council adopted the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan in September 2018. The Council has an adopted Economic Development Strategy that anticipates slower growth in local high-tech clusters / research and development as the sector matures.

However, other sectors are expected to account for a higher proportion of growth including tourism and leisure, (paragraph 8.4).

The proposed development is located outside the curtilage of Heathfield village but within the curtilage of the Imperial War Museum (IWM) at Duxford which is located within the Duxford Airfield Conservation Area and the designation covered by SCLP Special Policy Area E/7: Imperial War Museum at Duxford. The proposed hotel site is located between the M11 and the IWM's Airspace exhibition hanger and associated conference facilities and is currently used for car/coach parking.

Under SCLP Special Policy Area E/7, the site at Duxford Airfield will be treated as a special case as a museum which is a major tourist / visitor attraction, educational and commercial facility.

New proposals will be considered with regard to the particular needs and opportunities of the site and any proposals involving the use of the estate and its facilities for museum uses or non-museum uses must be complementary to the character, vitality and sustainability of the site as a branch of the Imperial War Museum.

The policy's supporting text explains IWM Duxford's long-term future as a vibrant, sustainable and effective visitor attraction, education provider and commercial venue with jobs and investment beyond the direct effects of the museum and its partners.

Within the context of protecting the quality of the surrounding landscape in this sensitive site on the edge of the Cambridge Green Belt, IWM Duxford is afforded special consideration given its national significance.

SCLP Policy E/20 'Tourist Accommodation' supports tourist accommodation within development frameworks where the scale and type of development is directly related to the role and function of the centre.

Outside development frameworks, development to provide overnight visitor accommodation, holiday accommodation and public houses will be permitted by the change of use / conversion / replacement of suitable buildings and by small scale new developments appropriate to local circumstances.

In 2017, over 8 million people visited Cambridge contributing £835m to the local economy and accounting for 22% of all employment in Cambridge. However only 12% of these visitors are currently exploring beyond Cambridge. Around 30% of all visitors are visiting friends and family locally. Tourism related employment represents 16,357 jobs<sup>1</sup>.

A general search for existing visitor accommodation in the area reveals approximately a dozen guesthouses and public houses offering B&B style accommodation. There is also a Holiday Inn Express at Whittlesford, approximately 1.5 miles away.

IWM Duxford receives approximately 440,000 visitors per annum; it also offers educational courses and hosts a number of related businesses on-site and has the potential for combined trips for tourists visiting the area and those specifically booked for flying events or organised visits through tour operators.

According to the applicant's hotel planning statement, the location of the hotel will enable the conference facilities to offer two or more day-events increasing the range of services it can offer.

The purpose-built conference centre, housed within the Airspace exhibition hangar is part of the commercial arm of IWM and provides individual rooms, lecture theatre and event area for up to 800 delegates. This commercial arm of IWM, in 2018 held 326 events, hosting more than 27,000 delegates. The proposed hotel will therefore complement and enhance the existing conference function.

The hotel will provide for corporate and commercial demand from the conference facility throughout the year, particularly during weekdays. There will also be demand at weekends and during peak summer months from tourists/visitors to IWM, and for visiting friends and relatives to the area particularly during the summer months. This will mean peak occupancy levels at all times of the year and as such the site offers an ideal location for a new hotel as it will cater for both corporate and visitor demand.

No details are provided regarding the hotel's proposed category, however given its distance from local services, many of which are in the village of Duxford it is important that the hotel is self-sufficient in services for overnight visitors, to minimise vehicular movements generated by hotel users.

Policy E7 requires new proposals to have regard to the particular needs and opportunities of the site and any proposals including non-museum uses must be complementary to the character, vitality and sustainability of the site as a branch of the Imperial War Museum.

The applicant has demonstrated the business case for the new hotel, which will have local economic benefits by providing 40 job opportunities and increase demand for local goods and services. The new hotel would also facilitate conferences (and other educational courses) lasting more than one day which would improve IWM's non-museum business sustainability and vitality. The hotel's ability to reduce the need to travel daily to and from the site would also improve the site's transport sustainability especially if it is relatively self-sufficient in services for overnight visitors.

The proposal would also support the Council's Economic Development Strategy as it would secure the value from the tourist / business conferencing hotel activity for the area without increasing the volume of visitors because they would stay overnight rather than travel on a daily basis to and from the site, as is the case at the moment.

The proposal is not expected to have an impact on existing visitor accommodation providers in the locale as it would cater for its own demand created by offering overnight courses.

Taking into account: the number of people visiting the IWM site for both tourist and, or educational activities; the conference facilities business; and the limited number of local hotel rooms, it is fair to assume that the number of daytrips made to the site are considerable. With only one Holiday Express Inn and a dozen guesthouses close by, the current number of 27,000 visiting delegates per annum would indicate the site already generates a significant number of conference related daytrips. The proposed hotel would reduce the need to travel and support the vitality of both the educational and commercial sides of IWM.

Policy E20 requires new overnight visitor accommodation, outside development frameworks, to be small scale and appropriate to local circumstances. The proposed hotel site is located outside the development framework of Heathfield, as such, it is difficult to conclude that the 168-room proposal is small in scale however, the proposal's physical size, design and materials are intended to relate to its context, that is to say, reflect the existing large, adjacent Airspace exhibition hangar. It would therefore be fair to conclude that while not small in scale the proposal is appropriate to local circumstance.

Overall, in terms of policy E7 and E20, the proposed 168-room hotel is in general conformity with these policies. However, it is recommended that the hotel provides a satisfactory range of services for hotel users, to reduce their need to travel to access visitor facilities that are not provided elsewhere on site.

12. **Historic Buildings Officer** – Comments, as amended, as follows: -

Further to the previous comments from the Conservation team regarding this application, and the submission of additional information from the applicant in response to these, below is a list of the key concerns raised. Each is followed by additional comments to reflect the additional supporting information submitted by e-mail on 10th January 2020.

1. The lack of supporting justification for the proposed location and evidence of other locations having been assessed and dismissed.

The supporting information has provided additional information as to why this zone/location is favoured in terms of its proximity to existing parking and conference facilities; however, it is disappointing that options for the reuse or conversion of existing buildings on the site (all zones) to secure repairs and long-term viable uses to the wider site do not appear to have been explored.

2. The impact of the scale and massing of the proposed structure on the primacy and setting of the existing structures including the listed buildings and the Airspace building.

The concerns regarding the scale and massing of the proposed extension, and its potential to detract from the primacy of the adjacent Airspace building and most importantly the adjacent listed buildings, have not been overcome.

3. The impact on spacing between the existing structures, which allows views through to the runways and surrounding countryside beyond and informs the historical function and context of the site.

Our views regarding on this matter have not been addressed and overcome and it is felt that the spacing between the structures and views through the runway and open countryside beyond, are readily appreciated on the approach from the east (A505) and south (M11).

4. The proposed roof design and white cladding?

The concerns regarding the roof design of the proposed structure are still considered to be relevant, as the structure would assume an air of prominence over the existing buildings on the site, not only the Airspace building, but also the listed structures including the Grade II\* listed hangars to the west. This impact is further exacerbated by the use of 'brilliant white' cladding, which would be out of keeping with the muted

and characteristic colour scheme elsewhere on the site. The proposed structure would not sit comfortably within the landscape of the wider setting of the heritage assets but would instead appear highly prominent and visually discordant in its context, actively competing with the existing structures on the site.

5. Artificial illumination resulting from the expansive glazing of the proposed structure?

Furthermore, the concerns regarding excessive artificial illumination from the hotel have not been addressed or overcome. Whereas the other buildings operate during working hours, the hotel will be in use throughout the day and night, thereby requiring illumination at all times both for parking and within the building itself. The levels of lighting likely to be required would be out-of-keeping with the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed buildings and would further amplify the visual dominance of the proposed hotel, in this highly visible location.

Whilst there is undoubtedly a potential public benefit to providing guest accommodation on the site, in order to increase income to the IWM and amongst other things, facilitate works to the existing historic structures on the site, it has not been evidenced that the current proposal is sufficiently sympathetic to achieve this without causing harm to the setting and significance of the heritage assets. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that the required facilities could not be achieved in a more sympathetic and appropriate manner which would better respond to, and preserve the special historic interest of, this nationally important site.

The NPPF is clear that 'great weight' should be afforded to the asset(s) conservation and that clear and convincing justification is required for harm, particularly to Grade II\* listed buildings. As such, I consider that further negotiation would be beneficial, with the input of the Conservation Team, to arrive at a successful scheme which could overcome the concerns raised above.

Originally commented on the application as follows: -

The application in question seeks consent for a new 168-bedroom hotel on the Duxford Airfield site; also known as the Imperial War Museum. The site is a nationally significant and features several listed buildings, including three Grade II\* listed hangars, an Operations Block and several Grade II listed ancillary structures, including Control Tower, Officer's and Sergeants' mess's, Officers' houses and stores.

The site has been further recognised for its significance, through its designation as a Conservation Area. The site is broadly divided into the 'North Camp' (as referenced in the supporting Heritage Statement by Turley Heritage, 2019) which has a more domestic/ office function, and the 'South Camp' which housed the service and operations buildings, as well as the airfield itself. The proposed hotel building is to be located at the eastern edge of the 'South Camp', in an area identified as the 'Eastern Zone' in the Heritage Statement, between the larger 'Airspace' museum building and adjacent hangars (unlisted). This area runs parallel to the M11 slip-road, which joins the A505.

Existing site

The Heritage Statement has a useful resume of the development of the site and notes about the heritage assets located there. It also suggests that the CA can be divided into zones and refers to the site of the proposed hotel as being the Eastern

Zone and describes this as a more 'modern' area somewhat away from the Historic Core.

It is true that the 'Airspace' museum building and the aircraft restoration 'hangars' appear clearly different to the Listed buildings of the functional historic [as opposed to residential / office] core of the Conservation Area. The very large scale of 'Airspace' relates to its museum display of large objects and the more commercial hangars relate, presumably, to the scale required for the restoration of aircraft. They are also prominent from the public realm, particularly the A505, M11 and Hunts Road; leading into Duxford village as well as from the surrounding Conservation Area. The construction of these buildings that form the context is clearly utilitarian with simply clad 'engineering' structures which whilst impressive have little pretention to being 'architecture'. Another unfortunate element of this part of the site is the car park, with its expanse of tarmac, which is also highly prominent from the road.

### Proposed scheme

Whilst the submitted documents state that the site was identified in the 'Masterplan 2016' for an hotel, they do not appear to expand upon why that was so. The site, in fact, appears to be far from ideal as the access is tortuous and awkward and requires imaginative architecture to deal with both the context and irregular plot.

Whilst from a commercial point of view one can see why an hotel operator would want to be highly visible from the motorway, it is not clear why this should be seen as a benefit to the Conservation Area or the museum. The 'Airspace' hangar, and the smaller adjacent buildings, make a clear statement of "arrival" for those visiting the museum as the building type is readily associated with flying and aerodromes [not being flat-roofed helps distinguish them from the 'big-shed' distribution centre building type] so the insertion of an hotel would detract from that focus. In addition to this, the spacing between the existing structures allows views through to the runways and surrounding countryside beyond which informs the historical function and significance of the Conservation Area, and its wider setting. This would also be severely compromised by the addition of the hotel in this location. It is not clear why other sites in the 'Eastern Zone' or 'Western Zone' were not considered.

