

**FORMER HOTEL FELIX,
CAMBRIDGE
STATEMENT OF CASE
FOR THE APPELLANT**

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	The Site and Context	2
3.0	Draft Statement of Common Ground	2
4.0	Legislation and the adopted Development Plan	3
5.0	The National Planning Policy Framework and other Material Considerations	4
6.0	The Appellant's case	5
7.0	Other matters	12

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This appeal is made on behalf of Cassel Hotels (Cambridge) Ltd [“the Appellant”], against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council [“the Council”] to refuse an application for detailed planning permission reference 21/00953/FUL [“the development”] at Former Hotel Felix, Cambridge [“the site”].
- 1.2 The description of development is:
- Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a care home (Use Class C2) with external amenity space, access, parking, landscaping and other associated works.*
- 1.3 The Appellant submitted an application for planning permission to the Council on 1 March 2020. The application was registered as validated on the same day.
- 1.4 The application was referred to planning committee on 13 July 2022 with a recommendation to approve permission. However, the Committee did not agree with the position of officers and refused the application on three grounds:
- 1) The site is located outside of the development framework boundary of Girton, within the countryside and Cambridge Green Belt. The proposed development would represent inappropriate development that is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt in policy terms as the development does not fall within any of the exception criteria within paragraphs 149 or 150 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy S/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and paragraphs 147, 148, 149 and 150 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 that seek to resist inappropriate development in the Green Belt.*
- 2) In addition to harm caused by inappropriateness, the proposed development would result in the loss of a non-designated heritage asset to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. In taking a balanced judgement, the loss of the non-designated heritage asset is considered to cause substantial harm as it would fail to sustain or enhance the significance of the asset and the overall benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh the harm identified. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and policy NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.*
- 3) The application has failed to provide very special circumstances including the need for specialist housing which, taken individually or collectively, demonstrate why the harm by reason of inappropriateness in the Green Belt and other harm identified, being the loss of the non-designated heritage asset, is clearly outweighed by these considerations. The application therefore fails to satisfy the requirements of paragraphs 147 and 148 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.*
- 1.5 The decision notice is provided at **Appendix 1** and the officer report at **Appendix 2**.
- 1.6 The Statement of Common Ground identifies the factual matters agreed with the Council. The remainder of this statement focuses the matters of disagreement, including:
- i) Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt is justified by very special circumstances; and

ii) Whether the loss of a non-designated heritage asset is justified against the test identified in paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

2.0 The Site and Context

2.1 A full description of the application site and its context is set out within the application documentation and the draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) that accompanies this appeal submission.

3.0 Draft Statement of Common Ground

3.1 A draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) accompanies this appeal.

3.2 The draft SoCG sets out areas of anticipated agreement between the Appellant and the Council to reduce the scope of evidence to be considered at the Inquiry.

3.3 The draft SoCG is set out as follows:

- Introduction
- Plans and statements
- Planning history
- Development Plan Policy
- Other relevant planning policy and guidance considerations
- Areas of agreement
- Areas with no agreement
- List of planning conditions
- Appendix 1: Draft Heads of Terms
- Appendix 2: Core Documents list.

3.4 Whilst there are three reasons of refusal, refusal reasons 1 and 3 are linked. Paragraph 148 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that any potential harm to the Green Belt by reasons of inappropriateness can be clearly outweighed by other considerations through 'Very Special Circumstances'. As such, it is anticipated that the areas of disagreement are:

i) Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt is justified by very special circumstances; and

ii) Whether the loss of a non-designated heritage asset is justified against the test identified in paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

3.5 Where there are matters set out in the draft SoCG that cannot be agreed with the Council, evidence will be presented at the Inquiry to address these matters.

4.0 Legislation and the adopted Development Plan

4.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that:

“If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”

The adopted Development Plan

4.2 The statutory adopted development plan, insofar as it relates to this appeal, comprises the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018).

4.3 The policies within the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) [“SCLP”] considered the most important in the determination of this appeal are set out in the draft SoCG and are as follows:

- Policy S/4: Cambridge Green Belt.
- Policy S/7: Development Frameworks.
- Policy HQ/1: Design Principles.
- Policy NH/2: Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character.
- Policy NH/8: Mitigating the Impact of Development in and Adjoining the Green Belt.
- Policy NH/14: Heritage Assets.

4.4 Explanatory paragraphs 7.38 to 7.39 of the SCLP are of relevance to this appeal and state the following:

[7.38] *‘The population of the district is ageing and often older people need or prefer smaller properties that are easier to manage than their original home, with people often looking to ‘downsize’ to a smaller property. We also know that as people age the incidence of disability and frailty also increase, and in the age band 64-74 up to 7% of residents will be classified as frail1. The Cambridgeshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for Older People (2010) recorded that 5% of older people received a disability living allowance and that by 2020 the prevalence of people with diabetes is expected to be 7.4%, 6% with cardiovascular disease and 2.7% with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease’.*

[7.39] *‘There are a range of models that can play a part in providing specialist accommodation for older people. These include sheltered and enhanced sheltered housing, Extra Care housing, retirement villages, continuing care retirement communities and registered care homes both with and without nursing care. Where appropriate, specialist accommodation for the elderly should be provided on a mixed-tenure basis, and such accommodation should be located on sites in new settlements or within larger villages. Where any scheme providing specialist accommodation for the elderly (with or without care) includes an affordable housing component, this can count towards the overall 40% affordable housing requirement if part of a wider development’*

4.5 On page 133 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, the ‘Key Facts’ section identifies that the district has an aging population with growth forecasts between 2001 to 2021 of 95% for the 60-74 age group and 108% for those over 75+ years of age.

- 4.6 Despite these local observations, and in spite of paragraph 11a) of the National Planning Policy Framework urging that plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area, the development plan does not contain any policies that proactively seek to deliver accommodation for older people.
- 4.7 The development plan is clear that new development will only be approved in accordance with Green Belt policy in the NPPF.

5.0 The National Planning Policy Framework and other Material Considerations

- 5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are to be applied in plan making and development management. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning, including the determination of planning applications and planning appeals.
- 5.2 The supporting planning statement outlines considerations from the NPPF, however the consideration was applied to the 2019 version, which updated in 2021. Therefore, it is necessary to identify the following sections from the NPPF (2021) below that are relevant to this appeal:
- Section 2: Achieving sustainable development
 - Section 5: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
 - Section 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities
 - Section 11: Making effective use of land
 - Section 12: Achieving well-design places
 - Section 13: Protecting Green Belt land
 - Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Supplementary Planning Documents

- 5.3 The following Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) were applied to the determination of this application:
- Biodiversity SPD (February 2022)
 - Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (January 2020)
 - Cambridge Flood and Water SPD (November 2016)

6.0 The Appellant's case

- 6.1 Paragraph 147 of the NPPF (2021) states that inappropriate development in the Green Belt is harmful to the Green Belt and that such development should only be in 'very special circumstances'.
- 6.2 Paragraph 148 of the NPPF (2021) states that 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other consideration.
- 6.3 The requirements of paragraph 148 of the NPPF (2021) is the determinative policy test in relation to this appeal.

The Benefits of the Development

Older People's Accommodation

- 6.4 National Planning Policy (paragraph 60 of the NPPF, 2021) is clear that in order to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. Within this context, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community, including older people, should be assessed and reflected in planning policies.
- 6.5 National planning guidance is unequivocal; the need to provide housing for older people is critical (Paragraph 001, Reference ID: 63-001-20190626).
- 6.6 The Council's Development Plan acknowledges that the population of the district is aging. It is anticipated that it will be matter of common ground that there is a significant need for specialist older people's accommodation within South Cambridgeshire.
- 6.7 The Council's Development Plan does not expressly allocate any land for the provision of specialist older people's accommodation. Neither does the Council's Development Plan contain any prescriptive policies that expressly require new housing or other developments to provide a minimum proportion of units as specialist accommodation for older people. The Development Plan is toothless in this regard, and it is the case that the needs of older people are not reflected within the planning policies of the Development Plan.
- 6.8 The Council has previously considered planning application 20/02929/OUT 'Land between Haverhill Road and Hinton Way, Stapleford' for a proposed retirement care village on Green Belt land. The Council refused this application on four reasons, including inappropriate development without meeting the exception criteria, and the failure to demonstrate 'very special circumstances'. The applicant subsequently lodged an appeal against the decision of the Council to refuse planning permission (APP/W0530/W/21/3280395).

- 6.9 The Statement of Common Ground in relation to appeal APP/W0530/W/21/3280395 states, in paragraphs 7.35 and 7.36, that the Council does not dispute the identified needs for older people's housing and that scheme would make a 'very significant' contribution to meeting local needs.
- 6.10 The Planning Inspectorate determined to allow the Stapleford appeal on 29 December 2021. The Inspector raised 'no reason to disagree' with the conclusions drawn by the expert witness on need (paragraphs 41-43), who demonstrated projected shortfalls in the delivery of the need for extra care dwelling units and the need for care home beds. The Inspector also did not disagree with the attachment of 'very significant weight' applied by the Council's Statement of Case in terms of the very significant contribution to meeting these local needs.
- 6.11 Another appeal is currently pending determination following the failure of the Council to determine planning application 21/05276/FUL '*Redevelopment to form 39 retirement living apartments for older persons including communal facilities, car parking and associated landscaping*' at No. 2 Station Road, Great Shelford, Cambridge. Within the Statement of Common Ground between the Appellant and the Council, it is agreed the need for specialist older persons accommodation is recognised, stating that the local population is rapidly ageing, including within the 60-74 and 75+ age brackets (paragraphs 8.2 and 8.3).
- 6.12 This appeal proposal will provide specialist accommodation for older people and will meet part of the existing large need for such accommodation with South Cambridgeshire. The Council has conceded in the Stapleford (20/02929/OUT) and Station Road (21/05276/FUL) appeals that there is a '*significant*' need for older people accommodation. The Stapleford Inquiry Inspector also acknowledged the need and attached significant weight to it in his planning decisions.
- 6.13 At the time the proposed scheme submitted for appeal was refused, the Council in their knowledge from the previous appeals (including Stapleford (20/02929/OUT) and Great Shelford (21/05276/FUL)), acknowledged that great weight should be attached to providing older people's accommodation. The officer acknowledged this need throughout Section 10 of the Committee Report, specifically referencing under paragraph 10.33 the Inspector's decision on the Stapleford appeal as well as the NPPG's comment of the '*need to provide housing for older people is critical*'. Officers stated under paragraph 10.15 of the Committee Report that they are satisfied that need for the care facility was appropriately demonstrated. Therefore, it is the Appellant's case that there remains a significant unmet need for older people accommodation and substantial weight should be attached to this need.
- 6.14 The planning application was not accompanied by an Alternate Site Search Assessment. No Alternate Site Search Assessment was requested by the Council and no reason for refusal was issued in the lack of one being submitted. The site is previously developed land that is relatively sustainable and well served by public transport.

Release of general housing

- 6.15 South Cambridgeshire is one of the most unaffordable areas to live in the Country. The Council's Development Plan acknowledges this fact as a 'key facts' section on page 133 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018).
- 6.16 Paragraph 7.38 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) confirms that the population of the district is ageing, and identifies that often older people need or prefer smaller properties that are easier to manage than their original home, with people often looking to 'downsize' to a smaller property.
- 6.17 The provision of purpose-built specialist accommodation for older people will be likely to lead the release of market housing in South Cambridgeshire and this is a benefit of the development proposal.

Landscape Enhancements

- 6.18 Paragraph 145 of the NPPF (2021) advises that Local Planning Authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of Green Belt land, including to enhance landscapes and visual amenity.
- 6.19 The proposed development would deliver enhancements to the character and appearance to the site and to the surrounding area.
- 6.20 The landscape design includes the retention of 62no. trees, relocation of existing semi-mature trees, provision of new trees and 1km of new hedgerow and herbaceous planting. The scheme also includes the seeding of 0.43ha of wildflower meadow and the establishment of fruit trees as a small orchard. In addition, nesting boxes, bat/bug boxes and log piles will also be incorporated into the scheme and within the design of the building, two areas of biodiverse roofs comprising pre-sown wildflower mats, all of which are encouraged by the Natural Cambridgeshire Local Nature Partnership Developing with Nature Toolkit.
- 6.21 The provision of the proposed care home would replace the existing built form and would not include substantial changes to the landscape character of the site or the surrounding area.
- 6.22 The landscape enhancements are a benefit of the development proposal and should be considered in combination with the Appellants consideration that no landscape or visual harm would arise from the proposals.

Biodiversity

- 6.23 The NPPF is clear at paragraph 180d that development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported, while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (or enhance public access to nature where appropriate).

- 6.24 The Council's Doubling Nature Strategy sets out a vision for the doubling of nature within South Cambridgeshire by 2050. On page 8, the strategy explains that important wildlife habitats in South Cambridgeshire include, amongst other things, woodland, scrub, hedgerows and lowland chalk grasslands.
- 6.25 The development proposal would result in significant Biodiversity Net Gain at the site. This includes a calculated 74.49% net gain in habitats and 38.72% net gain in linear features.
- 6.26 The ecological enhancement that will be delivered by the development proposals are significant and will be long lasting.

Job Creation and Economic Impacts

- 6.27 Chapter 6 of the NPPF (2021) focuses on building a strong, competitive economy. Paragraph 81 of the NPPF (2021) sets out that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.
- 6.28 The proposed care home is anticipated to generate 92no. full time employees and 11no. part time employees, across a variety of roles. The additional jobs created during demolition and construction, alongside the operations of the care home, would also contribute to the economic benefits that the scheme would deliver.
- 6.29 The creation of new local employment opportunities is a significant benefit of the development proposal.

Green Belt and other impacts

- 6.30 As set out within the draft SoCG, there is agreement that the proposal constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt.
- 6.31 The fundamental characteristic of a Green Belt is that of openness. There are five key purposes of including land within a Green Belt, as set out in paragraph 138 of the NPPF (2021). These are:
- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;*
 - (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;*
 - (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;*
 - (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and*
 - (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.*
- 6.32 In terms of the five Green Belt purposes set out in paragraph 138 of the NPPF (2021), the development does not conflict with the five purposes of the Green Belt, as demonstrated below:
- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;*

The proposed building is less extensive than compared to the existing building on site, there is no added sprawl.

(b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

The proposed care home would be constructed on previously development land and predominantly utilise the footprint of the existing building. The proposed would not decrease the established separation between Girton and Cambridge.

(c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;

The proposed development would not encroach into the open countryside.

(d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and

No conservation areas or listed buildings would be unacceptably impacted upon by the proposed development.

