

AGENDA ITEM NO: 8/1(b)

Parish:	King's Lynn	
Proposal:	Demolition of the Inspire Centre, including its associated car park and full planning permission for the construction of a new Multi-Storey Car Park, associated highway works, engineering works, drainage works and landscaping.	
Location:	Queen Elizabeth Hospital Gayton Road Queen Elizabeth Hospital Site King's Lynn PE30 4ET	
Applicant:	Queen Elizabeth Hospital King's Lynn NHS Foundation Trust	
Case No:	22/01947/FM (Full Application - Major Development)	
Case Officer:	Mrs N Osler	Date for Determination: 30 January 2023 Extension of Time Expiry Date: 28 April 2023

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee –

Referred by the Assistant Director

Neighbourhood Plan: No

Case Summary

Full planning permission is sought for a 1,383-space multistorey car park (MSCP) at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It would be sited near to the entrance to the overall hospital site, so that it will be very visible in the street scene along Gayton Road.

Six levels of parking would be provided over two phases, and would provide a total (phases 1 and 2) of 98no. disabled / accessible parking bays and 1,285no. ambulant bays. The car park would use automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) to manage parking and payments with options to either pay 'on foot' or 'upon exit'.

The building would measure 21.7m to the top of the vertical fins increasing to 25.3m to the roof of the stair cores. The top deck of the car park sits 18m above the ground level of the car park.

Vehicular access and egress from the building would be from the north.

Associated highways works (within the wider site) include the extension of the existing pedestrian crossing on the main hospital spine road, carriageway widening and realignment of footways, realignment of car park egress and construction of dropped kerb crossings with tactile paving.

No substantial or protected trees would be affected by the proposed development.

The site does not lie in an area at risk of flooding.

Planning Committee
24 April 2023

Whilst the application includes the demolition of the existing Inspire Building, this has already been permitted under application 22/01914/F. Therefore, no further consideration is being given to this.

The development will however require the temporary movement of the existing bus stop that sits to the north of the Inspire Building, and the loss of 218 car parking spaces. In relation to the latter point this loss has been addressed by the granting of provision of 227 temporary car parking spaces elsewhere on the wider hospital site, under application 23/00146/FM.

Key Issues

Principle of development

Form and character and impact on designated heritage assets

Highway safety

Impact on neighbour amenity

Flood risk and drainage

Ecology

Crime and Disorder

Any other matters requiring consideration prior to determination of the application

Recommendation

APPROVE

THE APPLICATION

The site lies within the development boundary for King's Lynn and forms part of the wider hospital site.

The site accommodates the Inspire Building (that provided training facilities, day nursery and vaccination facilities until they were recently decanted into purpose-built buildings approved under application 22/01914/F) and continues to accommodate a car park comprising 218 spaces as well as a bus stop with services from Hunstanton, Heacham, Snettisham, Dersingham, Fakenham, Grimston and Gayton. Hoardings have been erected around the Inspire Building which benefits from permission to be demolished under application 22/01914/F. The bus stop that sits to the north of the Inspire Building will be temporarily relocated next to the entrance to the main car park as part of this application, and the loss of the 218 car parking spaces will be countered by the provision of 227 temporary spaces within and adjacent to the existing hospital site as permitted by application 23/00146/FM.

This application seeks planning permission for a new Multistorey Car Park (MSCP) which would provide a total of 1,383 car parking spaces: 500 in Phase 1 to respond to existing car parking demand, followed by a further 883 spaces in Phase 2 to accommodate wider site provision subject to the receipt of funding and planning permission to build a new hospital. Associated highways works proposed (within the wider site) include the extension of the existing pedestrian crossing on the main hospital spine road, carriageway widening and realignment of footways, realignment of car park egress and construction of dropped kerb crossings with tactile paving.

The building would be over six levels and would provide 98no. disabled / accessible parking bays and 1,285no. standard bays. The car park would use automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) to manage parking and payments with options to either pay 'on foot' or 'upon exit'.

Planning Committee
24 April 2023

The building would measure 21.7m to the top of the vertical fins increasing to 25.3m to the roof of the stair cores. The top deck of the car park sits at 18m above the ground level of the car park.

Hard and soft landscaping is proposed.

No substantial or protected trees will be affected by the proposed development.

SUPPORTING CASE

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital King's Lynn NHS Foundation Trust (the Trust) have the vision to be the best rural District General Hospital for patient and staff experience. Our mission is to work with patients, staff, and partners to improve the health and clinical outcomes of our local communities. We have begun a journey of improvement, with the quality of our built estate a key focus.