Turning to the proposed design, in the submitted documents mention is made of choosing materials to work with the context and profiled metal sheet does achieve this; however, its use needs also to look to the form to which it is applied and to the nature of the buildings that form the near context. The hangar building type is essentially the weather-resistant enclosure of volume, to contain large objects. There are few windows but there can be massive doors, hence the walling ratio of 'solid-to-void' is always likely to be far from what is required for an hotel.

The proposed building form is largely driven by the standard hotel form of double-banked rooms off a central corridor and has an L-plan. The latter is far from the suggestion shown in the 'Masterplan' diagram which shows a building more-or-less parallel to the site edge / motorway. Quite what is the 'right' design precedent for airfields is difficult to say with certainty, but this is a military airfield and any commercial aspects relate to aircraft restoration and maintenance, which do not suggest "branding" and those aspects of commerciality.

Another difficulty arises from the attempt to introduce a design 'gesture' onto the given hotel form; the 'ski-jump' roof element doesn't reflect the quasi-industrial and functional form of hangars, which are simply designed to enclosure volume. It therefore fails to respond positively to the character of the Conservation Area and

setting of adjacent listed buildings. The strips of windows could be said to have a certain early-C20 flavour and the suggestion that the glazed top floor relates to the Control Tower has some merit. However, the scale and height of the building is excessive and distracts visually from the 'Airspace' museum and adjacent restoration hangars, which is clearly seen in the CGIs. The use of 'brilliant white' cladding in the walling, that is not profiled-metal sheet, will also contrast excessively from the predominantly 'drab' military colour palette characteristic of the other larger buildings on the site. At night the interior lighting will also clearly depart from the overall character and atmosphere of the Conservation Area, and would be a highly visible and notable alteration from the public realm.

## Conclusion

Whilst the concept of a hotel on the site is apparently established, the proposed siting, form, scale and detailing are not considered to preserve or enhance the character and overall significance of the Conservation Area and would harm the wider setting of the Grade II\* and Grade II listed buildings. The proposed structure would compete with the primacy of the existing structures and block existing views into the site from the A505 and M11 slip-road, whilst its form would appear incongruous in this context and visually discordant against the wider built forms on the site. The immediate context and the 'specialness' of the aerodrome would be impacted to a moderate to high level, amounting to less than substantial harm.

The proposed siting, form, scale, massing, design and materials of the proposed hotel would fail to preserve or enhance the setting of the listed structures on the site or the overall character of the Conservation Area, and would actively detract from the primacy and intrinsic historic, military character of the site. It would also obscure important existing views into the site and airfield which inform the context of the heritage assets. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy policy NH14 of the SCDC Local Plan, 2018 and the relevant paragraphs of the NFFP, 2019; specifically paragraphs 194 and 196.

In response to this, whilst it is acknowledged that there would be a degree of public benefit arising from the scheme, insufficient information has been provided to evidence clear and convincing justification for the proposed siting and related harm and the application does not demonstrate that the benefit would outweigh the long-term harm arising from the scheme.

### 13. **Urban Design Officer** – Has no objections, as amended.

Officers are generally supportive of the application in urban design terms and consider that the improvements proposed to the overall design of the scheme are acceptable. It has generally addressed previously raised issues.

The comments below are intended to draw attention to the areas that will require further consideration to ensure that the scheme addresses Policy HQ/2 of the 'South Cambridgeshire Local Plan' (2018) and Paragraph 127 of the 'National Planning Policy Framework' (2019).

Officers previously raised a concern that the current main entrance, due to the proposed orientation of the building, is accessed from the opposite direction of the main entrance to the site which may raise legibility issues. As a response to this, Officers suggested introducing a public art element to help create a more legible entrance. Unfortunately, this is not achieved yet and Officers still believe that replacing the tree in the middle of the turning area with this element can help achieve

better visual quality and sense of space (See Policy HQ/2: Public Art and New Development of the 'South Cambridgeshire Local Plan' (2018)).

Given the site's prominent location, it is important that the architect presents the amended scheme to the Council's DEP.

Recommends a condition in relation to details of materials.

Originally commented on the application as follows: -

Officers are generally supportive of the revisions in urban design terms and consider that the improvements proposed to the overall design of the scheme are acceptable. It has generally addressed previously raised issues.

The comments below are intended to draw attention to the areas that will require further consideration/clarification to ensure that the scheme addresses Policy HQ/1 of the 'South Cambridgeshire Local Plan' (2018) and Paragraph 127 of the 'National Planning Policy Framework' (2019).

The site sits within the boundary of the Imperial War Museum (IWM). The entire IWM site is located within the designation area of Duxford Airfield Conservation Area, which is largely defined by the former military base buildings and war-time airfield character.

The site located at the far east of the conservation area. It is bounded to the east by the M11, to the south by aircraft hangars, to the north by the A505 and to the west by the airspace hangar and conference parking facilities.

The airspace hangar is an iconic landmark which dominates the view onto IWM from M11 & A505.

The sensitive location of the site and the likely visual impact on the surrounded historic context is a key challenge for the scheme. Officers consider that the likely impact on the wider context of the site may be less of an issue since the site is separated from the historical centre of IWM by the Airspace hangar.

Positive aspects of the scheme

The development proposed a sympathetic approach to the adjacent context. The proposed scale complements the architecture and scale of adjacent buildings, mainly the Airspace hangar; this is also reflected in the proposed architectural treatment.

The design proposes keeping the height of the proposed development below the ridge line of the Airspace hangar along with sculpting the roof at the side facing the Airspace hangar to ensure that its corner remains a prominent feature when viewed from the M11 & A505. This is welcomed and is considered as a good response to address potential visual impact on the Airspace hangar and its setting. However, there are some issues related to the details submitted which are further discussed below.

The latest drawings show that effort has been made to resolve issues previously raised regarding elevational treatment, the roof design and materials. Features from the adjacent Airspace buildings are referred to, windows opening are now appropriately proportioned, have a better scale, a strong rhythm and acceptable materials reflecting those used in the Airspace hangar. The revisions would help

break down the scale of the building frontage and create coherent elevations with acceptable visual link to the hangar behind.

Issues the scheme needs to address/clarify

The landscape and public realm strategy should be developed further. The site will terminate the view of the route into the hotel and will be visible to all visitors entering the car parking areas and the surrounding buildings. The current main entrance area is mainly dominated by parking areas and only a small area is allocated as green spaces, this is not satisfactory as it does not contribute much to the creation of a sense of space on arrival. The design of the external space in front of the entrance should be of a good quality. At this stage it is considered that this has not been fully achieved. The site can benefit from having more trees in-between the cars when there is a row of 10 spaces or more, the introduction of public art elements can help achieve good quality space and create a more legible entrance.

Contextual information such as street elevations and visualisations would greatly help Officers to understand the proposals. The submitted drawings (ref. sketch elevations 6583-012d, 013, 014k, 015k, 016d, 017d & 018d) show that the proposed height of the development would be slightly below the ridge line of the Airspace hangar, this is welcomed. However, none of the submitted drawings provide sufficient details of the Airspace hangar heights or the proposed levels of the development, except a section presented in Page 22 of the DAS, which shows a height of (+53.02) with no reference to any measured building survey. In addition, the submitted topographical survey drawing no. 1180/01A shows a reference point (RL 48.03) which is different to what is shown in the above-mentioned section. It is important that a measured building survey of the hangar is submitted to state the height of the Airspace hangar, along with further details of the proposed level of the development. This is to ensure that the height of the proposed development would not exceed that of the hangar.

No cycle and motor-cycle stores (for staff and visitors) have been proposed and this is not acceptable. It is essential that secured space is provided for cycle and motor-cycle parking. The location of these stores should be carefully considered to ensure that they are overlooked and that they do not dominate the public realm.

14. **Landscape Design Officer** – Has no objections in principle, as amended, subject to landscape conditions. Comments as follows: -

Layout – The approach and entrance to the site is car dominated with no clear focal point to the new hotel. Suggest the applicant considers a focal point or artwork which will direct visitors to new build and entrance.

Access - Turning feature, parking layout and substation have not been addressed.

Hotel – Views of the airfield have been addressed by the applicant.

Cycle parking and Electric charging points - Concerns have been addressed by the applicant, although details to be provided.

Landscaping – Hard details have been provided. The secondary access is not ideal although acceptable.

Street furniture, lighting and refuse / bin storage areas to be conditioned

Soft landscaping – Applicant has addressed some of my concerns. However, tree planting is very disappointing.

Singular trees planted within parking bays are unlikely to survive. Applicant to amend and provide sufficient planting beds with ornamental planting.  
Planting plan 01 631/01 Rev B – applicant to revise typical fighter pen detail with EM6 seed mix. To be consistent with local landscape character.  
Boundary treatment – to be conditioned.

Originally commented on the application as follows: -

Objection due to insufficient information (within red line boundary), unacceptable layout and insufficient hard and soft landscape details.

Landscape, visual and visual amenity effect

Agrees with the findings in the LVIA and in line with the following principles the site is capable of accommodating a development in line with the following principles without resulting in significant adverse harm to the surrounding countryside's landscape character and views from the wider and local area.

- i) Incorporate chalk grassland species – typical national landscape characteristic
  - ii) Trees to be planted between buildings to camouflage small structures – typical local characteristic
  - iii) Improve the landscaping of the car park to the east to configure a distinct approach for business and commercial users as recommended within the masterplan.
  - iv) The small bank to the east and north of the site to be strengthened with low level native shrubs, tree planting and rough grassland – typical of the local landscape characteristics.
  - v) New build to be reflect the existing and adjacent modern buildings. To be contemporary in design, ridge height to be lower than Airspace, simple in structure and materials
  - vi) Street lighting to be low level to respect the rural character
- Items have not been addressed by the applicant within the detailed landscape proposals. Applicant to amend.

Green Belt

As outlined in the LVIA the site is adjacent to the Green Belt. With a high-quality landscape scheme and incorporating the principles outlined above the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt.

Additional comments / concerns

Layout – A disappointing layout.

The hotel will not be visible to visitors entering the site at the main gates. At present the hotel is obscured by the Airspace. The approach to the hotel is obscured by parked cars with no focal point. Rather than leading the visitor to the main entrance of the hotel, views are likely to be both parked cars and back of house details particularly at the north west corner of the site. The main entrance is dominated by parked cars, hard landscaping and a concrete turning feature which is unattractive and lacking arrival. Applicant to revisit the layout to create an attractive and welcoming layout.

Access – Although the applicant has indicated vehicle access and parking to the hotel, it is unclear how pedestrians are directed to the main entrance practically when entering the site from the A505. Design and Access Statement page 10 indicates

visitors walking on the grass towards the site which is unacceptable. Applicant to confirm.

Turning feature – I am concerned that the turning feature to the front of the hotel appears very tight particularly adjacent to parked cars as outlined in Sketch Scheme Plans 010 Rev H. Applicant to revisit and enlarge turning area.