(e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The proposal utilises previously development land and therefore the scheme represents a 'recycle' of this land.

- 6.33 In terms of the five Green Belt purposes set out at paragraph 138 of the NPPF (2021), the only purpose even arguably engaged is that of encroachment into the countryside.
- 6.34 As confirmed by Paragraph 001, Reference ID: 64-001-20190722 of the National Planning Practice Guidance, openness is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects.
- 6.35 In terms of assessing the impact of the development proposal upon the openness of the Green Belt, the Council states nothing on harm within their refusal reasons.
- 6.36 In addition, the comments from the Council's Landscape Officer considers the harm from the development to the openness of the Green Belt to be negligible, due to "the existing presence of a similarly functioning and sized building as discussed within the report".
- 6.37 Furthermore, the Council's Landscape Officer states that alongside the negligible harm, benefits would be obtained. This includes the reduction to the car park to the front of site for, along with the curved configuration of the entry route, both which would reduce the visual impact from Whitehouse Lane, the added landscaping that would be obtained from the reduction in the car park area would increase the visual separation between the proposed building and the Whitehouse Lane, as well as improving the character and openness of the surrounding area.
- 6.38 In addition, the Appellant states that given the findings demonstrated within the submitted Landscape and Visual Appraisal and Green Belt Study (Bidwells, February 2021), whilst the proposed scheme is larger than the existing building, the proposed development will not alter the

openness and other existing qualities of the Cambridge Green Belt and Girton Gap. Conversely, the proposal will result in improvements by increasing the perceived gap between Girton and the edge of Cambridge, reinforcing landscape features and reducing the amount of surface car park along Whitehouse Lane.

- 6.39 The development demonstrates no significant landscape or visual impacts would result from the proposed development. Planning conditions appropriate to the development, including a planning condition for details of a landscaping scheme, were considered by the Case Officer to be appropriate to secure. Overall, the Appellant states that no unacceptable harm would be applied to the Green Belt or landscape.
- 6.40 Taken the above together, there would be no significant harm and the planning balance should be viewed in that context. The proposed building is spatially well-related to the settlement edge, with the care home to be predominantly built on the footprint of the existing hotel, with the additional landscaping proposed alongside the reduction of the existing car parking provision and route re-configuration.

Heritage

- 6.41 The building is a typical example of its type, constructed during a time when numerous examples are apparent. It has undergone significant alterations and extension since its construction and does not display any technological innovation. Significant features such as the glasshouse have been removed and the original asymmetrical appearance of the front elevation has been obscured through an extension which results in this elevation having a symmetrical appearance, contrary to its original design. There are limited features of interest internally and large wings have been added which serve to displace the entrance hierarchy of the building.
- 6.42 The building was granted a Certificate of Immunity by Historic England in 2020, confirming it does not hold special architectural or historic interest. The Conservation team identified the building as an non-designated heritage asset ["NDHA"] and have indicated that the building holds a modest level of significance. They have acknowledged that it is a fairly typical example of a villa, which has a modest level of design and presence. As the Council does not have a Building of Local Interest/Local List, the Conservation Officer has made reference to the criteria for designating Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs) produced by the adjacent Cambridge City Council and has indicated that the building does meet some of these criteria (quality design, use of materials and aesthetic appeal) although they have not gone into detail on how, and to what extent it, it meets these criteria.
- 6.43 Having undertaken a robust review of the building including and its history, the Appellant considers that it holds a low level of interest. The Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) states that *"non-designated heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified by plan-making bodies as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets."* (Paragraph: 039 Reference ID: 18a-039-20190723). The PPG goes on to clarify that *"a substantial majority of buildings have little or no heritage significance and thus do not constitute heritage assets. Only a minority have enough heritage significance to merit identification as non-designated heritage assets."*

- 6.44 The Appellant considers that the building does not hold enough value to clearly be identified as a non-designated asset, although the Council has identified it as such. As a result, Paragraph 203 of the NPPF applies. This states that *“the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”*.
- 6.45 Paragraph 203 is clear that the balanced judgement is required to have regard to the scale of any harm or loss against the significance of the asset. In this case, due to the proposed demolition of the existing building, the scale of harm to the asset would equate to a “total loss” of significance in terms of the NPPF. However, the level of significance being lost is low and the level of harm, therefore should be attributed as low. There are numerous appeal decisions to support this level of harm/significance conclusion. In all these cases, the decision-maker has taken account of the level of significance to be affected and how this sits alongside other material considerations within the balanced judgement.
- 6.46 Refusal reason 2 states that the loss of the asset would “cause substantial harm as it would fail to sustain or enhance the significance of the asset and the overall benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh the harm identified”. When considering the application of Paragraph 203, it is clear that this reason for refusal is flawed as there is no requirement for the public benefits to outweigh harm. Paragraph 203 is not weighted in the same way that Paragraph 202, which deals with designated assets, is. The test is a balanced judgement against the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset against the impact of the proposed replacement in the context of other material considerations relating to the proposal.
- 6.47 Alternative options for the building have been discussed during the planning process. However, it must be made clear that, as a non-designated asset, there is no policy requirement to consider alternative schemes.
- 6.48 In addition to the above, both the Appellant and the Planning Case Officer recognise that under Class B of Part 11 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), prior approval could be applied for the demolition of the building and only the method of demolition would be assessed by Planning case officers.
- 6.49 It is therefore respectfully requested that the Inspector dismisses the Council’s determination for refusal reason 2, given the low significance of the existing building and the low level of harm that would be caused through its demolition. This is in addition to the test of assessment being incorrectly applied within the refusal reasons.

Overall Planning Balance

- 6.50 The development proposals as a whole constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The Development Plan is clear that the development proposals within the Green Belt should be determined in accordance with national Green Belt policy.
- 6.51 Paragraph 147 of the NPPF (2021) is clear that inappropriate development should not be approved except in ‘very special circumstances’.

- 6.52 Paragraph 148 of the NPPF (2021) is clear that ‘very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Such other considerations need not be special or unique in and of themselves, rather they can be common or garden planning considerations. The key test is whether they clearly outweigh harm outweigh harm by inappropriateness and other harms.
- 6.53 The definitional harm to the Green Belt arising from inappropriateness must be given substantial weight in accordance with paragraph 148 of the NPPF (2021). In addition, there is acknowledged to be some harm to the openness of the Green Belt and associated encroachment into the countryside. The development proposals do not conflict with any of the five Green Belt purposes.
- 6.54 It is the Appellant’s view that, taken in aggregate, other considerations clearly outweigh the harms by inappropriateness and limited other harms identified. Very special circumstances are deemed to exist, and in this context, allowing the appeal accords with both the statutory development plan and with national planning policy.

7.0 Other matters

Rule 6

- 7.1 At the time of writing, it is not known whether any interested persons will require Rule 6 status for the Appeal. The Appellant therefore reserves the right to refer to any other matters raised by an Rule 6 parties in the proofs of evidence or any addenda thereto.

Planning Obligations and Conditions

- 7.2 It is intended to submit a signed Planning Obligation agreement ahead of the Inquiry, to capture the required contributions to mitigate the impact of the proposed development.
- 7.3 A set of planning conditions, as recommended by the Planning Case Officer, are contained within the draft Statement of Common Ground. It is anticipated that these will be agreed with the Council.

Witnesses

- 7.4 Prior to the commencement of this Inquiry, a list of witnesses to give evidence on behalf of the Appellant will be provided. The Appellant, however, proposes provisionally that evidence will be presented on the following matters:
- Landscape and Visual Considerations and Green Belt
 - Need
 - Why the building cannot be converted to a care home
 - Heritage
 - Planning

- 7.5 The Appellant reserves the right to review its list of witnesses in light of the Council's Statement of Case.
- 7.6 A Core Documents schedule is included within the Appendix of the draft SoCG. The Appellant reserves the right to add to this in light of the Council's Statement of Case and/or in light of that any Rule 6 parties.

APPENDIX 1

DECISION NOTICE: 21/00953/FUL

Our Ref: 21/00953/FUL
Portal Ref: PP-09202280

22 July 2022



Ms Rebecca Smith
Bidwells
Bidwell House
Trumpington Road
Cambridge
Cambridgeshire
CB2 9LD

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

www.scambs.gov.uk | www.cambridge.gov.uk

Dear Ms Smith

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
Application for Planning Permission

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a care home (Use Class C2) with external amenity space, access, parking, landscaping and other associated works

Site address: Former Hotel Felix Whitehouse Lane Cambridge Cambridgeshire

Your client: Cassel Hotels (Cambridge) Ltd

Please find attached the formal decision notice refusing planning permission for the above development and giving the Local Planning Authority's reasons for doing so.

Appealing against this decision

You should also be aware that the applicant has the right to appeal against this decision, please see <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate> for details.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'SJ Kelly'.

SJ Kelly
Joint Director For Planning & Economic Development For
Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire



Refusal of Planning Permission

Reference 21/00953/FUL
Date of Decision 22 July 2022

Ms Rebecca Smith
Bidwells
Bidwell House
Trumpington Road
Cambridge
Cambridgeshire
CB2 9LD

The Council hereby REFUSES Planning Permission for:

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a care home (Use Class C2) with external amenity space, access, parking, landscaping and other associated works

at

Former Hotel Felix Whitehouse Lane Cambridge Cambridgeshire

in accordance with your application received on 1 March 2021 and the plans, drawings and documents which form part of the application for the following reason(s):

Reasons

- 1 The site is located outside of the development framework boundary of Girton, within the countryside and Cambridge Green Belt. The proposed development would represent inappropriate development that is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt in policy terms as the development does not fall within any of the exception criteria within paragraphs 149 or 150 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy S/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and paragraphs 147, 148, 149 and 150 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 that seek to resist inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- 2 In addition to harm caused by inappropriateness, the proposed development would result in the loss of a non-designated heritage asset to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. In taking a balanced judgement, the loss of the non-designated heritage asset is considered to cause substantial harm as it would fail to sustain or enhance the significance of the asset and the overall benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh the harm identified. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and policy NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.
- 3 The application has failed to provide very special circumstances including the need for specialist housing which, taken individually or collectively, demonstrate why the harm by reason of inappropriateness in the Green Belt and other harm identified, being the loss of the non-designated heritage asset, is clearly outweighed by these considerations. The application therefore fails to satisfy the requirements of paragraphs 147 and 148 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Plans and drawings

This decision notice relates to the following drawings:

Reference/Document/Drawing Title	Date Received
846 22A	01.03.2021
846 11A	01.03.2021
846 12A	01.03.2021
846 21A	01.03.2021
846 24A	01.03.2021
A-846 06A	01.03.2021
A-846 04B	29.04.2021

Authorisation

Authorised by:



SJ Kelly
Joint Director For Planning & Economic Development For
Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

Date the decision was made: 22 July 2022

Appeals to the Secretary of State

- If you are aggrieved by the decision of your local planning authority to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Appeals can be made online at: <https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate>.

If you are unable to access the online appeal form, please contact the Planning Inspectorate to obtain a paper copy of the appeal form on tel: 0303 444 5000.

- If an enforcement notice is or has been served relating to the same or substantially the same land and development as in your application and if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision on your application, then you must do so within: **28 days** of the date of service of the enforcement notice, **OR** within **6 months** (12 weeks in the case of a householder or minor commercial appeal) of the date of this notice, whichever period expires earlier.
- The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal, but he will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal.
- The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to the Secretary of State that the local planning authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions they imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order.
- If you intend to submit an appeal that you would like examined by inquiry then you must notify the Local Planning Authority and Planning Inspectorate (inquiryappeals@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) at least 10 days before submitting the appeal. Further details are on GOV.UK (<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/casework-dealt-with-by-inquiries>).

Purchase Notices

If the Local Planning Authority or the Secretary of State grants permission subject to conditions the owner may claim that he/she can neither put the land to a reasonably beneficial use in its existing state nor render the land capable of a reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted. In these circumstances the owner may serve a purchase notice on the Council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of Part VI of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Third Party Rights to challenge a planning decision

Currently there are no third party rights of appeal through the planning system against a decision of a Local Planning Authority. Therefore, if you have concerns about a planning application and permission is granted, you cannot appeal that decision.

Any challenge under current legislation would have to be made outside the planning system through a process called Judicial Review.

A 'claim for judicial review' includes a claim to review the lawfulness of a decision, action or failure to act in relation to the exercise of a public function, in this case, a planning decision. The court's permission to proceed is required in a claim for Judicial Review. A claim for Judicial Review is dealt with by the Administrative Court and if leave to judicially review a planning decision is granted, the Judicial Review will be decided by a judge at the High Court.

An application to Judicial Review a decision must be made within **6 weeks** of the decision about

which you have a grievance being made. For further information on judicial review and the contact details for the Administrative Courts, please go to <http://www.justice.gov.uk/>

APPENDIX 2

COMMITTEE REPORT: 21/00953/FUL



Planning Committee Date	13 July 2022
Report to	South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee
Lead Officer	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
Reference	21/00953/FUL
Site	Former Hotel Felix, Whitehouse Lane
Ward / Parish	Girton
Proposal	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a care home (Use Class C2) with external amenity space, access, parking, landscaping and other associated works.
Applicant	Cassel Hotels (Cambridge) Ltd
Presenting Officer	Mary Collins
Reason Reported to Committee	Called-in by Councillor Bygott Third party representations Departure Application Application raises special planning policy or other considerations
Member Site Visit Date	N/A
Key Issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Principle of Development in the Green Belt2. Green Belt Openness and Purposes3. Character and Appearance of the Area4. Landscape5. Biodiversity6. Trees7. Highway Safety and Parking8. Flood Risk and Drainage9. Heritage Impact10. Residential Amenity11. Renewables / Climate Change12. Very Special Circumstances13. Section 106 contributions
Recommendation	APPROVE subject to conditions / S106

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The site is located outside of the development framework boundary of Girton, in the Green Belt. The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a care home with external amenity space, access, parking, landscaping and associated works. The proposal would also include a Dementia Research Centre.
- 1.2 The proposal would result in a circa 13% increase in built footprint and circa 33% increase in associated volumes largely derived from the overall increase in building height, although hard surface car parking would be reduced. Although the harm to the openness of the Green Belt is not significant, it would constitute inappropriate development which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. In addition to the harm by reason of inappropriateness, the proposal is also considered to result in harm by virtue of the loss of openness to the Green Belt and conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt.
- 1.3 The applicant's agent has advanced a number of considerations that would outweigh the identified harm. The applicant has demonstrated very special circumstances exist, in particular the need for the specialist housing with dementia care and associated research centre, the site would make use of previously developed land and deliver a number of additional jobs. This, amongst other considerations, is considered to carry significant weight to constitute the 'very special circumstances' required to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt and loss of a non-designated heritage asset, clearly outweighing the identified harm.
- 1.4 Officers recommend that the Planning Committee approve subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement.