The current application for a Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP) is the first step in the Trust's wider plans to deliver a new hospital to replace the current facility which is beyond its useable life and failing structurally.

By way of background, the QEH is constructed from Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete (RAAC) panels, which have a limited lifespan and are subject of a safety alert issued in May 2019. 3478 steel and timber failsafe structural supports are currently in place within the hospital, and national experts have stated that, even if RAAC failsafe and protection works are carried out, the maximum residual life of the QEH is 2030.

Whilst the QEH was, unfortunately, not one of the 40 hospitals that secured £3.7 billion of Government funding towards their development last year, the Trust are committed to ensuring that the QEH is taken forward as one of the additional eight projects included within the national New Hospital Programme (NHP). We anticipate that alongside the other 'unfunded' RAAC hospitals in the UK, we will be prioritised for funding with an accelerated programme for delivery via the New Hospital Programme.

The Trust have developed a Strategic Outline Case for delivery of a new hospital and are awaiting the outcome of the NHP's funding announcements, which are anticipated to be announced by the Department of Health & Social Care and New Hospital Programme team imminently.

With this in mind, we have continued to plan for the delivery of the new hospital given that there is no other option – without this significant investment, the hospital would need to close by 2030. We are committed to ensure the Trust is 'investment ready' to maximise opportunity for funding for the new hospital.

The proposed MSCP is one of the key elements of enabling work required to facilitate the delivery of the new hospital. To avoid interruption of the critical provision of health services in the area, a new hospital needs to be provided whilst the existing hospital remains operational. Consequently the development zone for the new hospital has to be focussed on the areas of the site that do not currently house hospital buildings. This means that the new hospital can only realistically be sited, in the main, on the existing main surface car park.

A new MSCP is therefore required to free up the existing hospital car park for development of the new hospital.

The MSCP will provide a total of 1,383 car parking spaces in Phase 1 and Phase 2. Phase 1 (500 spaces) will provide a short-term solution of car parking provision capacity for QEH including the re-provision of 218 spaces which would be lost in order to construct the MSCP. Phase 2 seeks to deliver the remainder of the spaces to provide sufficient capacity for the increased parking demand arising from any new hospital and offer the long-term solution for parking capacity (to support the NHP).

The proposed site for the MSCP, on the south side of the QEH estate, has been selected following a thorough review of all options, following business case guidance, in the wider context of the need to provide a new hospital. The selected location ensures:

- The short-term and long-term requirements for parking can be achieved;
- The optimum building footprint is achieved so that the demand for car park spaces can be met, whilst acknowledging the limited land available for this use;
- The scale and massing of the MSCP can be kept to a minimum to reduce the impact of the car park on the street scene and surrounding landscape;
- The most effective use of the land on the current QEH site without prejudicing the wider delivery of the NHP or other ongoing estate priorities;
- The miscellaneous ancillary uses on this site to be displaced by the MSCP can be separated up and relocated in smaller areas across the QEH site including the training facility, day nursery and vaccination facility and surface level car parking spaces (all subject of separate approved planning applications);
- The proposed layout of the MSCP will have the space to be able to deliver cycle parking for staff and visitors, electric vehicle charging and accessible parking;
- The scheme is sited within a safe distance of the access points from the main hospital access road and fits into the wider accessibility and connectivity routes of the existing hospital site.

The Trust are seeking to start work on the delivery of the MSCP without delay to show our commitment towards reaching key milestones. Subject to funding, work is due to commence in May 2023 on the temporary surface level car park (approved under planning application reference 23/00146/FM) which will replace the 218 spaces lost on the MSCP site, and this is anticipated to be completed by August 2023. This allows for Phase 1 of the MSCP to begin construction in August 2023 and become operational in July 2024. Following this, construction of Phase 2 of the MSCP would commence in August 2024 with completion earmarked for August 2025.

This phasing and delivery programme is essential to ensure progress in line with the national NHP, and also to meet the current unmet demand for parking on the constrained QEH site.

It is acknowledged that national concerns regarding funding have been widely reported in the press; however, the preferred funding option for the MSCP is to pursue PDC Capital, via the New Hospital Programme 'Enabling works' route. If this is not forthcoming, an alternative option may be taken forward via a Private Finance model (could be either with the Local Authority or other Local Development Vehicle). Either way, the Phase 1 works need to be delivered to meet current demand and the Trust are committed to finding a way to secure its delivery with Phase 2 being secured following an announcement on the NHP.