Parking layout - The proposed car parking spaces will be laid out with small clusters interspersed by the retention of the existing trees on site and proposed new high-quality hard landscaping and additional planting. (Planning Statement). This has not been achieved and at present car parking dominates the overall layout with little soft landscaping. This is unacceptable and needs to be addressed by the applicant.

Existing electric substation – applicant to confirm new location within the site

Hotel – The applicant has indicated that the new hotel will have a ‘unique’ feature allowing views of the IWM airfield from the sixth floor. However, the building ridge height is below the Airspace and its location is set back into the site. Views of the airfield and the landing strip will therefore be limited and disappointing.

Secondary access – applicant to confirm how direct access will be achieved to the adjacent building. At present visitors must meander around parked cars.

Parking – Cycle parking – I welcome cycle parking. Details of the cycle shelter to be provided.

Electric charging points – 14 no. electric charging points to be indicated upon the plan.

Landscaping – Outdoor space for employees – applicant to confirm if any outdoor recreational space will be provided for employees.

All landscaping works within the red line boundary are to be provided. At present the applicant has only provided information around the new hotel and has excluded landscape enhancements along the access road and the strip to the south of the Airspace.

Hard landscape details have not been provided. Applicant to forward details.

Street furniture and lighting details to be provided.

Refuse / bin storage areas – details have not been provided.

Soft landscape details – I welcome the use of native species to encourage biodiversity. However, ‘enhancements include new native species-rich hedgerow around the north site boundary to strengthen connectivity around the site and within the wider landscape’ have not been included as outlined within the Planning Statement. Applicant to amend.

Native species typical of the local landscape character should include the following:

Hedgerows - Hawthorn, hazel, blackthorn, field maple, dog rose, and, occasional, wild privet and wayfaring tree.

Trees in Hedgerows - Beech, field maple - Tree planting within the site is very disappointing and the bare minimum. I would expect more tree planting to compliment the new build, to create interest and appropriate in scale.

Trees planted in structural soils or 3D cellular confinement systems to be defined upon the landscape drawing. Where services are close to street trees, a suitable root barrier (such as root deflectors) are to be provided, to protect against damage to services, cables and pipes.

Due to its location, seed mixes to be calcareous seed mixes.

Welcomes both the gravel gardens and fighter pens within the layout which reflects the local landscape character of the IWM site. Applicant to integrate the gravel gardens with SUDs details. Details of Fighter Pens to be confirmed indicating treatment of compacted soils for tree / shrub planting

Planting plan 01 631/01 – Applicant to confirm the location of ‘typical bund detail’.

Size of wall and bund to be confirmed.

Planting plan 02 631/02 – text upon the drawing is missing. Applicant to amend Gravel planting specification to be included.

Landscape Strategy 631/SK03 – Singular trees planted within parking bays are unlikely to survive. Applicant to amend and provide sufficient planting beds with ornamental planting.

Landscape design - workbook – Details of Masterplan to be provided to understand aspirations of the applicant for the whole site and its future development.

Boundary treatment – No details have been provided. Presumes security measures will be required to restrict public access to the museum around the site.

#### Summary

Insufficient information has been supplied by the applicant particularly within the red line boundary.

With a carefully designed landscape strategy the proposal can respect and enhance the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and of the individual National Character Area in which is it located. However, at present this has not been achieved by the applicant and contrary to Policy NH/2: Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character.

15. **Trees and Landscapes Officer** – Has no arboricultural or hedgerow objections to this application, as amended but has some concerns over the proposed landscaping. Trees on or adjacent site have a level of protection through the Conservation Area, and/or have no statutory protection. From a quick desk study, it is likely that hedgerows on or adjacent site may qualify as ‘important hedgerows’ under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, and/or have no statutory protection.

Tree and hedgerow information has been provided. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report (signed and dated July 2019) has been submitted. This is sufficient for this application.

With regard to the proposed landscaping:

- i) Not clear on the presence and location of tall lighting columns or CCTV points and how they relate to trees,
- ii) Disappointed with the lack of additional planting on the service road/entrance and no green roof,
- iii) The watering specification is insufficient (631-02 IWM Duxford Hotel - Planting Plan 02.pdf) even for these little trees. There needs to be a fixed watering programme stating start and stop dates in the season, frequency of watering and volume to water for the first three years. Nurseries publish suggested watering volumes etc for different sized trees,
- iv) Support the use of a green carparking surface in the overflow carpark,
- v) Support the use of Root Cell tree planting pits but require the dimensions of pit for each pit/trench,
- vi) Concerned about the over reliance on Highways England M11 tree planting - this is superficial tree planting,

- vii) Concerned about establishing a hedgerow on a 1m tall bund – concerned with species choice,
- v) Concerned with planting horse chestnut (bleeding canker), oak (OPM in areas of unavoidable dwell) and *A. buergerianum* (not a sheltered site). It's worth noting that the trees on site are not flourishing and therefore perhaps different species are required.

16. **Ecology Officer** – Has no objections, as amended, subject to conditions.

The applicant has provided a statement from Claire Wiggs (BSG Ecology, October 2019) in response to the original objections. The statement confirms that the extended redline boundary (including foul drainage) does not contain any sensitive habitats and poses only a small residual risk to potential protected species in the area. Any such risk can be managed through non-licensable mitigation which should already be included within any CEcMP condition.

In accordance with NPPF paragraph 170, 174, and 175, and the Adopted South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan Policy NH/4, where applications should look to enhance, restore and add to biodiversity. Opportunities should be taken to achieve a net gain in biodiversity through the form and design of development. This should include the incorporation of bat and bird nesting boxes in the development, use of native planting mixes and wild grasses, the inclusion of green and brown roofs, the inclusion of green walls, or the inclusion of features such as log piles, insect hotels and hedgehog connectivity. Using tools such as the DEFRA Biodiversity Impact Assessment Calculator can help to clearly show that the development is creating a positive gain in biodiversity.

Requires conditions in relation to a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP) to include the following: -

- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
  - b) Identification of “biodiversity protection zones”.
  - c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
  - d) The location and timings of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
  - e) The times during which construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
  - f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
  - g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECow) or similarly competent person.
  - h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs if applicable.
- and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) to include the following.
- a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
  - b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
  - c) Aims and objectives of management.
  - d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
  - e) Prescriptions for management actions.
  - f) Prescription of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).
  - g) Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan.
  - h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP

are not being met) contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.

Originally commented on the application as follows: -

The Ecological Appraisal (BSG Ecology, July 2019) is welcomed. The surveyed redline boundary as shown in Figure 1 differs from Site Context Plan Drawing 653-002; in particular, the proposed foul drainage has not been included. Although the footprint of the drainage work appears likely to be of low ecological value, a statement from a suitably qualified ecologist is required to confirm whether or not there are likely to be any additional impacts on important habitats or protected and notable species within this area. Please re-consult me once this information has been submitted.

In general, I am satisfied that the proposals will comply with UK and EU legislation. The Ecological Appraisal report should state that if any nesting birds are found, nests will be retained and protected until chicks have fledged.

In accordance with NPPF paragraph 170, 174, and 175, and the Adopted South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan Policy NH/4, applications should contribute to enhancing and restoring biodiversity. Opportunities should be taken to achieve a measurable net gain in biodiversity through the form and design of development. This should include the incorporation of bat and bird nesting boxes in dwellings within the development, use of native planting mixes and wild grasses, the inclusion of green and brown roofs, the inclusion of green walls, or the inclusion of features such as log piles, insect hotels and hedgehog connectivity measures. A net gain metric such as Defra V2.0 has not been submitted with the application. In addition, proposed landscaping provides little in the way of ecological beneficial habitats. The 'semi-native' shrub mixes should comprise native species of local provenance. A hedgerow should also be included along the northern boundary to meet the recommendations provided in Section 6 of the Ecological Appraisal.

Conditions will need to be attached to any consent granted for ecological mitigation measures as set out in the Ecology report and details of a scheme of ecological enhancement to be secured.

17. **Environmental Health Officer** – Has no objections in principle subject to conditions in relation to the hours of use of site machinery and construction related deliveries during construction, pile driven foundations and mitigation measure with regards to noise and vibration, measures to minimise the spread of dust, a construction programme, burning of waste on site, noise impact assessment relating to plant and equipment serving the development, a scheme for the protection of the development from road noise, a lighting assessment and a waste management and minimisation strategy.
18. **Contaminated Land Officer** – Has no objections subject to conditions in relation to any contamination found on site during the development. Comments that though the site is not being developed into a sensitive end use, it does have a potentially contaminative historical usage associated with the Duxford Airfield.

The assessment within the Phase 2 report identified elevated soil concentrations of some PAH's which exceed the assessment criteria for a commercial land use. However, the location of this is isolated and coincides with an area of made ground proposed for car parking. It is anticipated that some of this made ground will be removed during construction and, in addition, resurfacing as a car park further

reduces any risk. With the removal of the contaminant pathway, no further assessment is considered necessary.

Further to my memo dated 17th September 2019, a Preliminary Risk Assessment report has been submitted and is satisfied with the conclusions of the Phase 2 report in relation to risks to human health.

19. **Air Quality Officer** – Has no objections and suggests a condition in relation to the submission of a Low Emission Strategy to demonstrate that adequate measures for sustainable transport are considered.
20. **Sustainability Officer** – Has no objections subject to conditions. Comments that the applicant appears to have a good understanding of the requirements of the energy and carbon reduction policies in the current local plan and suggests the following measures will be incorporated into the proposed development:
  - i) U-values the same or better than Building Regulations
  - ii) Predominantly light-weight thermal mass
  - iii) Mechanical ventilation with heat recovery
  - iv) 100% low energy lighting
  - v) 100kW Combined Heat and Power Unit (CHP)

The applicant has presented two sets of BRUKL Output documents, one excluding the CHP unit and one without and these demonstrate the following carbon emissions reductions:

Target Emissions Rate: 48.2kgCO<sub>2</sub>/m<sup>2</sup>/annum

Building Emissions Rate (no CHP): 49.7kgCO<sub>2</sub>/m<sup>2</sup>/annum

% Carbon Reduction: 3.02% increase

Building Emissions Rate (with CHP): 41.3kgCO<sub>2</sub>/m<sup>2</sup>/annum

% Carbon Reduction: 14.31% reduction

Based upon these figures, the proposed development will achieve an overall carbon reduction of 14.31%, of which over 10% has been achieved via the installation of the combined heat and power unit. This would make the development compliant with the requirements of local plan policy CC/3.

The applicant has proposed a number of water efficiency measures for the proposed development, including:

- i) Low flow fixtures and fittings
- ii) Rainwater harvesting for external irrigation
- iii) Water meters and leak detection system

The above mentioned measures will all have a positive impact on reducing water use but the applicant must be aware that local plan policy CC/4 requires the development to achieve a minimum of 2 water credits from BREEAM, and the development as a whole must look to achieve an overall BREEAM rating no less than 'Very Good'.

To ensure the appropriate standards are achieved and the development is policy compliant, conditions in relation to precise details of the proposed renewable energy measures and improved levels of water efficiency are required.