2.0 Site Description and Context

None relevant		Tree Preservation Order	X
Conservation Area	-	Local Nature Reserve	-
Listed Building	-	Flood Zone 1	X
Building of Local Interest		Green Belt	X
Historic Park and Garden	-	Protected Open Space	-
Scheduled Ancient Monument	-	Controlled Parking Zone	-
Local Neighbourhood and District Centre	-	Article 4 Direction	-

- 2.1 The site lies outside of the Girton Village Development Framework and within the open countryside and Green Belt. The site has numerous Protected Trees within the site and on the boundaries. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 with public footpath 39/48 running north south along Whitehouse Lane which also forms a cycle route to Darwin Green. Immediate to the east of the site lies the boundary of Cambridge City Council. The site is considered to be a sustainable location.
- 2.2 The application site is a large hotel set in landscaped grounds and accessed via a drive from Whitehouse Lane off Huntingdon Road. The building is comprised of an original Victorian main house with later extensions in the form of single storey and two storey wings to the side and rear. It is located outside but adjacent to the development framework of Girton and in the Cambridge Green Belt. It is located between the Thornton Road housing estate to the west and the buildings on Whitehouse land to the east. To the front and rear of the site are sports grounds
- 2.3 The site currently comprises of a 52-bedroom hotel which includes a restaurant but one which is now permanently closed.
- 2.4 To the west the land is in use as a playing field. To the southeast is Whitehouse Lane with the NIAB site on the opposite side of the road.

3.0 The Proposal

- 3.1 The proposed development would involve the demolition of the hotel and restaurant to be replaced by an 80-bedroom care home facility with associated recreational spaces, clinic facilities, back of house facilities, kitchens and recreational facilities. The proposal includes a dementia research centre linking in-house care to professionals working at Addenbrookes hospital and the wider community.
- 3.2 The siting of the proposed care home would be largely in the same position as the existing building, slightly to the west and further south allowing sufficient distance to provide a level of amenity to the adjacent residents and respect the Green Belt and views to and from the site.
- 3.3 The replacement structure would be predominantly two storeys, with a localised 3 storey feature to mark the entrance to the care home. Its footprint (2,395 m²) will be slightly more than the existing structure (2,110 m²), and it is located slightly northwest compared to the existing.
- 3.4 The proposed design has been inspired by a neo-classical aesthetic. The principal external materials are plain grey brick and the pitched roof is slate.
- 3.5 A proposed landscape scheme accompanies the development, consisting of a sensory garden, private terraces for ground floor bedrooms, a residents' garden and associated parking court. The parking court has been laid out to prioritise the retention of existing trees, which would be joined by supplementary planting. Furthermore, the landscape proposal incorporates

features to enhance biodiversity, such as bat boxes and log piles; the design of the building includes two areas of biodiverse roof.

- 3.6 31 car parking spaces are to be provided including two Blue-badge parking spaces.

4.0 Relevant Site History

- 4.1 S/4502/17/FL – Erection of a two-storey extension to the rear of the building to provide 16 additional bedrooms and the erection of a new reception area to the side of the building – Approved.

- 4.2 S/0297/08/F – Extension of the hotel – Approved.

- 4.3 S/0817/00/F – Part Demolition and Extensions to Form 48 Bedroomed hotel – Approved.

5.0 Policy

5.1 National

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide 2021

Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20) Cycle Infrastructure Design

Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)

EIA Directives and Regulations - European Union legislation with regard to environmental assessment and the UK's planning regime remains unchanged despite it leaving the European Union on 31 January 2020

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Environment Act 2021

ODPM Circular 06/2005 – Protected Species

Equalities Act 2010

5.2 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018

S/1 – Vision

S/2 – Objectives of the Local Plan

S/3 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

S/4 – Cambridge Green Belt

S/5 – Provision of New Jobs and Homes

S/7 – Development Frameworks

CC/1 – Mitigation and Adaption to Climate Change
 CC/3 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments
 CC/4 – Water Efficiency
 CC/6 – Construction Methods
 CC/7 – Water Quality
 CC/8 – Sustainable Drainage Systems
 CC/9 – Managing Flood Risk
 HQ/1 – Design Principles
 HQ/2 – Public Art and New Development
 NH/2 – Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
 NH/4 – Biodiversity
 NH/6 – Green Infrastructure
 NH/8 – Mitigating the Impact of Development in & adjoining the Green Belt
 NH/9 – Redevelopment of Previously Developed Sites and Infilling in the Green Belt
 NH/14 – Heritage Assets
 H/9 – Housing Mix
 SC/2 – Health Impact Assessment
 SC/4 – Meeting Community Needs
 SC/5 – Community Healthcare Provision
 SC/6 – Indoor Community Facilities
 SC/7 – Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space & New Developments
 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

5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022
 Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020
 Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016

- 5.4 The following SPDs were adopted to provide guidance to support previously adopted Development Plan Documents that have now been superseded by the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. These documents are still material considerations when making planning decisions, with the weight in decision making to be determined on a case-by-case basis:

Health Impact Assessment SPD – Adopted March 2011
 Landscape in New Developments SPD – Adopted March 2010
 District Design Guide SPD – Adopted March 2010
 Open Space in New Developments SPD – Adopted January 2009
 Public Art SPD – Adopted January 2009
 Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009

6.0 Consultations

6.1 Girton Parish Council – Object

Comments (in full)

Strong concerns regarding ecological impact and the heritage impact of this proposed development, through loss of trees, increase in carbon footprint and the loss of an 1850s building.

- Girton is already well-provided with facilities for this age demographic and will not have adequate medical or burial services to support another 80-bed care and dementia facility. The Local Plan highlights the importance for planning for a mixed and balanced community and this proposal will merely skew the village's age demographic even further towards the elderly. There is no further need for additional care in the sector, including and especially at the luxury, and therefore most expensive, end of the market. Should SCDC Planners be minded to accept the application, Girton Parish Council would request a meeting with S106 Officers regarding an amount for the increased provision of health/medical services and burial services.
- This application provides for the complete demolition of the former Hotel Felix, which is a structurally sound building (completely refurbished in 2002). The resultant damage to the environment, and in particular to the 'Girton Gap', which is intended as a 'green' break between Cambridge City and Girton would be considerable. Moreover, the development would not fit with the street scene of Whitehouse Lane.
- The planning authority's failure to list the building is a planning objection to the development.
- There is inadequate parking provision for staff, who will not be able to use public transport if they are working shifts. There are also no facilities for overnight stays for staff.

NB: The effect on Heritage was not the subject of a resolution but the Council notes that others have commented extensively on this aspect.

6.2 Ancient Monument Society – Object

Comments (summary)

The priority for development within the District should be to adapt and reuse historic buildings, rather than demolish high quality, viable buildings. The AMS therefore strongly objects to the complete loss of the historic house and would recommend the plans are revised to retain the historic building and meet local zero carbon emission targets.

6.3 **Commissioning Manager (Adults), People & Communities, Cambridgeshire & Peterborough, Cambridgeshire County Council**

Comments (in full)

- The proposed site is on the border between Cambridge City and South Cambs district council boundaries.
- The County Council has been finalising needs assessment for accommodation-based services for older people which it expects to publish in the next few months. In its assessment of accommodation-based provision for older people, it has taken account of the Laing Buisson research which has noted that care home market capacity has remained largely flat over the past ten years, even though the numbers of older people has increased significantly. During the same period there has been substantial growth in 'housing with care' options. Projecting forwards, Laing Buisson's analysis suggests that care home growth would be between 4 – 23% above the existing provision. In its forecast, the county council has used the mid-point i.e. 13.5% which equates to an additional 731 beds across Cambridgeshire & Peterborough.
- According to CQC Care Directory, in April 2020 there were 928 care beds in South Cambridgeshire and 697 beds in Cambridge City. Using the mid-point as the basis of its projections, the County Council's needs assessment is that by 2036 1,052 care beds will be required in South Cambs and 791 in Cambridge City. So the expected need would be an additional 124 beds in South Cambs and 94 beds in Cambridge City.
- The County Council also noted that planning permission had been granted for a further 3 care homes with a total of 210 care beds.

6.4 **Conservation Team**

Comments (in full)

Existing

The 'significance assessment' submitted contains a history of the site and building and gives an estimate of how & when the building changed over time, leading to its current incarnation as an hotel.

The building is not an LB [and has immunity from Listing; see certificate from Historic England submitted] and does not lie within a CA [SCDC does not have BLIs] but does have a certain modest level of design and presence but has had a catalogue of change and alteration over the years. A very extensive range of indifferent extensions to form the hotel were built in the C21. As a fairly typical Victorian suburban villa it should be categorised as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) with its setting compromised by modern works.

The location of the historic part of the building lies in an important 'green finger' [the so-called Girton Gap] that clearly separates the edge of the city from the suburban part of Girton and, by historic chance, visually blocks that gap. In townscape terms, maintaining this gap is important and in terms of the evolution of both settlements it should be important that they are not seen as merging or the one subsuming the other.

Proposed

Demolition – The agents have noted that there were structural reports undertaken in the past but the comments suggest that the problems were not beyond repair. They also suggest that there were problems associated with damp and lack of compliance with the DDA. None of these sound to be insuperable or impossible to remedy.

Current thinking is that the most sustainable building is an existing building and there needs to be a judgment as to whether the NDHA could be repaired, retained and converted to a new use or, with selective demolition of insignificant elements, it could be repaired, retained and extended to better fulfil the needs of its new use. The submission describes various 'concept designs' looking at retaining the 'existing building' and converting it to the proposed use; four of the concepts involve retaining the modern extensions and one demolishing the modern extensions and retaining and extending the NDHA. The rejection of this concept as worthy of taking forward seems to be based entirely on perceived problems with levels.

New build – The design submitted is for a 'hollow square' plan form consisting of four substantial blocks of brick construction with pitched, hipped, slated roofs with flat areas with glazed link blocks. Some blocks are of two storeys and some of two-and-a-half storeys. It is a 'historicist' design with some glazed link blocks that are intended to break up the visual bulk of the scheme. Whilst repetitiveness can work well in some neo-classical designs [the terraces of Edinburgh or Bath, for example] these are usually in an urban setting whereas here that repetitiveness would be seen in an edge of suburban setting. Whilst there is no objection to this architectural approach, it does feel – given the size of the proposal – like it could do with more vivacity.

Site layout – If the demolition of the existing is accepted, then there seems to be no valid reason for putting the replacement building right in the middle of the site. This site forms part of an important 'green finger' separating Girton from the city and it is by historic chance that the existing building now rather links the two and dilutes that separation.

As the city expands onto the NIAB site, Whitehouse Lane tends to have become the delineator with the fringe of city suburbs to the South and the C20 suburban expansion of Girton to the North. If the historic building is to go, then it seems preferable that any new development is firmly located in one part of the site or the other, not 'floating' in between and diluting the effect of the 'green separation'. There appears to be no architectural or practical reason why the care home block should not be – for example – pushed well towards the back of the site and be seen as clearly part of Girton and its built fabric. Or the block could be pushed forwards towards Whitehouse Lane so that it fronted the lane more formally and be seen as part of the Northern edge of the city. Thus the 'green finger' [the gardens of the overall complex] would be re-established more clearly and that sense of separation would be stronger.

The proposals will not comply with Local Plan policy NH/14. This is because the scheme fails sustain and enhance the significance of the NDHA, including its setting, appropriately to its significance. NH/14, Section 2, part d.

With reference to the NPPF and the effect on the significance of the heritage asset, paragraph 197 would apply. This is because the scheme would cause substantial harm in the case of complete demolition and loss of the NDHA. Should this gain consent, then the usual Conditions relating to external materials and detailing would be necessary in order to get a decent building.

Further comments - Whilst the details of why Option 5 has not been pursued are noted it does not change the fact that the main building is a NDHA for the reasons outlined by Conservation Officer and the proposals will result in total loss of that heritage asset. Paragraph 203 of the NPPF states that a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. The loss of a NDHA can be mitigated by the quality of what replaces it and previous comments on the design of the new building are still valid as are comments relating to the site layout and loss of the "Girton Gap".

6.5 Ecology Officer – No objection.

Comments (in full)

The application is supported by an Ecology Assessment (Ecology Solutions, October 2020) which is welcome. The report found brown long eared bat droppings within the loft of the main building, and although no bats were seen to emerge or enter the building during surveys, it has been assumed that there is a bat roost within the building and a Natural England Licence will be applied for. With the exception of breeding birds, there were no other ecological constraints identified. Agree with the report and would suggest the following conditions:

- All ecological measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Ecology Assessment (Ecology Solutions, October 2020) as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination.
- Demolition of any building shall not in any circumstances commence unless the local planning authority has been provided with either: a licence issued by Natural England pursuant to Regulation 53 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) authorising the specified activity/development to go ahead; or a statement in writing from the relevant licensing body to the effect that it does not consider that the specified activity/development will require a licence.
- Scheme of biodiversity enhancement including details as to how a positive net gain in biodiversity has been accomplished.

6.6 Environmental Health – no objection

Comments (summary)

The proposed residential use is sensitive to contamination and the site has a potentially contaminative historical usage. Recommended conditions;

1. No development shall take place until:

a. The application site has been subject to a detailed scheme for the investigation and recording of contamination and remediation objectives have been determined through risk assessment and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

b. Detailed proposals for the removal, containment or otherwise rendering harmless any contamination (the Remediation method statement) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

2. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the works specified in any remediation method statement detailed in Condition 1 must be completed and a Verification report submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

3. 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.

- Construction Hours
- Construction Environmental Management Plan

6.7 Health Development Officer – no objection

Comments (in full)

Policy SC/2 b of the 2018 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan states that for developments for developments between 20 to 100 dwellings or 1,000 to 5,000m² or more floorspace the Health Impact Assessment will take the form of an extended screening or rapid Health Impact Assessment.

WHO defines HIA as '*a combination of procedures, methods and tools by which a policy, program or project may be judged as to its potential effects on the health of a population, and the distribution of those effects within the population*'.

As per the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Health Impact Assessment (HIA SPD) I have reviewed the outline application using the HIA Review Package checklist contained in Appendix 3. **The outcome is that the Health Impact Assessment as submitted has been assessed as grade A.** Grade A meets the required standard of the HIA SPD policy (only HIA's graded A or B are acceptable).

The siting of a dementia research facility at the Care Home would bring welcome local expertise. Creating closer links with local dementia groups should be sought to strengthen partnerships and share resource and

knowledge. Shared use of the sensory garden and talks with local care groups is also encouraged.

Welcome the suggestion of creating closer links with Cambridge Regional college to provide training and employment opportunities for local residents and students.

The report recommends that S106 should be sought to provide onsite medical provision via Huntingdon Road Surgery, although attempts to reach the surgery have not been possible. This needs to be conditioned as part of the application. It would have been advantageous for the applicants to consult the local Alzheimer's Society on certain design aspects and reference how consultation has helped to influence design.

Revised HIA - Satisfied that all points have been addressed and have re-scored the report accordingly.

As per the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Health Impact Assessment (HIA SPD) have reviewed the outline application using the HIA Review Package checklist contained in Appendix 3. The outcome is that the Health Impact Assessment as submitted has been assessed as grade A. Grade A meets the required standard of the HIA SPD policy (only HIA's graded A or B are acceptable).

Satisfied with the degree of community engagement in particularly the involvement of local voluntary sector organisations in addition to academia and medical experts. and that stakeholder engagement has influenced and shaped the design of this new facility.

6.8 Highways Development Management – No objections

6.9 Historic Environment - County Archaeology – No objections.

Have no requirements for archaeology or historic building recording work for this scheme and are satisfied that the archaeological desk-based assessment and the Heritage Statement contains sufficient information to indicate that the survival of archaeological resources is unlikely in the development area and to provide enough detail about this much modified building for entry in the HER.

6.10 Housing Strategy

Comments (Summary)

The proposed development is classified as a C2 development., therefore an affordable housing provision would not be required.

- Conclusion- Whilst we acknowledge that projections show that there will be an increase in the older population and that we need to plan for this need, the information from the County Council shows that there is sufficient provision and pipeline provision to meet this need.

6.11 Lead Local Flood Authority – no objection

Reviewed the following documents:

- Route of Ordinary Watercourse 1 of 2, Arc Engineers, Ref 20 106, dated: 8th June 2021
- Route of Ordinary Watercourse 2 of 2, Arc Engineers, Ref 20 106, dated: 8th June 2021
- Supplementary Notes to FRA and Design Strategy Report, Arc Engineers, Ref 20 106, dated: 17th May 2021

The above documents demonstrate that surface water from the proposed development can discharge via the existing 300mm diameter outfall pipe to the watercourse to the east of the site, restricting surface water discharge to 3.5l/s.

The LLFA is supportive of the use of permeable paving as in addition to controlling the rate of surface water leaving the site it also provides water quality treatment which is of particular importance when discharging into a watercourse.

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

Recommend the following conditions:

- No laying of services, creation of hard surfaces or erection of a building shall commence until a detailed design of the surface water drainage of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- No development, including preparatory works, shall commence until details of measures indicating how additional surface water run-off from the site will be avoided during the construction works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

6.12 Landscape Officer

Comments (in full)

The findings of the Landscape and Visual Appraisal are generally acceptable. It is considered that the impact of the development on the openness of the Greenbelt is negligible due to the existing presence of a similarly functioning and sized building as discussed within the report. The new building will be further away from development along White House Lane, but it will become closer to the back of properties along The Brambles. The gap between the building and both these developments, however, remains deep and open. A significant reduction in surface car parking area which can be converted into landscaping is also an improvement to the overall character and openness of the area. The placement of the new building has allowed for the retention of significant trees within and at the boundaries of the development site.

Significant concerns over the intention to move existing semi-mature trees. In all, ten trees are highlighted for relocation. Nine of these trees are identified as European Lime ranging from 7.5 to 10 metres tall. The remaining tree is an Atlas Cedar, 8.5 metres tall. Following discussions with the Tree Officer, that while it is possible to achieve, it is neither cheap nor easy, and requires a considerable time investment in advance of relocation. Of more concern is the moving of trees which are not particularly required for the construction and needs of the new building and we question whether there are options which, whilst perhaps, less aesthetic, allow for the retention of the trees in situ. It is considered that the Atlas Cedar, which would be the most vulnerable of the proposed trees for relocation, should be retained and developed into the landscape scheme. The limes should be considered as per the comments of the Tree Officer and adequate confirmation of method and phasing/timing submitted for review. It is considered that some pressure arising from a symmetrical building and garden design on the western end of the building is creating this desire to relocate trees and we feel this is not a strong enough reason for moving trees. The garden design should react to the context and constraints of its environment. We require a review of the proposed landscape with this key consideration in mind and which aims to retain as many trees and possible which are not truly in the path of development of the building or a danger. Initially, we would require a design which seeks first to retain as many trees as possible in coordination with a supplementary methodology and phasing plan for any trees remaining which must be moved.

Through the pre-app process the design of the individual patio/private amenity for the ground floor rooms was considered and agreed based on the health and medical needs of the residents and is acceptable. Other features of the retained and proposed landscape are acceptable. The car park is split up well and interspersed with tree and shrub planting which reduces the visual impact of car parking.

Beyond the intention to relocate mature trees to the boundaries, Landscape generally supports the application.

6.13 NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group

Comments (in full)

In terms of workforce demands, using Arlington Manor as a comparator, the direct workload for GP's from the care home exceed 1.5 GP sessions per week (NB a whole time equivalent GP will do 6-8 sessions per week) which equates to up to 25% of a GP's weekly sessional time. On top of this, there is the associated admin work required, including medication reviews, monthly prescriptions, adhoc requests, and End of life care. Regardless of whether or not additional GP's, admin and clerical staff can be recruited to cover this additional need, there is no space to accommodate this extra workforce: In terms of physical capacity demands - the Practice's list size already exceeds their capacity: Based on 120m² of Net Internal Area of

physical space per 1750 patients (this is considered the current optimal list size for a single GP , aligning with the space requirements set out in the DH guidance “Health Building Note 11-01: facilities for Primary and Community Care Services”) the maximum weighted list size that the Practice can support with their current premises size is 8,225. Their current weighted list size is 16,953 so they are already hugely over capacity in terms of space. The population growth in the area is significant and this weighted list size has increased by over 3000 in the last 4 years, with actualist size growing over 5000 in the same timeframe. Serving the Primary Care needs of another 80 bed care home within their Practice boundary is simply not tenable, as the above figures demonstrate. Particularly if the care home is a dementia specialist centre where by the needs of the residents will be even greater and place even more pressures on the Practice.

6.14 Policy

Comments (in full)

There are several sources of evidence regarding the need for care homes in South Cambridgeshire. The applicant has commissioned a ‘Headline Planning Need Statement’ study from Carterwood and the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning service has commissioned a ‘Housing Needs for Specific Groups’ study from GL Hearn as part of the Local Plan review process. The Headline Planning Needs Statement by the applicant identifies a need for 102 bedspaces by 2024 in South Cambridgeshire. This discounts all current bedspaces that are not en-suite and increases demand to incorporate an occupation capacity allowance. However, it does not consider the situation in Cambridge despite the proposed site being on the border of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The GL Hearn study found a shortfall of 328 bedspaces in 2020 across Greater Cambridgeshire. Additional demand was estimated using a range of demographic projections. These resulted in a shortfall of bedspaces in 2040 ranging from 1,884 to 2,048. This shortfall can be disaggregated into a shortfall of 215 to 259 in Cambridge and 1,668 to 1,789 in South Cambridgeshire. The shortfall is not profiled across the 20 year period. However, assuming a flat profile would suggest a need for 43 to 52 bedspaces in Cambridge and 334 to 358 bedspaces in South Cambridgeshire in 2024. Allowance would then be required for additional bedspaces likely to be completed by 2024. The applicants Headline Planning Needs Statement identified 260 such bedspaces in South Cambridgeshire. A new care home with 68 bedspaces was also completed in Cambridge in 2021 (following the demolition of the previous 58 bed care home). Despite the many differences in methodology and data sources the two studies have produced broadly similar results which suggest a potential shortfall of approximately 100 bedspaces in South Cambridgeshire by 2024. **The County Council has undertaken its own analysis which finds a much lower level of need. The discrepancy is due to the County Council estimates being strongly led by a proposed change in their commissioning strategy.** (Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council commission 32 per cent of care beds across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough). As a result, they will be prioritizing supporting people to stay in their own home, or where this is not

possible, to retain as much independence as possible through 'housing with care solutions'. The county council want to support the development of a 'mixed market' with a range of housing options including new models. The result is a reduced share of the market for care homes. It should also be noted that the County Council are piloting a new 'Independent Living Service' which it is assumed will support their commissioning strategy and a shift away from care homes towards more independent living options. The county council project a need for an additional 124 bedspaces in South Cambridgeshire from 2020 to 2036 but consider that as there have already been 210 permitted there is no further need. The Councils have requested further information from the county council so we can better understand how their estimates relate to the GL Hearn study, in order to inform the local plan. The Councils are currently in the process of reviewing their Local Plans, and the Greater Cambridge Local Plan will seek to consider and address the range of housing needs including specialist needs. The plan may not be adopted until 2025.

6.15 **Natural England** – No comments.

6.16 **Police Architectural Liaison Officer** – support

Comments (in full)

Comments in regard to safety made within the Design and Access Statements support that these areas should be addressed with what is proposed including the external lighting plan. Supportive and at this time have no further comments to make.

6.17 **Public Health England (PHE)**

Comments (in full)

As not a statutory consultee, would not normally comment on this type of planning application unless there are specific chemical & environmental hazard concerns which have the potential to impact on the health of local communities. Impacts on public health from local air quality, noise and contaminated land fall under the remit of the local authority and it is their responsibility to decide whether or not to comment on these aspects of the planning application.

6.18 **S106 Officer** – no objection

Comments (summary)

Planning obligations are sought in relation to the following: a) Burial provision an offsite contribution of £16,800 b) Monitoring Fees being a contribution of £500

6.19 **Sustainable Drainage Officer** – no objection

Comments (in full)

Proposals have properly identified the need of a Flood Risk Assessment, as the site area is greater than 1ha. The flood risk assessment should include

an assessment of the flood risk from all sources of flooding. The flood risk should include assessment of: fluvial flood risk, mapped surface water, flood risk associated with potential overland flow from adjacent steeply sloping land, groundwater flood risk, flooding from surface water, foul sewers and summary of historic flooding records (if any).

6.20 Sustainability Officer – No objection.

(Comments – summary)

Although would favour the reuse of buildings over demolition wherever possible, demolition and new construction may be proposed where the original structure is no longer fit for purpose, producing a more sustainable development.

The applicant has provided an Energy Strategy in support of this application which suggests a 'fabric first' approach to reducing the energy demand of the development via:

- High fabric efficiency
- Efficient building services
- Targeted performance parameters better than the notional Building Regulations Part L
- Mechanical ventilation with heat recovery
- Low energy lighting throughout

A Combined Heat and Power (CHP) unit was found to be the most feasible low/zero carbon technology for this project based on the findings of a feasibility study.

Overheating Risk

The development consists of a large number of single-aspect dwellings which can be prone to overheating. The developer intends to use a mechanical ventilation system but would strongly recommend that overheating analysis be undertaken for a sample of dwellings (including west facing), using current and future climate scenarios.

Water Efficiency

The applicant has provided a Water Management & Conservation Statement which details how water efficient fixtures, fittings and appliances will be used to ensure a maximum internal water consumption of 110 litres/person/day. Building Regulations Part G calculations have been carried out, which demonstrate a total water consumption of 105.85 litres/person/day can be achieved based on the targeted specifications. This would make the development compliant with Local Plan Policy CC/4 and if the application is approved, this strategy would be made a condition of the development

Construction Management Plan

The applicant suggests that a 'Resource Management Plan' (RMP) will be produced for the Proposed Development for each phase of construction to define measures for how to minimise the volume of waste arising from demolition and construction activities, which is sent to landfill. A detailed

Construction Management Plan must be submitted to and approved by the local authority, detailing measures to limit demolition waste to landfill and ensure the new structure is low in embodied carbon.

6.21 Transport Assessment Team Cambridgeshire County Council – no objection

(Comments – summary)

It is anticipated that the proposed development would result in a net reduction of 70 daily vehicle movements, including a reduction of 10 movements during the AM peak hour, and 12 movements during the PM peak hour.

A Travel Plan will be required with any permission granted to include incentives such as cycle discount vouchers, free bus taster tickets for staff etc.

6.22 Tree Officer – no objections

Comments (in full)

No arboricultural or hedgerow objections to this application. There is a provisional TPO covering this entire site and all species, TPO 0006 (2021) served in March (at the request of concerned locals). A Tree Survey and Arboricultural Implications Assessment, Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement & Tree Protection Plan (rev A dated 28/04/2021) has been submitted. This is sufficient for this stage of the application, but a further detailed Tree Protection Plan will be required if the application is approved. It should include a schedule of monitoring (specification and records to be kept) by a project arborist which the Council can request if required. Please also include specific instructions regarding the installation of all the low-level lighting, including tree up lighting, which is proposed.

6.23 Urban Design

Comments (in full)

From a design perspective, do not object to the overall approach to layout, massing and elevational treatment of the proposed new care home building but observe that the care home building would result in an increase in footprint and Gross Internal Floor when compared with that of the existing building and approved extensions combined.

The proposal to demolish the existing Victorian building is not a desirable option as it is considered to have architectural merits. However, if it is demonstrated that it is not feasible to retain the Victorian building, then it is important that references to the architectural elements of the Victorian building are made in the proposals in order to reflect the history of the existing Victorian building in some way. In that respect, the current proposals would at least retain one existing feature, i.e. the dog sculpture, which is welcome.

In terms of siting, the proposed building would be largely sited in a location that is similar to that of the existing building, while leaving sufficient separation distance between the building and the site's boundaries taking into account: 1) the need to provide a good level of residential amenity; and 2) respect the sensitive nature of the green belt and views to and from the site. As such, the siting of the proposed building is considered acceptable.

Scale and massing

From a design perspective, Officers would not object to the proposed footprint and the GIFA which have been designed to meet the operational needs of an 80-bed care home.

Layout

The layout of the proposed 80-bed care home is logical and generally well-considered. Following the last meeting, the applicant has since produced a document providing an assessment of the quality of the proposed home design against the ten principles set out by the Housing our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation (HAPPI), which is helpful.