21. **Highways England** – Has reviewed the transport assessments undertaken to understand the impact of this proposed development on the Strategic Road Network and in particular the M11 and its connection with the local road network at Junction 10. The conclusion of this review is that it is likely there will not be a significant impact on the operation of the junction. However it should be noted that due to significant congestion on the A505 at peak times, traffic blocks back onto the circulatory

carriageway at M11 J10. This causes traffic on the M11 southbound off slip to queue back onto, or near to the main line carriageway. Trips arising from the development albeit a small number may exasperate this situation increasing the safety risk of collisions occurring on the M11/slip road.

To minimise the risk of this occurring, it is requested that suitable keep clear road markings are provided on the circulatory carriageway where it connects with the M11 southbound off slip. This will help reduce the amount queuing of traffic on the slip road and associated safety concerns.

Given the level of congestion of traffic at the junction in peak hours, it is also requested that any construction management plan associated with this development looks to minimise unnecessary traffic movements through the junction at this time of day. Appropriate conditions are set out below

i) Prior to the beneficial occupation of the hotel, Keep Clear road markings or an equivalent measure shall be installed on the circulatory carriageway of M11 junction 10 where it connects with the M11 southbound off slip to the satisfaction of the planning authority in consultation with the local highway authorities.

ii) Prior to construction of the hotel and ancillary work, a construction management plan shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority. The plan should include measures to minimise traffic movements through the M11 Junction 10 at peak times Reason - To ensure that the M11 motorway and connecting roads at Junction 10 continue to serve their purpose as a part of a national system for through traffic in accordance with Section 10 of the Highways Act 1980, and to satisfy the reasonable requirements of road safety.

Previously commented on the application as follows: -

Further assessment required.

Highways England has is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such we work to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.

Whilst it appears from the documentation that there will not be a significant impact on the highway network; however, there has been no specific review of the performance of the M11 J10 as a result of the impact of the development.

In particular, we need to ensure that there is no risk as a result of the development of traffic queuing back on to the M11 mainline. Standing or slow-moving traffic on the exit to the motorway has a high safety risk of rear shunt type collisions.

Therefore, the applicant needs to provide sufficient analysis of the junction including predicted slip road queue lengths. This assessment should include weekend flows, as whilst mainline motorway flows may be less, the proximity of the nearby Duxford attraction can result in significant flows using the junction.

22. **Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Team** – Advise that full review of application has now been undertaken and no objection is raised to the proposal subject to recommended conditions which will be provided in an update prior to the committee meeting.

Previously commented on the application as follows: -

The below issues related to the Transport Assessment will need to be addressed before the transport implications of the development can be fully assessed.

TEMPro: Methodology is required for a review of the 2025 growth figures

Junction Modelling: Not acceptable

Accident Risk: Accident Cluster identified; further junction models required to justify that the development will not have a severe impact on the accident risk.

Comments in relation to the above points will be provided in the update report.

### Car Parking

As requested by the highway authority the applicant has provided updated information regarding the proposed provision of car parking on the site. In addition to the car parking already proposed, the applicant has confirmed that it has been agreed with the conference centre that there will be additional parking available to the hotel to use in busy periods. This will provide 18 additional spaces for weekdays and 53 additional spaces for weekends. The developments parking provision now equates to 218 spaces which is in accordance with South Cambridgeshire District Councils parking standards.

### TEMPro

The applicant has used TEMPro to calculate the growth figures for the future year scenarios.

The TEMPro growth factors for 2018 to 2019 and 2019 to 2020 are acceptable for use. A review of the 2020 to 2025 design scenario has been undertaken. The figures used by the applicant are lower than the growth figures calculated by the Highway Authority. The applicant needs provide the methodology used to ensure the growth figures are correct.

### Flow Diagrams

As requested by the Highway Authority the applicant has updated the distribution flow diagrams to include the circulatory flows on the M11 Junction 10 roundabout. The flow diagrams are acceptable for use subject to the review of the 2020 to 2025 TEMPro growth figure. An error was noticed on the September 2018 Survey AM Peak Hour (PCU) flow diagram, the circulator flow arrow at the southern side of the roundabout states the flow is 414 vehicles, this should be 1,414 vehicles.

### Junction Modelling

As agreed with the Highway Authority the applicant has updated the Linsig model at the site.

Access / A505 signalised junction to include all of the committed developments and the pedestrian phase is called every other stage.

The Linsig model is currently under review from the CCC modelling team, a review will be submitted to LPA once completed.

The applicant has provided a range of future year scenarios to show the developments impact on the signalised junction. The modelling results show:

#### Scenario 1- 2019 Baseline AM Peak

The 2019 AM Peak baseline shows that all arms of the junction are working within capacity, the maximum degree of saturation shown is 69.7% on the A505 West (EB) ahead arm. The maximum average delay recorded is 49.9 (s/pcu) on the IWM (NEB) left arm.

#### Scenario 2- 2019 Baseline PM Peak

The 2019 PM Peak baseline shows that all arms of the junction are working within capacity, the maximum degree of saturation shown is 79.5% on the A505 East (WB) ahead arm. The maximum average delay recorded is 49.9 (s/pcu) on the IWM (NEB) left arm.

#### Scenario 3- 2020 Baseline AM Peak

The 2020 AM Peak baseline shows that all arms of the junction are working within capacity, the maximum degree of saturation shown is 79.5% on the A505 West (EB) ahead arm. The maximum average delay recorded is 49.9 (s/pcu) on the IWM (NEB) left arm.

#### Scenario 4- 2020 Baseline PM Peak

The 2020 PM Peak baseline shows that the junction is working very close to its capacity with no development traffic added to the scenario. The maximum degree of saturation shown is 84.4% on the A505 East (WB) ahead arm. The maximum average delay recorded is 63 (s/pcu) on the IWM (NEB) right arm.

#### Scenario 5- 2020 Baseline + development trips AM Peak

Scenario 5 shows the 2020 baseline + development trips added to the junction. The modelling output shows no change to the maximum degree of saturation with the A505 West (EB) arm of the junction still operating at 79.5% capacity. However, the development does cause an impact on other arms of the junction, increasing the IWM (NEB) right arm by 31.9% to a degree of saturation of 33.6%. In addition to this the development increases the average delay per PCU to 54.2 s/pcu on the same arm. Despite this increase the junction is still working under capacity and the development does not impact the A505 through traffic.

#### Scenario 6- 2020 Baseline + Development Trips PM Peak

The junction modelling output shows no change to the maximum degree of saturation with the A505 East (WB) arm remaining very close to its capacity at 84.4%. The development does cause an impact on other arms of the junction, the largest increase is seen on the IWM (NEB) right arm of the junction with an increase of 20.3% to an overall degree of saturation of 77%. It should be noted that this arm is working under capacity, but it's close to being considered over capacity. The development also increases the average delay per PCU to 82.2 s/pcu on the same arm. Despite this increase the junction is still working under capacity and the development does not impact the A505 through traffic.

Please note, all of these comments are subject to the linsig model review by the CCC Modelling Team.

#### 2025 Scenarios

In point 2.12 of the technical note, the applicant sets out the scenarios to be tested for the future year junction modelling. The 2025 scenario is: 2025 design scenario (2020 development scenario + background traffic TEMPro Growth)

Like the 2020 scenarios the applicant needs to provide a 2025 baseline scenario and then a 2025 baseline + development scenario. This allows the developments impact

to be seen on the junction. Currently Scenarios 7 and 8 only show the overall capacity of junction meaning it is impossible to accurately determine the developments impact. The Highway Authority will continue the review of the 2025 scenarios once the applicant submits the 2025 baseline scenarios.

#### M11 Junction 10

During the pre-application stage the Highway Authority advised the applicant that: The boundary for traffic modelling as set out in figure 2 is acceptable. Further junction modelling may be required depending on the trip impacts and distribution. These should be agreed once the developer has identified the distribution and associated peak flows.

Comments submitted Highways England on the application present a holding objection, this is due to the possibility of an increased accident risk on the M11 Junction 10 roundabout and slip roads. The Highway Authority has completed further investigation into the possible accident risk of the M11 Junction 10 roundabout. This search expands the accident data search completed by the applicant in appendix B of the original Transport Assessment. Following the investigation an accident cluster has been identified located on the M11 Junction 10 Roundabout. Due to this the Highway Authority requests the applicant completes modelling junction assessment of the M11 Junction 10 roundabout. The assessment is to justify that the development will not cause severe impacts at the roundabout in terms of capacity issues, increased queue lengths and increased accident risk.

The developer should assess the junction using the same future year scenarios as the Site Access/A505 signalised junction. Like the site access junction, the applicant is advised to include a with and without development scenario for 2020 and 2025 future year scenarios.

#### Travel Plan

The travel plan measures presented by the applicant are acceptable for use.

Previously commented on the application as follows: -

#### Policy Context

The policy context is acceptable for use.

#### Local Highway Network

The description of the local highway network is acceptable for use. It is noted that the applicant has identified an opportunity to improve the cycling route between the development site and the Whittlesford Parkway train station.

#### Committed Developments

As requested by the Highway Authority, the applicant has included the Babraham Research Campus as a committed development within the assessment. Flows from the July 2014 transport assessment have been used showing that 6% of Babraham Research Campus' traffic will impact on the study area. This agreed.

#### Trip Generation

As requested by the Highway Authority the applicant has excluded Greater London sites from the TRICS assessment. The updated trip generation shows an overview increase of 6 vehicles in each of the peak hours. The total vehicle trip generation of the site is:

- AM Peak Arrivals – 38 trips
- AM Peak Departures – 59 trips
- PM Peak Arrivals – 45 trips
- PM Peak Departures -38 trips.

The trip generation is acceptable for use.

### Car Parking Numbers

The applicant has provided clarity over the number of car parking spaces available for the proposed development to use. There are 515 spaces car parking currently available on the site, of which 80 are reserved for the conference centre only, this leaves 435 spaces available for the IWM. The car parking surveys show that the IWM does not use their full allocation of parking, the additional capacity is proposed to be used by the development.

Table 1 overviews the possible car parking allocation available to the development based on the July 2019 car parking surveys. It has been noted that these surveys were undertaken during the IWM busiest periods and are considered a worst-case scenario.

#### Table 1: IWM Hotel Car Parking Provision

Weekday Weekend

Unused IWM spaces 80 spaces Unused IWM spaces 45 spaces

IWM Hotel Capacity 90 spaces IWM Hotel Capacity 90 spaces

IWM Hotel overspill 30 spaces IWM Hotel overspill 30 spaces

Total available 200 spaces Total available 165 spaces

As shown by Table 1 the maximum weekday allocation is 200 spaces and the maximum

weekend allocation is 165 spaces. South Cambridgeshire District Council's car parking

standards set out that 13 car parking spaces should be provided per 10 guest bedrooms. SCDC standards state that the development must provide 218 (rounded from 218.4) spaces to meet the minimum car parking standards. The current proposals do not meet these standards. The applicant is advised to address this issue.

### Traffic Surveys

As requested, the applicant has provided clarity over the traffic surveys. The baseline conditions have been calculated using data from the 4th and 5th September which are normal school days and within a neutral month.

The applicant has also provided a comparison between the survey flows and flows used by other committed developments in the area. The comparison shows that the September 2019 traffic flows are robust against committed developments. The September surveys are now acceptable for use.