Given the significant amount of time some of the residents will spend in their rooms (as some may prefer to stay in the room instead of staying in the communal rooms), it is welcome that all the rooms are provided with pleasant outlook and would receive adequate levels of daylight. Whilst there are some single-aspect north-facing units, they would be provided with large windows/openings and private terraces (to the ground floor units).

The rationale of providing private terraces to all ground floor units is strongly supported as this would help ensure their well-being, giving the residents and their families the space to have some private outdoor space to connect, particularly in light of the Covid-19 pandemic which indicates that access to private outdoor space is of significant importance to the vulnerable groups of members of our society. It is understood that the residents on the first floor would be residents with dementia and so it is not feasible to provide them with private amenity space. Officers are satisfied with this approach as external terraces are provided to all first floor residents in the form of communal amenity space.

The scheme incorporates classical architectural language with well-proportioned fenestrations. The setbacks introduced to the elevations are welcome as they would help to create a more dynamic built form and a more varied ridgeline to minimise its perceived bulk. The revised elevations use glazed elements to break up the long elevations, this is supported.

6.24 Victorian Society - object.

Comments (in full)

Hotel Felix has been extended and altered extensively in line with the various changes of use. Moreover, its setting has been developed

considerably, and what was once a modest country house on the outskirts of Cambridge, is now part of a much larger hotel complex between modern development. However, these changes have not been so unsympathetic as to destroy the significance of the remaining building. The core of the building, and its attractive façades, particularly the bowed south façade, have been retained and continue to contribute towards its architectural appeal. We recognise that a Certificate of Immunity has been issued for the building, but it is imperative to stress that this does not render a building devoid of architectural or historical interest. The criteria for national listing has become increasingly strict, and the standard that must be met for post 1850 country houses is particularly high given their relative abundance nationally. Despite recommending refusal for listing, the DCMS report notes that this remains an “attractive suburban villa” and references the notable south façade and terrace specifically as well. There is a clear opportunity here to highlight this remaining architectural attractiveness by removing later additions and allowing the original elements to be appreciated in full. Citing the additions as justification for total demolition on the other hand appears both uninspired and wasteful. This building should be viewed as a non-designated heritage asset by the local authority. It has clear architectural interest and local historical interest as a building

7.0 Third Party Representations

80 representations have been received. Objections: 47, Supporting: 33

7.1 Those in objection have raised the following issues:

- Demolition of a locally listed (non-designated) heritage asset. The Victorian part of the Hotel Felix is a distinctive, appealing and locally scarce historic building, It is in good repair, and has enormous potential for reuse. Demolition would rob us of a much-valued local landmark and cultural asset.
- Negative environmental impact of demolishing a structurally sound building. The demolition of the entire hotel complex, some of it less than twenty years old, would be extremely wasteful of resources.
- Effect on the Girton area (balance of use, lack of need, environmental impact) Girton at present does not have a public cemetery. If approved, funding to be provided to the community to establish a sizeable public cemetery as a matter of urgency.
- The current 'Hotel Felix' plot forms part of the important green gap between Girton and Cambridge which should be maintained.
- Proposed removal (or relocation) of substantial trees on this plot to allow for the development will be detrimental to the biodiversity of the local area.

7.2 Those in support have given the following reasons:

- Positive impacts which the care home will deliver to sustain a strong social welfare for the elderly. Will provide essential care for the local community and benefit the area through creation of employment.
- Society needs to invest in the elderly and people with dementia and this specialist care home is beneficial. Offering 80 people essential care in the most vulnerable time in their life.
- Care homes must be built to a high standard and through renovation of old buildings, this may not be possible. The replacement building is architecturally significant, purpose built, and sustainable building which will benefit the area in the future.

7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

8.0 Member Representations

8.1 Cllr Bygott has made a representation (objecting to) the application on the following grounds:

- Design and Construction SPD states: *4.6.1 "The construction industry is the single largest user of materials in the UK. 420 million tonnes of materials are consumed in construction annually. In addition to this, about 10% of national I am writing to request that the planning application 21/00953/FUL, which is to demolish a magnificent Victorian building known as the Hotel Felix on Huntingdon Road Girton, be called in to the Planning Committee, unless there is an officer decision for refusal or it is referred to a Design Review Panel. Material planning grounds for refusal of the application are contained in the attached document.*
- The Hotel Felix www.hotelfelix.co.uk is locally listed on the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER) with number 05482 under one of its former names, Howe House (which has since become the name of the modern house next door). After Girton College and the Parish Church, it is the most substantial historic building in Girton. As far as I am aware, it is the most significant heritage building to have been proposed for demolition in South Cambridgeshire during my 15 years as a District Councillor. As can be seen in the photographs on the above website, the Victorian building is in excellent condition, having been fully restored in 2002.
- The applicant, a subsidiary of Venture Capital firm Melford Capital Partners LLP, has not demonstrated that the demolition of the Victorian villa is necessary in order to construct an 80 bed care home on the site. The desired outcome of a Design Review Panel would be to recommend preserving the villa and building the care home next to it. The Victorian building has many potential ancillary uses such as offices, staff or visitor accommodation.

The National Planning Policy Framework states:

- *"Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies."*
- This shows that Policy NH/9 should not require the care home to have fewer beds if the Victorian villa is preserved.
- *Our Sustainable energy consumption is used in the production and transport of construction products and materials."*
- It is not environmentally sustainable for us to allow perfectly usable buildings in an excellent state of repair to be demolished whenever there is a short term change in demand for various uses. This applies not only to the Victorian building, which is capable of surviving in active use for many centuries to come (and possibly indefinitely with the correct maintenance), but also the modern additions built in 2002 and 2008 which have more than sixty years remaining of their design lives.
- Planet Earth does not have infinite resources, and it is shameful that building materials should be wasted in this way.

9.0 Local Groups / Petition

Not applicable

10.0 Assessment

10.1 Principle of Development

10.2 The site is located outside of the development framework boundary of Girton and in the Cambridge Green Belt. The site is considered to be previously developed land occupied by a Victorian villa which was most recently used as a hotel (Former Hotel Felix).

10.3 There are no Local Plan policies which seek to safeguard against the loss of visitor accommodation therefore, no objections are raised in this regard.

10.4 Policy S/2 of the Local Plan sets out how the vision for the Local Plan will be secured through the achievement of six key objectives including to ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure (criterion e).

10.5 Care homes are largely self functioning and do not rely heavily on a range of services within the community, save for health, in terms of primary care. They serve an important function in providing a specific type of housing to meet the needs of people requiring care in their day to day lives. In this

instance, the focus is on provision of dementia care. The proposal is therefore not considered to conflict with policy S/2.

- 10.6 Policy S/6 of the Local Plan sets out the Council's development strategy and a hierarchical approach to new housing in the district, with a descending order of preference given to on the edge of Cambridge, at new settlements and only limited development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres. The site is located within the Cambridge Green Belt between the village of Girton and Cambridge and is therefore, outside the development framework of both settlements. As such it conflicts with policy S/7 of the Local Plan which states that outside development frameworks, only allocations within Neighbourhood Plans that have come into force and development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside or where supported by other policies in this plan will be permitted. Whilst policy S/7 seeks to protect the countryside from gradual encroachment on the edges of villages and help guard against incremental growth in unsustainable locations, spatially, the site is not in conflict with policy S/6. Nevertheless, its location within the context of the Cambridge Green Belt is discussed in more detail below.
- 10.7 The site is outside the development framework of Girton and Cambridge and therefore, the proposal is contrary to policy S/7. However, this is considered more widely in the context of previously developed land in the Green Belt.
- 10.8 The proposal is for an 80 bed care home providing residential care, nursing care and dementia care. Half of the units (40) will be dedicated to dementia care. Paragraph 62 of the NPPF, in the context of seeking to significantly boost the supply homes, recognises the need for a range of housing within different groups in the community such as older people. "Older people" is defined within the NPPF as; people over or approaching retirement age, including the active, newly retired through to the very frail and elderly; and whose housing needs can encompass accessible, adaptable general needs housing through the full range of retirement and specialised housing for those with support or care needs. Policy H/9 of the Local Plan reiterates the need for a wide choice of housing and the supporting text identifies that the population of the district is ageing (in the age band 64-74 up to 7% of residents will be classified as frail) and there are a range of models that can play a part in providing specialist accommodation for older people. These include care homes.
- 10.9 A key fact noted in the Local Plan is an ageing population with growth forecast between 2001 to 2021 of 95% for the 60-74 age group and 108% for those 75+. The Cambridgeshire Older People's Strategy identifies that between 2011-2036 it is projected that South Cambridgeshire will experience a 100% increase in the over 65s. There is also a significant growing incidence of dementia in older people and by 2025 it is estimated that over 1 million people in the UK will have a diagnosis of dementia. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Adult Social Care Market Position Statement 2018/19 identifies a number of key challenges including the lack

of capacity to deliver nursing and nursing dementia care for older people in some areas of Cambridgeshire and a shortage of residential dementia, nursing and nursing dementia provision is South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City.

- 10.10 In allowing the recent appeal for a retirement village at Stapleford (December 2021), the Inspector noted the need for care home beds in the market area submitted by the appellant was unchallenged and that the Council's own analysis for the emerging local plan suggested the figures may be underestimates. The applicant has used the same company, Carterwood, to assess need for care beds in relation to this application. The applicant's needs assessment states that the earliest the proposed care home could be made available is 2023. The applicant has considered need as of 2023, with those aged 65+ at risk of requiring care in a residential setting is for 1071 bed spaces within South Cambridgeshire. Including an occupancy capacity allowance (i.e. effective full capacity) of 92%, this increases to 1,161 bed spaces. In terms of specialist dementia care, the need to support the number of people at risk of requiring dedicated dementia care within South Cambridgeshire is 488 bed spaces increasing to 529 with the occupancy capacity allowance.
- 10.11 The applicant has also assessed existing supply to 2023 noting that a market standard bed space should provide a minimum of en-suite WC and wash hand basin. Within the local authority area there are 18 care homes providing 964 registered bed spaces, 84% (812 bed spaces) which meet the applicant's market standard. In terms of specialist dementia bedspaces the total existing supply is 289 bedspaces.
- 10.12 In terms of planned supply, the applicant has assessed applications which have been granted since December 2017. The applicant has estimated that by 2023, 250 market bedspaces will be delivered, of which 110 will be for dementia care. The demonstrates a need for circa 100 bedspaces in the general market and 240 for specialist dementia care bedspaces. A summary of the figures above are set out in the table below.

	All beds	Dementia beds
Need		
Total Demand (including capacity allowance) for those aged 65+	1161	529
Supply		
Existing beds (en-suites)	812	179
Planned beds (by 2023)	250	110
Total Supply	1062	289
Balance of Need	99	240

- 10.13 The Council, in preparing its evidence base for the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan, has also commissioned a report for Housing Need for Specific Groups (October 2021). This report is broadly consistent with the applicant's findings, which suggest a potential shortfall of bedspaces in South Cambridgeshire Council have identified a much lower need. However, they have not explained the associated rationale, although the County as part of their commissioning strategy will be prioritising people staying in their own home for as long as possible and promoting independence through housing with care solutions.
- 10.14 In allowing the appeal at Stapleford the Inspector notes that the provision of C2 housing comprises part of the overall housing requirement and that sufficient land for housing development has been identified for the next 6 years (now 6.5 years). The 5 year housing land supply was not contested however, the Inspector considered this was not sufficient. Evidence was also provided (and uncontested) which highlighted that unless sites are specifically allocated for C2 development, the developers of such schemes are unable to compete for sites in the housing land supply market with the providers of C3 general housing accommodation and so, the delivery of C2 development will be restricted. The Inspector goes on to note that; *“despite a plethora of studies, the Council’s approach has not delivered and is not expected to deliver special care housing in anything like sufficient quantities. No policy nor any allocation in the Local Plan requires a specific proportion of dwellings to be delivered as special care housing”*.
- 10.15 The NPPF and Local Plan identify a need for a variety of housing to support different groups within the community. The Council’s own evidence corroborates that of the applicant’s in terms of a shortfall in bedspaces in

the general market and also for dementia care in South Cambridgeshire. Furthermore, given the local plan policy restrictions for ensuring land for C2 housing can come forward, officers are satisfied that the need for a care facility which specialises in dementia care, has been appropriately demonstrated. As such no objections are raised to the principle of the proposed care home subject to other material considerations which are discussed below.

Principle of Development in the Green Belt

- 10.16 The application site is located within the Cambridge Green Belt with no statutory designations for landscape character or quality covering the site. Proposals within the Green Belt are assessed against the guidance set out in Section 13 of the NPPF in addition to the Council's own Green Belt policies. The NPPF states that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. There is a strong emphasis on the presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is by definition harmful. Any identified harm will be given substantial weight.
- 10.17 Policy S/4 of the Local Plan sets out that new development in the Green Belt will only be approved in accordance with Green Belt policy in the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 10.18 Policy NH/8 of the Local Plan states that any development proposals within the Green Belt must be located and designed so that they do not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt. Where development is permitted, landscaping conditions, together with a requirement that any planting is adequately maintained, will be attached to any planning permission in order to ensure that the impact on the Green Belt is mitigated.
- 10.19 Policy NH/9 of the Local Plan states that redevelopment of Previously Developed Sites and Infilling in the Green Belt will be inappropriate development except for:

The partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

Appropriateness of Development

- 10.20 The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence (NPPF, paragraph 137).

- 10.21 As defined by paragraph 138 of the NPPF 2021, the Green Belt serves five purposes: (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- 10.22 Paragraph 149 of the NPPF states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate, though there are exceptions to this defined at Paragraphs 149 and 150. As such, the assessment first determines whether the development would be inappropriate or not. Paragraph 149(g) is relevant to this application: "limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development". The application site comprises Previously Developed Land (PDL), otherwise known as brownfield land, which would be redeveloped. An assessment is made on whether the proposed development would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing.
- 10.23 There is no specific definition of "openness" in the NPPF. National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states that openness can have both spatial and visual aspects. Case law has established that the concept of openness is not narrowly limited to a volumetric approach but visual effects should also be given appropriate weight when these are a relevant consideration for the assessment of the impact on the Green Belt's openness.
- 10.24 When considering the impact on the openness of the Green Belt, this is not affected by natural screening (i.e: trees and hedgerows) as these are not permanent features; openness means the absence of buildings or development. When openness is reduced, harm takes place regardless of whether it is visible or witnessed. Measures in mitigation can never completely remove the harm since a development that is wholly invisible to the eye remains, by definition, adverse to openness.
- 10.25 The application site within a 'green finger' of land, known as the Girton Gap. This is an area of Green Belt bounded by Huntingdon Road to the southwest, to the north-western side by residential properties in Thornton Road and The Brambles and the Development Framework Boundary of the village of Girton, to the southeast by Whitehouse Lane in the city and to the north-east by public footpath 99/13. To the opposite side of Whitehouse Lane is NIAB building and the city of Cambridge.
- 10.26 This area of land includes the Howes Close Sports Ground to the north-eastern end and playing fields in the south-western end, both of which are used by Anglian Ruskin University. This area of land clearly separates the edge of the city of Cambridge from the suburban part of Girton. The existing Hotel Felix is located within the Girton Gap and bridges this green gap.

- 10.27 The proposals would result in an increase in footprint of 165m² (13%) and an increase in volume of 33%; when compared with that of the existing building. The increased volume is mainly due to the overall increase in building height. This is the result of modern architectural standards, which require greater floor-to-ceiling heights across the whole scheme, compared to the existing. However, there is a circa 16% decrease in the perimeter of the development.
- 10.28 The applicant argues that despite the increase in proposed volume, the perceived built form is less intrusive than the existing as a result of its compact form (decrease in overall perimeter) and relocation towards the northwest of the Site. The gap between the urban edges is increased and the local quality of openness of the Green Belt related to undeveloped land is improved. There are opportunities for the development to result in making more of the Green Belt open through removal of development such as hard standings and parking areas and replacement with soft landscaping.
- 10.29 The north-western end of the proposed building is approximately in line with the adjacent dwelling to the north and has moved marginally further towards the northwest and Girton. The southwestern elevation of the proposed building is set further back from the Whitehouse Lane frontage, although this elevation is now a full two storeys. However, it will be sited closer to the back of properties along The Brambles in Girton. The proposed building's footprint would be larger than the existing and the proposed height, although not higher than the existing, would have a greater extent of development at more than one storey. The proposed building would be more compact, but it would be two storeys across its footprint. In terms of visual impact on the landscape, the findings of the submitted Landscape and Visual Appraisal are that in visual terms the proposal would have no greater impact on the 'openness' of the Green Belt and does not result in adverse effects on the qualities of the Green Belt.
- 10.30 Landscape Officers consider that the impact of the development on the openness of the Green Belt is negligible due to the existing presence of a similarly functioning and sized building. The entrance to the site from Whitehouse Lane would be altered to create a curved configuration to create a less formal entry route to the site and the amount of car parking areas would be reduced. This would reduce the visual impact of the proposal as viewed from Whitehouse Lane and would help to increase the visual separation between the building and the lane. A significant reduction in surface car parking area which can be converted into landscaping is also an improvement to the overall character and openness of the area. The placement of the new building has allowed for the retention of significant trees within and at the boundaries of the development site.
- 10.31 Nevertheless given the increase in footprint and volume and the visual perception of being closer to properties in The Brambles, Girton, on balance, officers consider that the spatial and visual harm would have a greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt and is therefore, inappropriate development. Although this impact is not considered

significant, it does amount to harm to the Green Belt. The proposal would therefore, conflict with policy NH/9 of the Local Plan, although this policy makes no reference to whether very special circumstances (VSCs) can be demonstrated. Nevertheless, officers are of the view that the development would fail to comply with Paragraph 149g of the NPPF. The NPPF states that very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The assessment now considers whether there are any VSCs to justify the proposed development, and if so what weight these are considered to carry. The harm identified must be given substantial weight and will be considered along with any other harm identified in relation to other material planning considerations assessed in this report. The VSCs will then be weighed against all identified harm.

Very Special Circumstances

- 10.32 The Applicant has advanced a number of matters which they consider amount to very special circumstances which clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

Critical need for housing for older people

- 10.33 NPPF requires that the needs of specific housing groups are addressed. There are no allocated sites for care homes in the Local Plan. This was supported in the appeal decision at Stapleford in weighing the planning balance and whether very special circumstances existed. Supported by PPG, which states, "*the need to provide housing for older people is critical*". In addition, with application S/3418/17 considered in March 2018, the Authority accepted that the level of need for care bed spaces at that time was sufficient to represent very special circumstances. That need has not materially diminished.

Critically needed dementia care facilities

- 10.34 NPPF requires that the needs of specific housing groups are addressed, yet there is a critical shortfall of spaces available and no site allocations in the Local Plan for dementia care bed spaces.

Improves choice of care bedspaces

- 10.35 Provides a better choice of accommodation to suit changing needs, providing health benefits (as supported by PPG) and encourages take-up of bed spaces, thereby avoiding people having to live in inappropriate accommodation.

The development will indirectly contribute to the housing land supply within the district

10.36 Although not formally a part of the housing land supply requirements, 80 beds could release 42 homes from underoccupancy, reducing the housing need requirement in an area where there is substantial housing need. This was given limited weight in the Stapleford appeal where a much greater number of houses (134) were estimated could be released into the local housing market.

The site would provide economic benefits by generating jobs, in the construction and operational phases of the development and by residents spending locally.

10.37 The new care home will provide a net increase in new jobs, generating around 115 direct jobs. The new jobs will offer a variety of roles with a mix of full and part time opportunities. In addition to onsite jobs, the Dementia Research Centre will provide training and research into dementia care, helping to upskill the sub regional population and support the voluntary sector. There will also be a number of indirect jobs created through the construction work and the supply chain. An investment of £25million locally, creating 115 jobs.

There would be social benefits in specialised age friendly housing

10.38 The Health Impact Assessment in support of the application confirms that the proposal will have a positive impact on new and existing residents by delivering a range of health benefits. This includes the provision of communal facilities to encourage resident's social interaction and engagement with the wider community. The proposal will also increase local housing choice and allow more older people to stay close to existing friends and family in the community. Health, wellbeing and social benefits to the residents and wider community; The proposed development co-locates a Dementia Research Centre with residential and nursing care, providing unique support for people with Dementia and their carers. It will relieve pressure on an overstretched NHS and local authority health services as private pay model.

The scheme would deliver significant environmental benefits

10.39 The scheme will result in a significant Biodiversity Net Gain at the site. A Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment prepared by Ecology Solutions uses the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 to calculate a net gain of 74.49% in habitats and 38.72% gain in linear features based on the proposed landscaping scheme.

The openness of the green belt is improved through the removal of parking and increased landscaping

10.40 Landscape officer comments have confirmed that the impact of the development on the openness of the Green Belt is 'negligible' and that the significant reduction in surface car parking area which can be converted to landscaping is also 'an improvement to the overall character and openness

of the area'. Whilst officers note the landscape officer comments and that there will be some improvements through reduced surface car parking, on balance, openness is not considered to be improved and therefore, this is not considered to be a VSC.

10.41 In summary, the proposal would meet an identified need for specialist C2 housing with a focus on dementia care and provision of a Dementia Research Centre. The proposal would provide economic benefits including additional employment through the construction and operational phases. The site is also previously developed land within the Green Belt. These factors are considered to carry significant weight as VSCs. The other benefits such as release of existing housing stock, improved choice of bedspaces, social benefits, biodiversity enhancements within the Green Belt and economic multiplier effects of increased expenditure are less outstanding and carry more moderate-limited weight but nevertheless also contribute as VSCs. Nevertheless, taken together, officers consider these factors do amount to very special circumstances which outweigh what is a balanced assessment regarding harm to the Green Belt.

10.42 The identified circumstances must be assessed against the identified harm. Paragraph 148 of the NPPF states that VSCs will not exist unless potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In terms of other identified harm, the remainder of this report assesses the impact of the development to identify where this harm may exist. All identified harm will be weighed in the planning balance, against the circumstances that have been identified.

Impact upon Landscape Character

10.43 The NPPF requires decisions to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Policy NH/2 of the Local Plan requires new development to respect and retain or enhance the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape. Policy NH/6 states the Council will aim to conserve and enhance green infrastructure within the district. As noted above the application site is set within a green gap between Girton and Cambridge and is occupied by a former hotel building. The site is not identified as being located within a valued landscape or the subject of any statutory designation. Although the proposed built form is volumetrically larger and has a slightly larger footprint, its visual impact in terms of a building seen in the context of the wider landscape will be broadly similar. The landscape officer has not raised an objection with regard to the impact of the proposed building in the wider landscape and as such the proposal is not considered to conflict with the NPPF or Local Plan in this regard.

Design, Layout, Scale and Landscaping

10.44 The NPPF places great importance on design quality, noting that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development; Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Developments should add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, and should be sympathetic to local character and history including the surrounding built environment.

- 10.45 Policy HQ/1 'Design Principles' provides a comprehensive list of criteria by which development proposals must adhere to, requiring that all new development must be of high-quality design, with a clear vision as to the positive contribution the development will make to its local and wider context. The District Design Guide SPD (2010) and Landscape in New Developments SPD (2010) provide additional guidance.
- 10.46 From a design perspective, the proposed footprint and the GIFA have been designed to meet the operational needs of an 80-bed care home. The scheme incorporates classical architectural language with well-proportioned fenestrations. The setbacks introduced to the elevations help to create a more dynamic built form and a more varied ridgeline to minimise its perceived bulk and glazed elements contribute to break up the long elevations. In terms of siting, the proposed building would be largely sited in a location that is similar to that of the existing building, while leaving sufficient separation distance between the building and the site's boundaries taking into account: 1) the need to provide a good level of residential amenity; and 2) respect the sensitive nature of the green belt and views to and from the site. As such, the siting of the proposed building is considered acceptable.
- 10.47 The layout of the proposed 80-bed care home is logical and an assessment of the quality of the proposed home design against the ten principles set out by the Housing our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation (HAPPI), has been made. The replacement building, which is of a high architectural quality, would be highly sustainable and would provide a high quality care home, built to 21st century standards with a high level of amenity for future residents.
- 10.48 Overall, the proposed development is a high-quality design that would contribute positively to its surroundings and be appropriately landscaped. The proposal is compliant with the NPPF and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) policies HQ/1.

Trees

- 10.49 Policies NH/2, NH/4 and HQ/1 seek to preserve, protect and enhance existing trees and hedges. Para. 131 of the NPPF seeks for existing trees to be retained wherever possible.
- 10.50 The application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment. The proposal entails the relocation of 10 existing semi-mature trees, (nine European Lime and one Atlas Cedar) on the west side of the site to suit the formality of the proposed landscape design and the Landscape Officer has

raised concern regarding the proposed intention to relocate some semi-mature trees (between 8-10m tall) from the central areas of the site and move them to the boundaries. However, the tree officer has not raised an objection, although notes it is an expensive and time consuming process. Relocation of existing trees is not objected to in principle, subject to appropriate transplanting measures being implemented and will ensure existing semi-mature trees contribute to the landscape setting of the building.

- 10.51 The Council's Tree Officer has advised that there is a provisional TPO covering this entire site and all species, TPO 0006 (2021). A Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement (PAMS) & Tree Protection Plan (rev A dated 28/04/2021) has been submitted. This is sufficient for this stage of the application, but a further detailed Tree Protection Plan and AMS will be required by condition. A landscaping scheme will also be secured by condition and any transplanted tree that subsequently dies will be expected to be replaced.
- 10.52 Subject to conditions as appropriate, the proposal would accord with policies NH/2, NH/4 and HQ/1 of the Local Plan.

Heritage Assets

- 10.53 Policy NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) requires development affecting heritage assets to sustain or enhance the character and distinctiveness of those assets. Development proposals will be supported when they sustain and enhance the special character and distinctiveness of the district's historic environment including its villages and countryside and its building traditions and details: and they create new high quality environments with a strong sense of place by responding to local heritage character including in innovative ways.
- 10.54 Paragraph 195 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
- 10.55 Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states that there is a general preference in favour of retaining any heritage asset. However, the desirability of doing so is dependent on the significance of the asset and the effect the development would have on its significance.
- 10.56 Paragraph 203 NPPF 2021 states: "The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into

account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”.

- 10.57 The existing building is the subject of certificate of immunity from listing. Whilst it is recognised that a Certificate of Immunity has been issued for the building, this does not render the building devoid of architectural or historical interest. A building may be assessed as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA) during the consideration of a development proposal as stated in Historic England’s Advice Note 7 (second edition) in paragraph 27.
- 10.58 National Planning Policy Guidance states that “*non-designated heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified by plan-making bodies as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets. A substantial majority of buildings have little or no heritage significance and thus do not constitute heritage assets. Only a minority have enough heritage significance to merit identification as non-designated heritage assets.*” (Paragraph: 039 Reference ID: 18a-039-20190723).
- 10.59 South Cambridgeshire does not have published list of local heritage assets although have used Cambridge City Councils’ (Part of the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service) published criteria for designating Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs) as a guide to assess the building’s significance. The Conservation officer notes the building is a typical example of a villa of the well-to-do professionals building houses in this period. It also has some historic interest in that it had locally notable owners/occupants and was in institutional use by the County Council for some time and will be remembered by users. Although the planning practice guidance notes that only a minority of buildings have enough significance to merit identification as NDHAs, the Conservation Officer is of the opinion that this modest significance indicates that the building can be categorised as an NDHA.
- 10.60 The existing building does not benefit from protection against demolition through listing status or through being located within a Conservation Area. Demolition can be carried out under Schedule 2, Part 11 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), Class B through the submission of a prior approval where only the method of demolition is under consideration and not the principle of demolition.
- 10.61 There are no policies within the adopted Local Plan, NPPF or Sustainability SPD that seek to retain existing buildings on the grounds that it is not a sustainable approach to development to demolish. The applicant has set out in detail, why it is not economic or practical to convert the existing building. The replacement building would comply with SPD and sustainability policies as discussed later in this report.

10.62 Given these circumstances, officers are of the view that the loss of a Non-Designated Heritage Asset carries limited weight. This loss is balanced against a replacement building which is of a high architectural quality, highly sustainable and would provide a high quality care home, built to 21st century standards with a high level of amenity for future residents. The proposal will also result in other benefits such as meeting an identified care need, provision of a dementia research centre, biodiversity improvements and jobs growth. These benefits are considered to outweigh the harm.

10.63 The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and Local Plan policy NH/14.

Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design

10.64 The Councils' Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020) sets out a framework for proposals to demonstrate they have been designed to minimise their carbon footprint, energy and water consumption and to ensure they are capable of responding to climate change as required by policy CC/1.

10.65 Policy CC/3 'Renewable and Low Carbon Energy', requires that Proposals for new dwellings and new non-residential buildings of 1,000m² or more will be required to reduce carbon emissions by a minimum of 10% through the use of on-site renewable energy and low carbon technologies.