### Distribution

It is noted that 100% of the arrivals will come from the A505 westbound carriageway and the M11. It is noted that there is no right-hand turn into the site from the eastbound carriageway. The applicant has updated their distribution to include the M11 junction 10 roundabout. The updated distribution provides more of an understanding of where the development traffic will impact on the highway network.

The results show:

- M11 Northbound – 53%
- M11 Southbound – 30%
- A505 Westbound – 12%
- A505 Eastbound- 5%

The current flow diagrams are difficult to follow as the applicant has not included any of the right-hand movements from any of the arms of the M11 Junction 10 roundabout, a review is required.

The applicant has not included future year flow diagrams as requested by the highway authority. These need to be included to understand the developments impact in the future year. The applicant also needs to include the TEMPro growth figures used.

#### Junction Modelling

The applicant has not updated to the Linsig model to include the new trip generation figures and the addition of the Babraham Research Campus as a committed development. Full details including the Linsig model need to be submitted to the Highway Authority for review.

#### Travel Plan Measures

It is noted that the proposal of a staff minibus will be decided once the addresses of the employees are known.

A commitment to financial measures to encourage sustainable travel should be made at this stage, this ensures commitment to completing travel plan measures.

23. **Local Highways Authority** – Has no objection subject to the provision of a footway/cycleway link along Royston Road adjacent the A505 to the site entrance under a Section 106 to improve pedestrian/cycle connectivity to the proposed development from Whittlesford Station in order to reduce the use of motor vehicles and promote more sustainable modes of transport.
24. **Cambridgeshire County Council Flood and Water Team** – Has no objections as amended subject to conditions. Comments that the submitted documents demonstrate that surface water from the proposed development will infiltrate into the ground through soakaways. On site infiltration test results in line with BRE DG 365 standards have now been provided to support this strategy. The LLFA is supportive of the use of soakaways as they provide water quality treatment which is of particular importance when infiltrating into the ground.

The site is located entirely in Flood Zone 1 and is considered to be at low risk to surface water flooding. In addition, groundwater was encountered approximately 7 metres below ground level meaning the site is unlikely to be at risk of groundwater flooding.

Water quality has been adequately addressed when assessed against the Simple Index Approach outlined in the CIRIA SuDS Manual.

Requires a condition in relation to a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site based upon the principles within the agreed Surface Water Design Statement prepared by DJP Consulting Engineers Limited (ref: 19053) dated 25th September 2019 and shall also include:

- a) Full calculations detailing the existing surface water runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events.
- b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with an assessment of system performance;
- c) Full details of the proposed soakaways.
- d) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants.
- e) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system.
- f) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water

The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF.

Also requires a condition to provide details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features). The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes.

25. **Environment Agency** – Has no objections. Welcomes the revisions to the Preliminary Risk Assessment in response to its previous comments. Has reviewed the scope of Phase 2 Intrusive Ground Investigation works and has no further comments at this stage.
26. **Anglian Water** – Comments that there are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. Requests an informative with regards to the assets.

The foul drainage from the development is within the catchment area of the Duxford Water recycling centre that will have available capacity for the flows.

It is noted that the site falls within a Source Protection Zone and have assessed that there is no risk to the potable water source.

The sewerage system at present has capacity for the flows. Requests informatives with regards to the sewerage connection.

The proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian water operated assets.

27. **Historic England** – Has no objections. Comments that the Duxford Airfield is an historic place of remarkable significance. From its creation as a training station during the First World War, the site has continued to develop and expand, with buildings of

numerous dates, both relating to its history as a defence airfield, and its subsequent role as a national museum. Many of the structures are listed, including the Grade II\* designation of the remaining early hangers, and the inter-war Control Room. The complete site is included in the conservation area.

In recent years the site's operators, the Imperial War Museum, have engaged Historic England in their evolving Masterplan, and we have been a partner in this vision document for the future management and development of the airfield. The current proposals, for an hotel adjacent to the (modern) perimeter of the site, is in line with the masterplan. We were consulted earlier in the year regarding the evolving hotel design and raised no concerns.

National policy as set out in the NPPF makes clear the government's commitment to sustainable development (para 7 & 8). Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (para 184).

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (para 193). Harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use (para 196).

28. **Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team** – Has no objections. Although this site lies in an area of archaeological potential, situated to the south-east of extensive areas of Roman settlement south of Chronicle Hills which are designated of national importance as a Scheduled Monument (National Heritage List for England reference 1006794), it is thought that an evaluation of the proposed development area, constrained as it is by the motorway and by the airfield development - and likely subject to associated truncation - is unlikely to yield substantial new information relating to the development of former settlement and land use in this area. A condition of planning permission is not considered to be necessary in this instance, and there are no further requirements for the development as proposed.
29. **Civil Aviation Authority** – No reply (out of time).
30. **Natural England** – Has no objections. Comments that the development is unlikely to have any significant effects upon statutorily protected nature conservation sites or landscapes.
31. **Crime Prevention Officer** – Supports the application as security has been considered. The counter terrorism security advisor has good contacts with the site there are no other concerns at this stage.
32. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** – Requires a condition in relation to the provision of fire hydrants.
33. **Camcycle** – Requests that accessibility is improved to the site for cycles in the form of the repair, widening and resurfacing of the path adjacent to the A505 from Heathfield to the M11 and M11 to Whittlesford, evaluation of the byways between Thriplow and Heathfield, provision of toucan crossings at M11 ramps or a bridge over the M11, and review and update signage.

### **Representations**

34. 7 letters of representation have been received in relation to the application. The following concerns have been raised: -

- i) Visual impact- height and size of building dominant, design.
- ii) Impact upon historic site.
- iii) Need for hotel.
- iv) Location of hotel close on operational side of site.
- v) safety - hazard to airplanes.
- vi) Traffic impact- increase in traffic in congested area, survey times, need to consider transport review of A505 first, lack of on-site parking.
- vii) Loss of privacy.
- viii) Security of airfield.
- ix) Impact upon local businesses and competition for staff.

### **Site and Surroundings**

35. Duxford Imperial War Museum (IWM) is a major tourist / visitor attraction, educational and commercial facility based on the historic Duxford airfield. It is located to the north west of Duxford village, south west of Whittlesford village, south of Thriplow village and east of Heathfield. It also situated immediately adjacent to Junction 10 of the M11 motorway and to the north and south of the A505 road. The area to the south of the A505 comprises the airfield, operational buildings, the main exhibit hangers and the conference centre. The area to the north of the A505 comprises storage buildings for the museum and ancillary facilities such as offices. IWM is outside of any village framework, in the countryside and designated as a Special Policy Area. It is situated in the conservation area and comprises a number of listed buildings including three grade II\* listed hangers 3, 4 and 5 (buildings 78, 79 and 84) and the grade II listed Control tower (building 204). It also lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). Green Belt land lies to the north.
36. The site itself is located to the south of the A505 on the eastern part of the airfield mainly between the Airspace Building and Partner hangers. It currently comprises the access road to the conference centre, the conference centre parking area, an area of grassland (partly raised by approximately 1 metre) and an energy building and electricity substation. There are a number of small trees and landscaping on the site along the boundaries with the A505 and M11 and a few small trees on the site.

### **Proposal**

37. The proposal seeks the erection of a 168 bedroom hotel with ancillary facilities, associated access, gates, car parking, cycle parking and landscaping. It would be associated with the existing use of the site as a museum and conference centre and also be open to the general public. The hotel is required to ensure the viability of the site as a national tourist attraction. It would employ 40 staff.
38. The hotel would be sited centrally within the area of grassland to the east of the conference centre parking area and to the north of the energy centre. It would have an L-shape plan form and be six storeys in height (max. 22 metres). The bedrooms would be on the ground to fourth floors, a lobby and gym would be on the ground floor, and the reception area and the bar lounge and dining area would be on the top floor together with an external terrace.
39. The design of the building would comprise features such as the roof, horizontal glazing, top storey and entrance canopy to reflect the features of a plane and the use of the site as an airfield.

40. The materials of construction would be grey metal cladding and white metal cladding with dark grey aluminium panels and glazing for the walls and a light grey metal standing seam roof. There would be a blue brise soleil on the southern elevation and grey louvres to the plant areas.
41. A secondary entrance from the conference centre and a cycle store and refuse storage area would be provided to the northern side of the hotel.
42. Access to the hotel would be via the existing internal access road to the south of the A505 and north of the visitor car park. A new gate would be installed near the entrance that would be controlled by the hotel outside museum operating hours.
43. 89 vehicle parking spaces would be provided to the north and west of the hotel along with a turning area. 30 vehicle parking spaces would be provided within an overflow area to the south of the hotel. 60 vehicle parking spaces would be provided to the south east for the conference centre.
44. 11 trees would be removed from the main site area with the remaining 36 trees alongside the access road retained. New landscaping in the form of native trees and planting is proposed along the boundaries of the site with the M11 and within car parking area on the site. The areas immediately adjacent to the hotel bedrooms would have gravel gardens with shrubs. The main roadway would be tarmac, the parking areas would be paved, and the overflow parking area would be grasscrete.

### **Planning Assessment**

45. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to the principle of the development and the impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the area, heritage assets, trees and landscaping, biodiversity highway safety, flood risk and neighbour amenity.

### **Principle of Development**

46. The site is located outside of any village framework and in the countryside. Duxford IWM is located within a Special Policy Area as a result of it being a major tourist attraction, educational and commercial facility within the District of national importance. The development of a hotel on the site is required to enable the site to remain viable in the future and ensure the sustainability of the site as a branch of the Imperial War Museum.
47. A hotel was granted planning permission on the site in 2003 that comprised conversion of the Officers Mess on the northern part of the site. However, this scheme was not implemented due to the costs of the conversion works. The building is now used as serviced offices.
48. The existing museum has a substantial number of visitors per annum (2,688 in 2018/2019), the airshows generate a significant number of visitors (40,000 per annum) and the conference facilities host a considerable number of events (326 events and 27,000 delegates in 2018). The hotel would provide accommodation to complement and enhance the museum, air shows and conference centre for existing visitors by potentially increasing the time spent at the site. It would also add vitality to the site by attracting new visitors to the area due to the improved public offer.
49. The hotel proposal forms part of the Masterplan of Duxford IWM 2016 that has the aim to make the site a leading UK visitor attraction by increasing visitor numbers,

protecting the heritage of the site and creating a unique public offer and visitor experience.