10.66 Policy CC/4 'Water Efficiency' requires that all new residential developments must achieve as a minimum water efficiency to 110 litres pp per day and for non-residential buildings to achieve a BREEAM efficiency standard equivalence of 2 credits. Paras 152 – 158 of the NPPF are relevant.

10.67 Although the reuse of buildings is favoured over demolition wherever possible, demolition and new construction may be acceptable where the original structure is no longer fit for purpose, and the replacement building produces a more sustainable development.

10.68 The application is supported by an Energy Strategy which suggests a 'fabric first' approach to reducing the energy demand of the development via:

- High fabric efficiency
- Efficient building services
- Targeted performance parameters better than the notional Building Regulations Part L
- Mechanical ventilation with heat recovery
- Low energy lighting throughout

10.69 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Sustainability Officer who raises no objection to the proposal subject to

conditions relating to carbon reduction technologies and water efficiency. The applicant has suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and subject to conditions the proposal is compliant with Local Plan policies CC/1, CC/3 and CC/4 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

Biodiversity

- 10.70 The Councils' Biodiversity SPD (2022) require development proposals to deliver a net gain in biodiversity following a mitigation hierarchy which is focused on avoiding ecological harm over minimising, rectifying, reducing and then off-setting. This approach accords with policy NH/14 which outlines a primary objective for biodiversity to be conserved or enhanced and provides for the protection of Protected Species, Priority Species and Priority Habitat.
- 10.71 The application is accompanied by a preliminary ecological appraisal Ecology Assessment (Ecology Solutions, October 2020). This appraisal identified the existing building as a potential bat roost and that a licence from Natural England would be required to remove the roost. A biodiversity net gain assessment has also been submitted which demonstrates a net gain of 74.49% in habitats and 38.72% gain in linear features based on the proposed landscaping scheme.
- 10.72 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer, who raises no objection to the proposal and recommends several conditions to ensure the protection of species and the estimated biodiversity net gain is delivered.
- 10.73 In consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer, subject to an appropriate condition, officers are satisfied that the proposed development complies with policy NH/14, the Biodiversity SPD 2022, the requirements of the Environment Act 2021 and 06/2005 Circular advice.

Water Management and Flood Risk

- 10.74 Policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 of the Local Plan require developments to have appropriate sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems and minimise flood risk. Paras. 159 – 169 of the NPPF are relevant.
- 10.75 The site is in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore considered at low risk of flooding.
- 10.76 The applicants have submitted a Flood Risk Assessment.
- 10.77 The Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer has advised conditions are required and the Local Lead Flood Authority has advised the application has demonstrated that surface water from the proposed development can discharge via the existing 300mm diameter outfall pipe to the watercourse to the east of the site, restricting surface water discharge to 3.5l/s. The LLFA

is supportive of the use of permeable paving as in addition to controlling the rate of surface water leaving the site it also provides water quality treatment which is of particular importance when discharging into a watercourse.

The applicants have suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, and subject to conditions the proposal is in accordance with Local Plan policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 and NPPF advice.

Highway Safety and Transport Impacts

- 10.78 Para. 111 of the NPPF advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Policy HQ/1 states that proposals must provide safe and convenient access for all users and abilities to public buildings and spaces, including those with limited mobility or those with impairment such as sight or hearing. Policy TI/2 requires developers to demonstrate adequate provision will be made to mitigate the likely impacts of the proposed development and, for larger developments, to demonstrate they have maximised opportunities for sustainable travel, and provided a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.
- 10.79 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment. Access to the site would be from the existing entrance/exit from Whitehouse Lane.
- 10.80 The application has been subject to formal consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council's Local Highways Authority and Transport Assessment Team, who raise no objection to the proposal subject to condition requiring a Travel Plan.
- 10.81 Subject to conditions, the proposal accords with the objectives of policy TI/2 of the Local Plan and is compliant with NPPF advice.

Cycle and Car Parking Provision

- 10.82 Policies HQ/1 and TI/3 set out that car and cycle parking provision should be provided through a design-led approach in accordance with the indicative standards set out in Figure 11 of the Local Plan. Cycle parking should be provided to at least the minimum standards.

Cycle Parking

- 10.83 Policy TI/3 requires 1 cycle parking space per 2 staff working at the same time.
- 10.84 The supporting text advises that for residential purposes cycle parking should be within a covered, lockable enclosure and that for houses this could be in the form of a shed or garage, for flats either individual lockers or cycle stands within a lockable, covered enclosure are required. All cycle

parking should be designed and located to minimise conflict between cycles, pedestrians and vehicles.

10.85 22 cycle spaces have been provided in a cycle store. This is acceptable.

Car Parking

10.86 Policy TI/3 requires 1 car parking space per residential staff plus 1 car parking space per 3 bed spaces.

10.87 The supporting text to the policy advises that the Council will encourage innovative solutions such as shared parking areas, for example where there are a mix of day and night uses, car clubs and provision of electric charging points and that a developer must provide clear justification for the level and type of parking proposed and will need to demonstrate they have addressed highway safety issues.

10.88 The Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD outlines the standards for EV charging at one slow charge point for each dwelling with allocated parking, one slow charge point for every two dwellings with communal parking (at least half of all non-allocated parking spaces) and passive provision for all the remaining car parking spaces to provide capability for increasing provision in the future. 31 parking spaces including two disabled bays are proposed. This is considered to meet the requirement per bedspaces.

10.89 Subject to conditions, the proposal is considered to accord with policies HQ/1 and TI/3 of the Local Plan and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.

Amenity

10.90 Policy HQ/1 (n), sets out that proposals must protect the health and amenity of occupiers and surrounding uses from development that is overlooking, overbearing or results in a loss of daylight or development which would create unacceptable impacts such as noise, vibration, odour, emissions and dust.

10.91 The District Design Guide 2010 advises that to prevent the overlooking of habitable rooms to the rear of residential properties and rear private gardens, it is preferable that a minimum distance of 15m is provided between the windows and the property boundary. For two storey residential properties, a minimum distance of 25m should be provided between rear or side building faces containing habitable rooms, which should be increased to 30m for 3 storey residential properties. It advises that a 12 metre separation is allowed where blank walls are proposed opposite the windows to habitable rooms.

Neighbouring Properties

- 10.92 The site lies adjacent to the rear gardens of neighbouring properties to the north east in Thornton Close. There is a separation of approximately 13 metres to the common boundary and a distance of approximately 27 metres between existing dwellings and the proposed care home. Residential properties to the north west in The Brambles are separated from the proposal by a distance of approximately 43 metres. The proposal will not result in harm in terms of loss of light, loss of privacy or be visually overbearing to adjacent neighbouring properties as the proposed care home occupies a similar position to the existing building on the site.

Future Occupants

- 10.93 The quality of the proposed home design has been assessed against the ten principles set out by the Housing our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation (HAPPI). Each resident would have 43.5sqm including a wet room, internal seating area and access to a garden. The accommodation is therefore, considered to be of a high quality.
- 10.94 Given the significant amount of time some of the residents will spend in their rooms (as some may prefer to stay in the room instead of staying in the communal rooms), all the rooms are provided with pleasant outlook and would receive adequate levels of daylight. Whilst there are some single-aspect north-facing units, they would be provided with large windows/openings and private terraces (to the ground floor units). There are a number of west facing single aspect rooms which can be prone to overheating. It is noted by the Council's sustainability officer that the developer intends to use a mechanical ventilation system but would strongly recommend that overheating analysis be undertaken for a sample of dwellings (including west facing), using current and future climate scenarios. This now forms part of the Building Regulations (Part O).
- 10.95 Providing private terraces to all ground floor units would help ensure their well-being, giving the residents and their families the space to have some private outdoor space to connect, particularly in light of the Covid-19 pandemic which indicates that access to private outdoor space is of significant importance to the vulnerable groups of members of our society. It is understood that the residents on the first floor would be residents with dementia and so it is not feasible to provide them with private amenity space, however external terraces are provided to all first floor residents in the form of communal amenity space.

- 10.96 The proposal is considered to provide a good level of amenity for future occupiers and will not harm the amenity of adjacent residents as such it is in accordance with the NPPF and policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan.

Health and wellbeing of new and existing residents

- 10.97 Policy SC/2 of the Local Plan requires that all new developments will have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of new and existing residents. Planning applications for developments between 20 to 100 dwellings or 1,000 to 5,000m² or more floorspace must be accompanied by a Health Impact Assessment to demonstrate this. The Council has also adopted a Health Impact Assessment SPD which is a material consideration.
- 10.98 A Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is a method of considering the positive and negative impacts of development on the health of different groups in the population, in order to enhance the benefits and minimise any risks to health. The Health Impact Assessment submitted has been assessed against the criteria in the “Review package for health impact assessment reports of development projects” which enables the Council to reach an opinion as to the quality of the completed HIA report. The assessment has been graded A – which is compliant with the requirements of the SPD. No objection has been raised by the Council’s Health Development Officer.
- 10.99 The submitted plans show a consulting room for a visiting GP as well as a therapy room. As a care home the applicant employ their own nurses directly so this has a beneficial reduction on any visits to or from a GP. It is usual for the residents (who are usually local) to be already registered with one of the local GP’s prior to moving to the care home. As part of the day to day operations of the care home, the local surgery have confirmed that provision of GP services will be agreed between the care home operator and appointed surgery. This agreement falls outside the planning process.
- 10.100 The proposal is considered to comply with policy SC/2 of the Local Plan.

Construction and Environmental Health Impacts

- 10.101 The land contamination, air quality and noise and vibrational impacts associated with the construction and occupation of the site are addressed by Local Plan policies CC/6 ‘Construction Methods’, CC/7 ‘Water Quality’, SC/9 ‘Lighting Proposals’, SC/10 ‘Noise Pollution’, SC11 ‘Contaminated Land’, SC/12 ‘Air Quality’ and SC/14 ‘Odour’. Paragraphs 183 - 188 of the NPPF are relevant.
- 10.102 The Council’s Environmental Health Team have assessed the application and recommended conditions are attached to ensure appropriate mitigation during the construction period and necessary mitigation with regard to potential land contamination.

10.103 The associated construction and environmental impacts would be acceptable in accordance with policies CC/6, CC/7, SC/9, SC/10, SC/12 and SC/14 of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

10.104 LP policy TI/10 'Broadband' requires new development to contribute towards the provision of infrastructure suitable to enable the delivery of high-speed broadband services across the District. A condition is proposed to ensure this provision.

Planning Obligations (S106)

10.105 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

10.106 Policy TI/8 'Infrastructure and New Developments' states that Planning permission will only be granted for proposals that have made suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms. The nature, scale and phasing of any planning obligations and/or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions sought will be related to the form of the development and its potential impact upon the surrounding area.

Heads of Terms

10.107 The Heads of Terms (HoT's) as identified are to be secured within the S106 and are set out in the summary table below:

Obligation	Contribution / Term	Trigger
Community facilities - Burial	£16,800	Tbc

Burial provision

10.108 Girton Parish Council request a S106 regarding an amount for burial services. All housing developments will include or contribute to the provision of the services and facilities necessary to meet the needs of the development. The scale and range of this provision or contribution will be appropriate to the level of need generated by the development and will address the specific needs of different age groups, of people with disabilities, and faith groups

and will be adaptable to population growth and demographic changes. The full range of services and facilities are likely to be required in new settlements and similar developments. The community facilities and services to be provided include provision for burials. Girton has a traditional churchyard, which is almost completely full, with some 'family graves' which surviving relatives wish to fill.

10.109 The Section 106 Officer requests that the above development mitigates its impact by contributing towards the provision of additional burial plots in Girton. The methodology for £210 per dwelling, is supported by a planning appeal (APP/W0530/W/17/3187048 Para 48 and 51 – Land north east of Rampton Road, Cottenham.) A contribution of £16,800 is necessary to mitigate the impact of an 80 bed care home.

10.110 The applicant is willing to enter into a s106 planning obligation with regards to burial contributions and monitoring costs and for the trigger for payment to be prior to occupation of the care home.

10.111 The planning obligation is considered necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the required planning obligation(s) passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and are in accordance with Policy TI/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018).

Planning Balance

10.112 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

10.113 The proposed development is considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, the loss of openness is considered in the context of replacing an existing building. A number of circumstances have been identified to justify why the harm identified is outweighed by other considerations. Paragraph 148 of the NPPF states that 'very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations'.

10.114 Substantial weight is given to the harm caused to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness. Significant weight is given to the harm caused to the loss of openness to the Green Belt while significant weight is also given to the harm caused to the conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt. Substantial weight is accorded to the overall harm to the Green Belt.

10.115 The proposal would also result in the loss of a Non-Designated Heritage Asset which is considered of modest significance. The building is not protected by virtue of being Listed (it is immune from such designation) or located in a Conservation Area. Furthermore, the Council has not identified any other buildings of local heritage interest within the Local Plan. As such,

Officers attach limited weight to this in terms of other harm caused by the proposal.

- 10.116 A case for VSCs has been set out in support of the proposal. The care home would meet an identified need for specialist C2 housing with a focus on dementia care and provision of a Dementia Research Centre. The proposal would provide economic benefits including additional employment through the construction and operational phases. The site is also previously developed land within the Green Belt. These factors are considered to carry significant weight as VSCs. The other benefits such as release of existing housing stock, improved choice of bedspaces, social benefits, biodiversity enhancements within the Green Belt and economic multiplier effects of increased expenditure are less outstanding and carry moderate-limited weight but nevertheless also contribute as VSCs.
- 10.117 Therefore, it is Officers judgement that the case for VSCs would clearly outweigh the identified harm that would arise as a result of the development, even assigning that harm substantial weight as per national policy. The case for planning permission is thus made out.
- 10.118 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, such as the very special circumstances, the proposed development is recommended for approval.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1 Approve subject to:

-The planning conditions as set out below with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to officers.

-Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement which includes the Heads of Terms (HoT's) as set out in the report with minor amendments to the Heads of Terms as set out delegated to officers.

- 11.2 In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development.

Recommended Conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 3 No laying of services, creation of hard surfaces or erection of a building shall commence until a detailed design of the surface water drainage of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Those elements of the surface water drainage system not adopted by a statutory undertaker shall thereafter be maintained and managed in accordance with the approved management and maintenance plan.

The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Drainage Strategy Report prepared by Arc Engineers (ref: 20 106) dated February 2021 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) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, attenuation and flow control measures, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers, designed to accord with the CIRIA C753 SuDS Manual (or any equivalent guidance that may supersede or replace it);
- d) Full detail on SuDS proposals (including location, type, size, depths, side slopes and cross sections);
- e) 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.
- f) Demonstration that the surface water drainage of the site is in accordance with DEFRA non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems.
- g) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system.
- h) Permissions to connect to a receiving watercourse or sewer.
- i) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water.