50. The Masterplan splits the site into three zones – the western zone, the historic core and the eastern zone. The hotel would be located adjacent to the conference centre in the eastern zone. This zone is the more commercial area and has mainly modern buildings such as Airspace that includes the conference centre and the Partner hangers in addition to the visitor centre and visitor parking area. It would be located a significant distance away from the main historic core and airfield in order to retain the original character of the site.
51. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy E/7 of the Local Plan.
52. The development would provide additional visitor accommodation in the area. Whilst the site is in the countryside and the development is not considered to represent a new small-scale development, it is considered to relate specifically to local circumstances as it is required to support the museum.
53. The Cambridge area is an international tourist destination with a significant number of visitors particularly in the summer. The museum provides a unique attraction for visitors to the area.
54. Whilst there is a significant amount of hotel accommodation within the city of Cambridge, it is understood that there is an increased need for hotel accommodation in the district since the research carried out for the latest Local Plan that did not allocate any site for visitor accommodation. In addition, there is a limited amount of accommodation in the immediate area of Duxford IWM that consists of a Holiday Inn Express 70 bed hotel close to Whittlesford Parkway Station and approximately 12 small hotels/ guesthouses including the Red Lion Hotel, Whittlesford and The Lodge, Duxford.
55. The hotel would also provide accommodation to cater for visitors to the Cambridge area. This would contribute to the need and demand for accommodation in the area and reduce the need to travel from other accommodation to the site.
56. Notwithstanding the above, the hotel would promote economic growth by providing 40 new jobs in the local area.
57. The issues raised in relation to competition with local businesses is not a planning consideration that can be taken into account in the application decision-making process.
58. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy E/7 of the Local Plan. Whilst the proposal would not comply with Policy E/20 of the Local Plan, it is considered acceptable as a departure to this policy given the national importance of the site.

### **Character and Appearance of the Area**

59. The site is located outside of any development framework and in the countryside. Duxford IWM to the south of the A595 comprises a central historic area that has the three grade II\* listed hangers and a number of other listed and older buildings. The outer areas that contain modern buildings such as Airspace, Hanger 4 and the Partner hangers to the east and American Air Museum and Land Warfare Hall to the west. The airfield runway lies to the south.

60. The grade II\* listed hangers and the modern buildings are significant in scale whereas the other listed and older buildings along with the modern visitor centre are lower in scale.
61. The larger and modern buildings on the site have fairly simple plan forms, a design appropriate to their uses, and use light metal cladding materials. The exception is the hangers that have painted brick materials. The smaller buildings are more complex in their plan form, have a more detailed design appropriate to the time, and use red bricks and slate tiles for the roofs.
62. The hotel would be sited within an existing complex of modern buildings to the eastern part of the site. It would have a simple L shape plan form and be set back behind the existing Partner hangers to the south and approximately in line with Airspace building to the west. It would be significant scale being six storeys in height and higher than the existing hangers but approximately 0.5 metres lower than the Airspace building with a sloping roof to the western wing. The plan form of the building would have two wings that measure 58 metres and 43 metres in length. The footprint of the building would be similar to the footprint of the hangers but much smaller than the size of the Airspace building.
63. Whilst it is noted that the building would infill an existing fairly open gap between two buildings to the east of the site, it is not considered to result in a visually prominent building that would block important countryside views, adversely affect the landscape character of the area and be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the local area. This is due to the close views of the airfield from the M11 and M11 slip road being limited due to the site levels, level of the road and direction of traffic to the north and the close views from the roundabout at junction 10 of the M11 being dominated by the Airspace building. The building would be read within the context of existing buildings and landscaping in longer distance views from the M11, the eastern section of the A505 and Grange Road in Duxford.
64. When visitors would enter the site from the A505, the view would be of Airspace building and the visitor car park with signs alongside directing visitors along the access road to the hotel. Public art has been encouraged to be provided on the site close to the main access to aid legibility. However, it is considered that public art could detract from the main entrance feature to the IWM visitor car park and signs would be acceptable.
65. When visitors would enter the hotel site from the main access road, the view would be of a grass area with feature planting and signs directing visitors to the main car park. The vehicle parking would be beyond this planting area and dispersed with trees. The access to the hotel car park would have a view of the cycle parking and bin enclosure with an area of grass, but it is considered that views would be drawn to the roof of the building that slopes down to create a distinctive feature and the feature concrete turning area beyond that has a focal point tree. Public art has also been encouraged in this area, but it is considered that planting would be better in order to soften the impact of the development and enhance its visual quality. The layout is therefore considered satisfactory.
66. The building would have an L shape plan form where the eastern wing would run at right angles to the Airspace building and the western wing would run parallel to the Airspace building.

67. The design of the building would modern and contemporary. It would be fairly simple in its overall character and appearance but would comprise additional features to reflect a plane and the use of the site as an airfield. These include a curved roof and end to reflect the curves of the adjacent hanger, an entrance canopy to reflect a wing of a plane, horizontal glazing to reflect the windows of a plane and a fully glazed top floor to reflect the design of a control tower.
68. The materials of construction would comprise metal cladding in a palette of greys along with glazing and elements of blue on the brise soleil. The type of materials and colours would replicate the colours found on the Airspace building adjacent and are considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the modern buildings on the airfield.
69. The scheme was presented at the Design Enabling Panel at the pre-application stage and is now considered to address the original concerns. It is not considered necessary to present the application for a second time.
70. A condition would be attached to any consent to agree samples of materials to ensure that the development reflects existing palette of materials on the site.
71. The scheme is considered to be of high-quality design and make a positive contribution to the visual amenity of the area.
72. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies NH/2, HQ/1 and HQ/2 of the Local Plan.

### **Heritage Assets**

73. The site is situated in the conservation area and comprises a number of listed buildings.
74. The Duxford Airfield was designated as a conservation area on 4 June 2007. It was designated as it is regarded as the finest and best preserved example of a fighter base representative of the period up to 1945 in Britain, with an exceptionally complete group of First World War technical buildings in addition to technical and domestic buildings typical of both inter-war Expansion Periods of the RAF. It also has important associations with the Battle of Britain and the American fighter support for the Eighth Air Force.
75. Its first use as a landing field for military flying was during the Military Manoeuvres of 1912. After the first German bomber raids on London in 1917 was apparent that the distribution of airfields away from the coast to form a defensive arc around the capital would be required. Construction of the Training Depot Station at Duxford started in October 1917 with the first units, including Americans, arriving in March 1918.
76. The central historic core of the site is considered the most significant part of the conservation area as it comprises three grade II\* listed hangers that face the airfield to the south and the grade II listed Control Tower. In addition, it also includes the grade II\* listed operations room along with 15 other grade II listed buildings.
77. The three grade II\* listed World War 1 Hangers are described as follows: -

Group of three hangers built in 1917-18 to the War Office's Directorate of Fortifications and designed by Lieutenant-Colonel BHO Armstrong of the Royal Engineers.

They are listed for the following reasons: -

*Architectural interest:*

\* as a rare First World War Hangar which remains largely unaltered since it was built as part of the original layout and design of the Training Depot Station;

\* it was designed by Lieutenant-Colonel BHO Armstrong, considered to be the most important War Office architect of the First World War;

\* its Belfast roof truss exemplifies the high standard of design achieved against the constraints in cost, efficiency and utility as demanded by the Air Ministry;

\* the undivided interior allows for the full impact of its space and construction to be appreciated, with the military experience still being readily captured;

\* the inter-war alterations to the annexes are significant in themselves as they illustrate how the hangar was modified to meet the threat posed by Germany's increasing air strength.

*Historic interest:*

\* as an integral component of Duxford Airfield the finest and best-preserved example of a fighter base representative of the period up to 1945 in Britain;

\* for Duxford's important association with the Battle of Britain and the American fighter support for the Eighth Air Force.

*Group value:*

\* for its strong group value with the uniquely complete group of First World War technical and domestic buildings typical of both inter-war Expansion Periods of the RAF;

\* for the surviving spatial and functional relationship between the hangar and the flying field which it served.

78. The grade Control Tower is described as follows: -

An airfield control tower, dating to 1942 and built by the Air Ministry's Directorate of Works and Buildings.

It is listed for the following reasons: -

*Architectural interest:*

\* in spite of later alterations the tower continues to reflect its 1942 design.

*Historic interest:*

\* it is one of the key buildings on Duxford Airfield which forms important physical evidence of the historic use of the airfield and more generally of the military forces deployed within the United Kingdom during the Second World War.

*Group value:*

\* it is part of the important surviving ensemble of military airfield structures at Duxford airfield.

79. The siting of the development in the eastern zone of the site within the complex of existing modern buildings is considered appropriate as siting within the historic core of the site would result in substantial harm to the most significant part of the conservation area as part of the military experience of the Museum and the secure site. There are also no existing buildings on the site in an appropriate location outside the historic core that would be viable to use for this purpose.
80. The eastern part of the airfield has already been significantly altered by the construction of the M11 that is a modern intervention and separates the site from the surrounding countryside. This area comprises a number of more modern buildings including Airspace, Hanger 2, the Partner hangers and the Visitor Centre.
81. The main public views into the eastern part of the conservation area are from the M11, A505, Hunts Road and Grange Road.
82. When travelling along the M11 northbound, the existing long-distance views comprise the airfield and historic hangers to the west and a group of modern buildings to the east. The Airspace building dominates the view due to its siting closer to the road. The development would result in the loss of the eastern part of the Airspace building in this view as the new development would be sited to the eastern side of this building and behind the existing hangers. However, the original west elevation facing towards the airfield would be retained.
83. When travelling along the M11 northbound, the existing close views are mainly of the Partner hangers. The Airspace building is obscured from views until you are nearly level with that building and this is screened by a tree belt and views towards the airfield and countryside beyond are limited to very small section of the slip road. Whilst it is acknowledged that the development would be highly visible in these views, it should be noted that the views are passing views where you would need to turn away from the road and not main focal point views. The development is not considered to significantly change views into the conservation area across to the airfield and countryside beyond due to the limited nature of the view and direction of travel.
84. Views from the M11/A505 roundabout would also be very limited with the eastern elevation of the Airspace building representing the most dominant structure due to its siting and scale.
85. When travelling along the M11 southbound, views would be dominated by the Airspace Building.
86. When travelling along the A505 westbound, the existing long-distance views comprise the Airspace building, Partner hangers tree screening and countryside to the south. The Airspace building dominates the view. The development would result in the loss of the western part of the Airspace building in this view as the new development would be sited to the western side of this building to the side of the existing hangers. However, the original east elevation facing towards the road would be retained.

87. When travelling along the A505 westbound, the existing close views are mainly of part of the eastern elevation of the Airspace building, Partner hangers and tree screening. The development would have limited visibility from these views.
88. From Hunts Road leading to Duxford to the east, the mid-distance views are of the Airspace building and partner hangers. This is the view of the site where the development is considered to have the greatest impact. The hotel would be visible between the existing buildings and obscure the existing south elevation of the Airspace building. However, views of the eastern elevation would be retained. These views would not result in the loss of views into the conservation area of the airfield and countryside. Whilst it is acknowledged that the development would be fairly dominant in these views, it should be noted there is some screening along the road and it would be passing views where you would need to turn away from the road and not a focal point.
89. From Grange Road in Duxford to the south, the long-distance views are of the whole airfield. The historic core is lower in scale than the American Air Museum and future large objects store at the western end and at the Airspace building at the eastern end. The development would result in the loss of the eastern part of the Airspace building from this view. However, the western elevation facing the airfield would remain along with views of the historic core of the site.
90. Consequently, the development is considered to result in less than substantial harm to views into the conservation area from surrounding public viewpoints.
91. Views from the historic core of the site in the conservation area and the setting of the listed buildings are currently towards Hanger 2, the visitor centre, the northern and western elevations of the Airspace building and Partner hangers.
92. The development would be sited a distance of 460 metres from the historic core of the conservation area and the grade II\* listed Hanger 3 and separated by the non-listed Hanger 2 and part of the Airspace building. It is considered that very limited views of the development would be seen from the central part of the airfield and that the Airspace building would dominate the view. However, it is noted that views would become more apparent the further you travel to the east notwithstanding that these views would consist of the existing group of modern buildings.
93. Consequently, the development is considered to result in less than substantial harm to views from the most significant part of the conservation area in the historic core and within the setting of the listed buildings. Views from the less significant part of the conservation area to the east and the listed Control Tower are less important and would not interrupt the most significant historic settings of these buildings towards the airfield and the relationship with the wider context of the site. This is likely to result in less than substantial harm.
94. The building would be sited back from the west elevation of the Airspace building when viewed from the airfield so this would be retained as the most visually prominent building in this part of the site. The scale of the building would also be subservient in height and footprint to the adjacent Airspace building.
95. Whilst it is acknowledged that the design of the building more complex in terms of its design than the existing buildings on the airfield, it would replicate features commonly found within airfields to reflect the historic use of the site. It would not be possible to design a hotel without features such as glazing and subsequently some artificial lighting in order to ensure that it has a solely utilitarian appearance. In addition, not all

areas are likely to be illuminated at the same time. The use of features such as the horizontal glazed windows to reflect a plane and a top floor which reflects a control tower is considered acceptable within this context. The sloping roof would not be visible from the historic core and the most significant part of the site.

96. A condition could be attached to any consent to ensure that the colour of the building is more appropriate to the existing buildings and ensure that it would not detract from the palette of colours on the site.
97. Given the conclusion that the development would result in less than substantial harm to heritage assets, any public benefits of the development need to be balanced against the harm. In this particular case, the viability of the site as an important tourist attraction is considered to attract significant weight in the decision-making process. Without this development, Duxford IWM would struggle to ensure that the existing historic buildings and site is maintained in the national interest. Commercial developments are required on the site to supplement the funding currently provided by the government.
98. The site lies in an area of archaeological potential and close to a Scheduled Ancient Monument. An evaluation of the site is not considered necessary to be gain any new information not already known given its nature that is constrained by the motorway and airfield development. The development is not considered to harm archaeological interest and a condition is not required in relation to a further archaeological investigation of the site.
99. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy NH/14 of the Local Plan.

#### **Trees and Landscaping**

100. The site currently comprises a number of small trees and landscaping along the outer boundary of the site and within the grassed area on the site.
101. A Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment was submitted with the application. 11 trees would be removed from the site that would include one category B tree (moderate quality) and 10 category C trees (low quality). 35 trees would be retained and protected that include one category A tree, 13 category B trees and 21 category C tree. The development is not considered to result in the loss of any trees that are important to the visual amenity of the area.
102. New landscaping would be provided within the site to compensate for the trees lost and enhance the quality of the development. The current landscape scheme is not supported due to types of the trees and position of planting within the parking areas.
103. However, it is considered that an acceptable scheme could be provided, and a condition would be attached to any consent to agree an appropriate strategy that responds to the local character of the area.
104. The visitor car park does not fall within the site area and is not required to be improved as part of the application.
105. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy NH/4 of the Local Plan.

#### **Biodiversity**

106. The site consists of habitats in the form of grassland, perennial vegetation, hard landscaping and small trees.
107. An Ecological Appraisal was submitted with the application. From the survey, no evidence of badgers, bats, birds, newts and reptiles were recorded on the site. Mitigation in the form of the removal of vegetation outside the bird breeding season, any excavations deeper than 0.2 metres covered overnight or a means of escape provided to protect badgers and any vegetation kept at a height of 5cm to avoid reptiles colonising the site. The development is not considered to have an adverse impact upon protected species.
108. Biodiversity enhancement on the site would be achieved through planting native trees and shrubs.
109. Conditions would be attached to any consent in relation to a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP) to ensure adequate mitigation and enhancement together with a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) to ensure biodiversity on the site is maintained in the future.
110. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy NH/4 of the Local Plan.

### **Highway Safety**

111. The access to the site is off the A505 which is a busy through road with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. The current visitor entrance has a slip road and traffic signals.
112. The development would increase traffic generation to the site. There are also a number of other developments in the area such as Genome Campus expansion, Sawston Trade Park that need to be taken into consideration when carrying out an assessment as to the impact of the development upon the capacity of the public highway.
113. The estimated number of trips calculated under TRICS during the am peak period (07.00 to 10.00) is 109 arrivals and 154 departures and in the pm peak period (16.00 to 19.00) is 139 arrivals and 130 departures. This result in 43 arrivals and 66 departures during the am peak hour (08.00 to 09.00) and 51 arrivals and 43 departures during the pm peak hour (17.00 to 18.00). Of the trips in the am peak hours, 38 arrival and 59 departures are by car and of the trips in the pm peak hours, 45 arrivals and 38 departures are by car. Currently there is very limited modes of travel to the site by public transport.
114. The overall number of trips generated is not considered to adversely affect the capacity and functioning of the public highway subject to the results of the Temprow growth figures, linsig review of the junction modelling and adequate mitigation. It is suggested that a commuted sum for the maintenance of the keep clear area on the M11 Junction 10 roundabout is secured. This would be a condition of any consent.
115. The design of the existing access accords with Local Highways Authority standards in terms of its width and visibility splays and no improvements are required as a result of the development.
116. Whittlesford Parkway Station is located approximately 2.5 km to the north east of the site that has a regular train service to Cambridge and London Liverpool Street. There is a shared footway/cycleway along the northern side of the A505 and access along Royston Road and Station Road West to the station.

117. The 7A bus stops outside the Duxford IWM visitor car park. It has a service every 1.5 hours Mondays to Saturdays to Whittlesford Parkway Station and Trumpington Park and Ride site. The Citi 7 bus also stops at Heathfield once a day.
118. The site is considered to be accessible by a variety of modes of transport by staff. However, this is more limited for visitors as they may have luggage that would prevent walking and cycling. The upgrading the footway is not justified for this size/type of development due to the modal split which states that there are no trips associated with sustainable modes. To ensure effective travel planning, and the introduction of a shuttle bus service to local transport hubs would provide adequate mitigation. This has been agreed by the applicant and would be a condition of any consent.
119. The measures suggested by Camcycle are also not justified as these measures are not required as a result of the development to make it acceptable in planning terms and are more for existing users or local users.
120. The hotel has a floorspace of 7,801 square metres.
121. C1 uses require 13 vehicle parking spaces per 10 guest bedrooms. The hotel has 168 bedrooms so this would result in a requirement for 218 vehicle parking spaces.
122. 96 vehicle parking spaces would be provided on the site that would include 6 disabled spaces and 14 spaces with electric vehicle charging points. In addition, 30 vehicle parking spaces would be provided in an overflow area. The conference centre has 80 spaces and the museum has 595 spaces.
123. A survey has been carried out of the car parks that has identified that they are not fully occupied on weekdays (18% left) or the weekend (10% left). The conference centre would provide 18 spaces in weekdays and 53 spaces at the weekend. This would provide additional vehicle parking to address the shortfall and the level of vehicle parking on the site is considered acceptable.
124. C1 uses require 1 cycle parking spaces per 2 staff working at the same time. The hotel would have 40 staff so this would result in a requirement for 20 cycle parking spaces.
125. A cycle parking shed with 20 spaces would be provided adjacent to the hotel to comply with the standards.
126. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies TI/2 and TI/3 of the Local Plan and paragraph 109 of NPPF.

### **Flood Risk**

127. The site is located within flood zone 1 (low risk).
128. A Flood Risk Assessment, surface water design statement and calculations and a drainage layout plan has been submitted with the application.
129. The development is not considered to be at significant risk of flooding and the development is appropriate within the low risk flood zone. It is not sited close to any fluvial sources and groundwater is 7 metres below ground levels.

130. The development is not considered to increase the risk of flooding to the site and surrounding area. Surface water from the development is proposed to infiltrate into the ground through soakaways. On site filtration tests have been carried out to demonstrate that this is an acceptable method of drainage that meet sustainable drainage principles. Soakaways would provide water quality treatment to minimise pollution to groundwaters.
131. Conditions would be attached to any consent to secure a suitable surface water drainage scheme along with details of its long-term maintenance.
132. The development would therefore comply with Policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 of the Local Plan.

### **Neighbour Amenity and Amenity of Future Occupiers**

133. The development would be located adjacent to existing commercial buildings on the airfield. It is not considered to result in an unduly overbearing mass, significant loss of light, severe loss of privacy or unacceptable increase in the level of noise and disturbance to occupiers of the adjoining buildings given their uses.
134. Conditions would be attached to any consent in relation to a noise impact assessment for any plant and equipment, hours of use of site machinery and deliveries during construction,
135. The site is located adjacent to the M11 motorway and on an airfield. The adjoining uses are not considered to harm the occupiers of the hotel through an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance providing a condition is attached to any consent in relation to a noise insulation scheme.
136. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan.

### **Other Matters**

137. The site is located within the Duxford Airfield safeguarding zone. The development is not considered to result in a safety risk to aircraft taking off and landing at the site as it would not be directly within the line of approach to and the flightpath from the runway and would be lower in height than the existing Airspace building. A significant amount of research has recently been carried out by Duxford IWM to understand movements to and from the airfield.
138. The site is currently an airfield. Phase 1 and Phase 2 Land Contamination reports have been submitted with the application. The surveys have identified some contaminants on the site, but these will be removed as part of the development or covered by a parking area. The development is not considered to have an adverse impact upon human health.
139. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy SC/11 of the Local Plan.
140. A Sustainability Statement has been submitted with the application. Energy efficiency measures include building fabric with good thermal properties and solar controls, high efficiency lighting and mechanical ventilation. The renewable energy measures recommended for the development include combined heat and power and air source heat pumps. Water conservation measures include water meters, low flow fittings and rainwater harvesting. These measures are likely to be acceptable and meet the targets. Conditions would be attached to any consent to agree precise details of the

renewable energy measures and water conservation strategy to ensure the targets are achieved.

141. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies CC/1, CC/3 and CC/4 of the Local Plan.

### **Recommendation**

142. Approval subject to the following conditions and informatives

### **Conditions**

a) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

(Reason - To ensure that consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development, which have not been acted upon.)

b) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing numbers 653-001 Revision F, 653-002, 653-010 Revision J, 653-011 Revision D, 653-013, 653-014 Revision K, 653-015 Revision K, 653-016 Revision E, 653-017 Revision D and 653-018 Revision D.

(Reason - To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)

c) No development above base course level shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the buildings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the site does not detract from the character of the area in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

d) No development shall be occupied until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the development is occupied in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.

(Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the site does not detract from the character of the area in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

e) No development shall be occupied until full details of soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include specification of all proposed trees, hedges and shrub planting, which shall include details of species, density and size of stock.

(Reason - To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity in accordance with Policy NH/4 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

f) All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of five years from the date of the planting, or

replacement planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

(Reason - To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity in accordance with Policy NH/4 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

g) If, during remediation or construction works, any additional or unexpected contamination is identified, then remediation proposals for this material should be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any works proceed and shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved.