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 and to ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage can be incorporated into the development, noting that initial preparatory and/or construction works may compromise the ability to mitigate harmful impacts. Reason - To ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage and to prevent the increased risk of flooding in accordance with Policies HQ/1, CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 4 No development, including preparatory works but excluding demolition, shall commence until details of measures indicating how additional surface water run-off from the site will be avoided during the construction works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The applicant may be required to provide collection, balancing and/or settlement systems for these flows. The approved measures and systems shall be brought into operation before any works to create buildings or hard surfaces commence.

Reason: To ensure surface water is managed appropriately during the construction phase of the development, so as not to increase the flood risk to adjacent land/properties or occupied properties within the development itself; recognising that initial works to prepare the site could bring about unacceptable impacts.

- 5 Before any works on site commence a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement, Tree Protection Strategy and Schedule of Monitoring shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority, including details of timing of events, protective fencing and ground protection measures. This should comply with BS5837. The tree protection measures shall be installed in accordance with the approved tree protection strategy before any works commence on site. The tree protection measures shall remain in place throughout the construction period and may only be removed following completion of all construction works.

- 6 Prior to the commencement of site clearance a pre-commencement site meeting shall be held and attended by the site manager, the arboricultural consultant and LPA Tree Officer to discuss details of the approved AMS.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that trees to be retained will not be damaged during any construction activity, including demolition, in order to preserve arboricultural amenity in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 Policy NH/4.

- 7 The approved tree protection methodology will be implemented throughout the development and the agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area

protected in accordance with approved tree protection plans, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority. If any tree shown to be retained is damaged, remedial works as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority will be carried out.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that trees to be retained will not be damaged during any construction activity, including demolition, in order to preserve arboricultural amenity in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 Policy NH/4.

- 8 If any tree shown to be retained on the approved tree protection methodology is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies within five years of project completion, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that arboricultural amenity will be preserved in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 Policy NH/4.

- 9 No development with the exception of demolition shall take place until:
- a. The application site has been subject to a detailed scheme for the investigation and recording of contamination and remediation objectives have been determined through risk assessment and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - b. Detailed proposals for the removal, containment or otherwise rendering harmless any contamination (the Remediation method statement) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land 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.

- 10 Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the works specified in any remediation method statement detailed in Condition 9 must be completed and a Verification report submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land 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.

- 11 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 care home hereby approved.

If during the development contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, such as putrescible waste, visual or physical evidence of contamination of fuels/oils, backfill or asbestos containing materials, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for, a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

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

- 12 No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The principal areas of concern that should be addressed are:

- i) Movement and control of muck away vehicles (all loading and unloading should be undertaken where possible off the adopted public highway)
- ii) Contractor parking, with all such parking to be within the curtilage of the site where possible
- iii) Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway where possible.)
- iv) Control of dust, mud and debris, and the means to prevent mud or debris being deposited onto the adopted public highway.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that before development commences, highway safety will be maintained during the course of development. (South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 Policy CC/9)

- 13 No development (including any site clearance/preparation works) shall be carried out until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing.

The plan shall include the following matters: -

- a) Piling methods (if employed);
 - b) Earthworks;
 - c) Hoardings to the site,
 - d) Noise limits;
 - e) Hours of working;
 - f) Vibration;
 - g) Control of emissions;
 - h) Waste management and disposal and material re use;
 - (i) anticipated nature and volumes of waste
 - (j) measure to ensure the maximisation of the reuse of waste
 - (k) measures to ensure effective segregation of waste at source including waste sorting, storage, recovery and recycling facilities to ensure the maximisation of waste materials both for use within and outside the site.
 - (l) any other steps to ensure the minimisation of waste during construction
 - (m) the location and timing of provision of facilities pursuant to criteria b/c/d
 - (n) the proposed timing of submission of a Waste Management Closure Report to demonstrate the effective implementation, management and monitoring of construction waste during the construction lifetime of the development.
- and,
- o) Materials storage; and hazardous material storage and removal.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To protect the amenity of the locality, especially for people living and/or working nearby, in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.

- 14 No construction site machinery or plant shall be operated, no noisy works shall be carried out and no construction related deliveries taken at or dispatched from the site except between the hours of 0800-1800 Monday to Friday, 0800-1300 Saturday and not at any time on Sundays or Bank or Public holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the locality, especially for people living and/or working nearby, in accordance with Policy CC/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 15 All ecological measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Ecology Assessment (Ecology Solutions,

October 2020) as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination.

Reason: To maintain, enhance, restore or add to biodiversity in accordance with Policies S/3, HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 16 Prior to the commencement of development above slab level a scheme of biodiversity enhancement shall be supplied to the local planning authority for its written approval. The scheme must include details as to how a measurable net gain in biodiversity has been accomplished. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented within an agreed timescale unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: To maintain, enhance, restore or add to biodiversity in accordance with Policies S/3, HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 17 Prior to occupation a "lighting design strategy for biodiversity" features or areas to be lit shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall: a) Identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and b) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specification) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.

It should also provide details of the installation of all the low-level lighting, including tree up lighting, which is proposed.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.

Lighting shall not be installed in the canopy of trees. If lighting is proposed, a bat roost assessment of the tree shall be undertaken and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures.

Reason: To minimise disturbance, harm or potential impact upon protected species in accordance with Policies S/3, HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and their protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

- 18 No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until details of a hard and soft landscaping scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:
- a) proposed finished levels or contours; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. Street furniture, artwork, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, CCTV installations and water features); proposed (these need to be coordinated with the landscape plans prior to being installed) and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant;
 - b) planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme;
 - c) boundary treatments indicating the type, positions, design, and materials of boundary treatments to be erected.
 - d) a landscape maintenance and management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas.
 - e) any trees to be translocated and their means of protection and establishment

Reason: To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 19 All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out and maintained 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 as soon as is reasonably practicable, 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 and to ensure that the impact on the Green Belt is mitigated in accordance with Policies HQ/1, NH/4 and NH/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 20 The proposed drive way be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted

public highway. Please note that the use of permeable paving does not give the Highway Authority sufficient comfort that in future years water will not drain onto or across the adopted public highway and physical measures to prevent the same must be provided.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 21 Prior to the first occupation or bringing into use of the development, hereby permitted, two pedestrian visibility splays of 2m x 2m shall be provided each side of the vehicular access measured from and along the highway boundary. Such splays shall be within the red line of the site and shall thereafter be maintained free from obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the adopted public highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 22 The new proposed drive shall be constructed using a bound material, for the first five metres from the boundary of the adopted public highway into the site, to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 23 No occupation of the building shall commence until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify: the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking how the provisions of the Plan will be monitored for compliance and confirmed with the local planning authority The Travel Plan shall be implemented and monitored as approved upon the occupation of the development.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site in accordance with Policy TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 24 The approved renewable/low carbon energy technologies (as set out in the Energy Strategy Report, Version P2, May 2021) shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter maintained in accordance with a maintenance programme, details of which shall have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Where grid capacity issues subsequently arise, written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and a revised Energy Statement to take account of this shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The revised

Energy Statement shall be implemented development and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution (South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2018, policy CC/3 and Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD)

- 25 No part of the care home hereby permitted shall be occupied until a water efficiency specification for the proposed development, based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach set out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall demonstrate that all dwellings are able to achieve a design standard of water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2018 policy CC/4 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020).

- 26 The care home hereby approved shall not be occupied until the care home has been made capable of accommodating Wi-Fi and suitable ducting (in accordance with the Data Ducting Infrastructure for New Homes Guidance Note) has been provided to the public highway that can accommodate fibre optic cabling or other emerging technology, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure sufficient infrastructure is provided that would be able to accommodate a range of persons within the property and improve opportunities for home working and access to services, in accordance with policy TI/10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 27 No permanent connection to the electricity distribution network shall be established until an electric vehicle charge point scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved scheme shall be fully installed before the development is occupied and retained as such.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes and forms of transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality (South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 policy CC/3 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020)

- 28 No occupation of the building shall commence until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to

encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking how the provisions of the Plan will be monitored for compliance and confirmed with the local planning authority The Travel Plan shall be implemented and monitored as approved upon the occupation of the development.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site in accordance with Policy TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 29 Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), the premises shall be used for a residential care home and for no other purpose (including any other purposes in Class C2 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (England) Order 1987 or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, and because use of the building has been identified as a care home. (South Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy HQ/1.

- 30 The care home hereby approved shall only be occupied by persons aged at least 55 years.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, and because use of the building has been identified as a care home (South Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy HQ/1.

- 31 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, drawings at a scale of 1:10 showing details of the material finish and colour of windows and doors, sills, reveals, lintels, jambs, transoms, and mullions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory. (South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 policy HQ/1)

- 32 No development shall take place above ground level, except for demolition, until details of all the materials for the external surfaces of buildings to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include include non-masonry walling systems, brickwork, windows, doors and entrances, porches and canopies, roof cladding, balustrades and rain water goods. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area (South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 policy HQ/1).

- 33 Before starting any external finishes, a sample panel of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site to establish the detail of the materials palette and shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panel(s), which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development, shall be maintained throughout the development.

Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 34 The development, hereby permitted, shall not be occupied until details of the refuse storage has been provided within the site in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter retained.

Reason: To provide for the screened storage of refuse in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.

- 35 Prior to the first use of the development hereby approved, 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.

- 36 Prior to first occupation of the development, hereby permitted, or commencement of the use, full details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied or the use commences and shall be retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles in accordance with Policy HQ/1 and TI/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 37 Prior to first occupation of the development, hereby permitted, or commencement of the use, the car parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the parking of vehicles in accordance with Policy HQ/1 and TI/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

Informatives

- 1 The granting of a planning permission does not constitute a permission or licence to a developer to carry out any works within, or disturbance of, or interference with, the Public Highway. A separate permission must be sought from the Highway Authority for such works.
- 2 No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate/ door/ ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.
- 3 Public utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.
- 4 Fire Service vehicle access should be provided in accordance with Approved Document B Volume 1 of the Building Regulations. There should be vehicle access for a pump appliance to within 45m of all points within the dwelling-house in accordance with paragraph 11.2 of Approved Document B Volume 1. Where the proposed new dwelling cannot meet access requirements for fire appliances, compensatory feature(s) should be provided.
- 5 The granting of permission and or any permitted development rights for any Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) does not indemnify any action that may be required under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 for statutory noise nuisance. Should substantiated noise complaints be received in the future regarding the operation and running of an air source heat pump and it is considered a statutory noise nuisance at neighbouring premises a noise abatement notice will be served. It is likely that noise insulation/attenuation measures such as an acoustic enclosure and/or barrier would need to be installed to the unit in order to reduce noise emissions to an acceptable level.

To avoid noise complaints it is recommended that operating sound from the ASHP does not increase the existing background noise levels by more than

3dB (BS 4142 Rating Level - to effectively match the existing background noise level) at the boundary of the development site and should be free from tonal or other noticeable acoustic features. In addition equipment such as air source heat pumps utilising fans and compressors are liable to emit more noise as the units suffer from natural aging, wear and tear. It is therefore important that the equipment is maintained/serviced satisfactory and any defects remedied to ensure that the noise levels do not increase over time.

- 6 In order to facilitate the upgrade of heating systems to efficient (i.e. heat pump) electric heating, radiators shall be sized and fitted on the basis of running at a maximum of 45°C flow temperature to all residential units. In addition, for all residential units identify an appropriate space for external air source heat pump units that are acceptable within permitted development requirements for noise, proximity to boundaries and physical size and provide valved and blanked pipe work connections between the external unit and the primary heating installations (heating pump and hot water tank) to enable the use of the heat pump system with minimum disruption upon gas boiler removal. The hot water tank is to incorporate sufficient heat exchanger area and storage volume to allow a designated heat pump system with domestic hot water capabilities to be used without the need for replacement or upgrade.
- 7 The Council recommends the use of low NO_x boilers i.e. appliances that meet a dry NO_x emission rating of 40mg/kWh, to minimise emissions from the development that may impact on air quality.
- 8 The dust management plan should reference and have regard to various national and industry best practical technical guidance such as:
 - Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction, version 1.1 (IAQM, 2016)
 - Guidance on Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites, version 1.1 (IAQM, 2018)
- 9 To satisfy the condition requirements the applicant / developer will need to demonstrate that practical consideration has been given to all aspects of Electric Vehicle (EV) charge point infrastructure installation and that the provision of an operational EV charge point or multiple points is deliverable, as part of the residential and/or commercial development. The intention or commitment in principle to install an active EV charge point will not be considered acceptable. Information should include numbers of charge points, intentions for active and passive provision, location, layout (including placement of EV infrastructure), Charge Rates of active EV charge points (slow, rapid or fast) and availability of power supply.
- 10 To satisfy and discharge Environmental Health recommended conditions (including those related to construction / demolition, operational artificial lighting, contaminated land, noise / sound, air quality (including Electric Vehicle Charging) and odours / fumes / smoke, any impact assessment and mitigation as required, should be in accordance with the scope, methodologies and requirements of relevant sections of the Greater

Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document, (2020). Due regard should also be given to relevant and current up to date Government / national and industry British Standards, Codes of Practice and best practice technical guidance.

- 11 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.
- 12 All green roofs should be designed, constructed and maintained in line with the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753) and the Green Roof Code (GRO).
- 13 Constructions or alterations within an ordinary watercourse (temporary or permanent) require consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority under the Land Drainage Act 1991. Ordinary watercourses include every river, drain, stream, ditch, dyke, sewer (other than public sewer) and passage through which water flows that do not form part of Main Rivers (Main Rivers are regulated by the Environment Agency). The applicant should refer to Cambridgeshire County Council's Culvert Policy for further guidance: <https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/business/planning-and-development/water-minerals-and-waste/watercourse-management/>
Please note the council does not regulate ordinary watercourses in Internal Drainage Board areas.
- 14 Before the existing property is demolished, a Demolition Notice will be required from the Building Control section of the council's planning department establishing the way in which the property will be dismantled, including any asbestos present, the removal of waste, minimisation of dust, capping of drains and establishing hours of working operation. This should be brought to the attention of the applicant to ensure the protection of the residential environment of the area
- 15 A licence issued by Natural England pursuant to Regulation 53 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) may be required authorising the specified activity/development to go ahead.

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 Local Development Framework SPDs



BIDWELLS