(Reason – To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy SC/11 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.)

h) No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEcMP shall include the following.

a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.

b) Identification of “biodiversity protection zones”.

c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).

d) The location and timings of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.

e) The times during which construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.

f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.

g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.

h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs if applicable.

The approved CEcMP shall be ahead to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

(Reason - To minimise disturbance, harm or potential impact upon protected species in accordance with Policy NH/4 of the adopted Local Plan 2018 and their protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.)

i) Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority prior any development above slab level. The content of the LEMP shall include the following.

a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed.

b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.

c) Aims and objectives of management.

d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.

e) Prescriptions for management actions.

f) Prescription of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).

g) Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan.

h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results form monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To minimise disturbance, harm or potential impact upon protected species in accordance with Policy NH/4 of the adopted Local Plan 2018 and their protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.)

j) No above ground works shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before development is completed.

The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Surface Water Design Statement prepared by DJP Consulting Engineers Limited (ref: 19053) dated 25th September 2019 and shall also include:

a) Full calculations detailing the existing surface water runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events.

b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with an assessment of system performance;

c) Full details of the proposed soakaways.

d) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants.

e) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system.

f) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water.

The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG.

(Reason - To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development in accordance with Policies CC/8 and CC/9 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

k) Details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any building. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

(Reason - To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of drainage systems that are not publicly adopted, in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework.)

l) No construction work and/or construction related dispatches from or deliveries to the site shall take place other than between the hours of 08.00 to 18.00 on Monday to Friday, 08.00 to 13.00 hours on Saturdays and no construction works or collection /

deliveries shall take place on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.  
(Reason – To protect the amenities of occupiers of the nearby buildings in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

m) In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents noise and or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5528, 2009 - Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites Parts 1 - Noise and 2 -Vibration (or as superseded). Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason – To protect the amenities of occupiers of the nearby buildings in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

n) No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust (including the consideration of wheel washing and dust suppression provisions) from the site during the construction period or relevant phase of development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details / scheme unless the local planning authority approves the variation of any detail in advance and in writing.

(Reason – To protect the amenities of occupiers of the nearby buildings in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

o) No development (including any pre-construction, demolition or enabling works) shall take place until a comprehensive construction programme identifying each phase of the development and confirming construction activities to be undertaken in each phase and a timetable for their execution submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The development shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved programme unless any variation has first been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(Reason – To protect the amenities of occupiers of the nearby buildings in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

p) A further detailed noise assessment to be completed and a scheme be submitted for the insulation of the building(s) and/or associated plant / equipment or other attenuation measures as necessary, in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said building(s) and/or plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be maintained in strict accordance with the approved details.

(Reason – To protect the amenities of occupiers of the nearby buildings in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

q) Before any development is commenced, a scheme for protecting the proposed hotel from noise from the road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and all works which form part of the approved scheme shall be completed before the development is occupied.

(Reason – To protect the amenities of the occupiers of the hotel in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

r) Before the development hereby permitted is occupied, an assessment of the noise impact of plant and or equipment including any renewable energy provision sources such as any air source heat pump or wind turbine on the proposed and existing residential premises and a scheme for insulation as necessary, in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant and or equipment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any noise insulation scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the development hereby permitted is occupied and shall thereafter be maintained in strict accordance with the approved details and shall not be altered without prior approval.

(Reason – To protect the amenities of the occupiers of the hotel in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

s) Prior to the occupation of the development an artificial lighting scheme, to include details of any external lighting of the site, floodlighting, security / residential lighting and an assessment of impact on any sensitive residential premises on and off site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include layout plans / elevations with luminaire locations annotated, full isolux contour map / diagrams showing the predicted illuminance in the horizontal and vertical plane (in lux) at critical locations within the site, on the boundary of the site and at adjacent properties, hours and frequency of use, a schedule of equipment in the lighting design (luminaire type / profiles, mounting height, aiming angles / orientation, angle of glare, operational controls) and shall assess artificial light impact in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011. The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

(Reason - To protect the occupiers of nearby buildings from light pollution / nuisance and protect / safeguard the amenities of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

t) Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, a Waste Management & Minimisation Strategy (WMMS), including the completed RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit and supporting reference material, addressing the management of municipal waste generation during the occupation stage of the development shall be submitted. No development shall be occupied until the strategy has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The Waste Management & Minimisation Strategy (WMMS) must demonstrate how waste will be managed in accordance with the requirements of the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and the principles of the waste hierarchy, thereby maximising waste prevention, re-use and recycling from domestic households and commercial properties and contributing to sustainable development. The WMMS should include:

- i. A completed RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit and supporting reference material
- ii. A detailed Waste Audit to include anticipated waste type, source, volume, weight etc. of municipal waste generation during the occupation stage of the development
- iii. Proposals for the management of municipal waste generated during the occupation stage of the development, to include the design and provision of permanent facilities e.g. internal and external segregation and storage of recyclables,

non-recyclables and compostable materials; access to storage and collection points by users and waste collection vehicles

iv. Arrangements for the provision, on-site storage, delivery and installation of waste containers prior to occupation of any dwelling

v. Proposals for the design and provision of temporary community recycling (bring) facilities, including installation, ownership, on-going management and maintenance arrangements

vi. Arrangements for the efficient and effective integration of proposals into waste and recycling collection services provided by the Waste Collection Authority

vii. A timetable for implementing all proposals

viii. Provision for monitoring the implementation of all proposals

The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the occupation, use or opening for business of any building that will be used for residential, commercial or employment purposes and shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

(Reason - To ensure that waste is managed sustainably during the occupation of the development in accordance with objectives of Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003.)

u) A Carbon Reduction Statement, which demonstrates that at least 10% of the developments total predicted carbon emissions will be reduced through the implementation of on-site renewable and/or low carbon energy sources, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The statement shall include the following details:

a) Full detailed design stage SBEM calculations demonstrating the total energy requirements of the whole development, set out in Kg/CO<sub>2</sub>/annum based on a Part L Compliant Scheme.

b) A schedule of how the proposed on-site renewable and/or low carbon energy technologies will impact on the carbon emissions presented in (a) above.

The proposed renewable energy technologies shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of any approved buildings and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

(Reason - In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (South Cambridgeshire Local Plan policy CC/3).

v) The development shall not be occupied until a final Certificate has been issued certifying that BREEAM (or any such equivalent national measure of sustainable building which replaces that scheme) rating 'Excellent' has been achieved for this development."

(Reason - In the interests of reducing carbon emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings in line with policies CC/1, CC/4 and CC/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

The BREEAM condition mentioned above should ensure that the development will achieve the improved levels of water efficiency required by CC/4, (2 BREEAM credits for water efficiency).

w) Prior to the occupation of the development, a Low Emission Strategy should be submitted and approved by Local Authority. LES should demonstrate that adequate measures for sustainable transport are considered for the proposed development in accordance with current council policy for a development of this size.

(Reason: In the interests of reducing impacts of developments on local air quality and encouraging sustainable forms of transport in accordance with Policy SC/12 Air Quality and Policy TI/2 Sustainable Travel of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Adopted September 2018 and the National Planning Policy Framework NPPF 2018).

x) No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision and location of fire hydrants to serve the development to a standard recommended by the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the approved scheme has been implemented.

(Reason - To ensure an adequate water supply is available for emergency use.)

y) Prior to the beneficial occupation of the hotel, Keep Clear road markings or an equivalent measure shall be installed on the circulatory carriageway of M11 junction 10 where it connects with the M11 southbound off slip to the satisfaction of the planning authority in consultation with the local highway authorities.

(Reason - To ensure that the M11 motorway and connecting roads at Junction 10 continue to serve their purpose as a part of a national system for through traffic in accordance with Section 10 of the Highways Act 1980, and to satisfy the reasonable requirements of road safety.)

z) No development shall commence until a scheme to secure the maintenance of the keep clear area on the M11 Junction 10 roundabout has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained.

(Reason – In the interests of highway safety.)

ai) No development shall commence until a scheme to secure the introduction of a shuttle bus service to local transport hubs has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained.

(Reason – In the interests of highway safety.)

bi) Prior to construction of the hotel and ancillary work, a construction management plan shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority. The plan should include measures to minimise traffic movements through the M11 Junction 10 at peak times

(Reason - To ensure that the M11 motorway and connecting roads at Junction 10 continue to serve their purpose as a part of a national system for through traffic in accordance with Section 10 of the Highways Act 1980, and to satisfy the reasonable requirements of road safety.)

## **Informatives**

a) Surface water and groundwater bodies are highly vulnerable to pollution and the impact of construction activities. It is essential that the risk of pollution (particularly during the construction phase) is considered and mitigated appropriately. It is important to remember that flow within the watercourse is likely to vary by season and it could be dry at certain times throughout the year. Dry watercourses should not be overlooked as these watercourses may flow or even flood following heavy rainfall.

b) There shall be no burning of any waste or other materials on the site, without prior consent from the environmental health department.

c) To satisfy the Commercial Use Operational Noise Impact/Insulation condition, the noise level from all powered plant, vents and equipment, associated with this application that may operate collectively and having regard to a worst case operational scenario (operating under full power / load), should not raise the existing lowest representative background level dB LA90,1hr (L90) during the day between 0700 to 2300 hrs over any 1 hour period and the existing lowest background level dB

LA90, 15mins (L90) during night time between 2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 15 minute period by more than 3 dB(A) respectively (i.e. the rating level of the plant needs to match or be below the existing background level), at the boundary of the premises subject to this application (or if not practicable at a measurement reference position / or positions in agreement with the LPA) and having particular regard to noise sensitive premises. The appropriate correction factors need to be applied to any characteristic acoustic features in accordance with BS4142 2014.

d) This is to guard against any creeping background noise in the area and to protect the amenity of the area, preventing unreasonable noise disturbance to other premises.

e) To demonstrate this requirement, it is recommended that the agent/applicant submits a noise prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142: 2014 "Method for rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas" or similar. In addition to validate /verify any measured noise rating levels, noise levels should be collectively predicted at the boundary of the site having regard to the nearest residential premises.

f) Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring noise sensitive premises; with noise sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of noise sources; details of proposed noise sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power levels, noise frequency spectrums, noise directionality of plant, noise levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of noise mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full noise calculation procedures; noise levels at a representative sample of noise sensitive locations (background L90) and hours of operation. Any report shall include raw measurement data so that conclusions may be thoroughly evaluated, and calculations checked. Any ventilation system with associated ducting should have anti vibration mountings.

g) The applicant should take all relevant precautions to minimise the potential for disturbance to neighbouring residents in terms of noise and dust during the construction phases of development. This should include the use of water suppression for any stone or brick cutting and advising neighbours in advance of any particularly noisy works. The granting of this planning permission does not indemnify against statutory nuisance action being taken should substantiated noise or dust complaints be received. For further information please contact the Environmental Health Service.

h) The granting of this planning permission does not in any way indemnify against statutory nuisance action being taken should substantiated complaints within the remit of part III of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 be received

### **Background Papers:**

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
- South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents
- File references S/2896/19/FL

**Report Author:**

Karen Pell-Coggins  
Telephone Number:

Senior Planning Officer  
07704 018456