The MSCP proposals have been carefully considered, and actively responded to the comments raised following submission of the application, notably in relation to the heritage impact of the scheme and are in a position where there are no outstanding objections to the scheme. For example, in recent days further comments have been added by the KLWNBUG The Norfolk and Fens Cycling Campaign which have been addressed by incorporating additional cycle storage spaces (above the level requested by NCC Highways and policy). In addition, we are in open engagement with other stakeholders to ensure that the NHP echoes

Planning Committee
24 April 2023

these aspirations and our long-term commitment to more sustainable modes of travel. As we progress our thinking towards a new hospital, the Trust are committed to engaging with the Local Authority and associated consultees to ensure all aspects are considered for any forthcoming application.

At both the national and local planning policy level, there is a presumption in favour of enhanced community facilities, including supporting projects such as this to deliver the further development of the QEH to meet current and future needs. It has been demonstrated that there are no technical or infrastructure constraints to the site's development, which would prevent its delivery, and that there are no direct conflicts with either specific policies within the NPPF or the Council's adopted Development Plan when read as a whole.

The MSCP is critical to securing the future of the QEH and the NHP and it can be demonstrated that there are no adverse impacts arising from the development that are sufficient either individually or collectively to outweigh the significant public benefits.

PLANNING HISTORY

There is extensive history on the wider hospital site. The following are the most recent and relevant.

23/00146/FM: Application Permitted 21/3/23 The development of surface-level Temporary Car Parks together with associated works, including landscaping and highways.

22/01914/F: Application Permitted: 23/12/22 - Proposed demolition of The Inspire Centre, Proposed construction of a single storey children's day nursey for hospital staff and construction of a single storey hospital vaccination centre (Use class C2), with associated infrastructure and landscaping.

22/00479/F: Application Permitted: 20/06/22 - Development of a Diagnostic Assessment Centre, together with associated car parking, highway works, engineering works, drainage works and landscaping.

21/01979/FM: Application Permitted: 07/12/21 - Public service infrastructure planning application. Proposed construction of a two-storey hospital building (Use Class C2) with associated infrastructure and landscaping

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Parish Council: N/A

King's Lynn Advisory Consultative Committee (KLACC): NO OBJECTION The KLACC Planning Sub-Group had no objection to the application subject to the bus stop being re-routed with appropriate signage and that larger trees would be used as part of the landscaping proposals on the southern and western elevation.

Highways Authority: NO OBJECTION Further to my previous response, the subsequent submission of planning application 23/00146/FM, and your recent emails please find my updated comments.

As you will be aware, following our previous response which requested confirmation of the details of the temporary parking arrangement during the construction phase, the applicant submitted 23/00146/FM for your approval.

Planning Committee
24 April 2023

With regard to 23/00146/FM, I have previously confirmed that the temporary car parks proposed as part of that application are acceptable and as such, subject to your approving them, SHC23 (for this application) can be amended accordingly.

In light of the above, I can confirm that the HA has no objection to the proposals subject to the temporary parking arrangements being agreed & in place prior to construction and the phased closure / opening of the car parks & the car parking management strategy (CPMS) being agreed by condition.

Should you be minded to approve the application I would suggest conditions relating to the following be appended to any permission granted: provision of temporary car parks approved under application 23/00146/FM, parking for construction workers, construction traffic management, phased opening of new and closure of existing car parks and car park management plan.

Highways England: NO OBJECTION National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such we work to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.

Due to the scale of the proposed development, it is considered unlikely to have a material impact on the SRN in this location. Consequently, we offer no objection to this application.

Historic Environment Service: NO OBJECTION There are no known archaeological implications.

Historic England: Awaiting comments

Conservation Officer: NO OBJECTION Thank you for consulting the Conservation Team on the amended details for this scheme, submitted on 14th March 2023 for the proposed new multi-storey car park at Kings Lynn hospital.

Of particular interest to the Conservation Team are:

* Photos for consultation

This document is a series of wireline diagrams shown on viewpoints which were discussed with the Conservation Team prior to submission. The viewpoints have been chosen in order to show those points from which the impact is likely to be greatest from the designated heritage assets and from the general street scene. The Conservation Team provided initial comments on the application on 23rd February 2023 and upon the locations for the wireline diagrams on 7th March 2023.

The wireline diagrams, alongside the submitted CGI images show that Historic England's initial concerns regarding the scale and mass were justified. The building will read as a large block from the scheduled monuments and the listed building and will be a large, alien feature within the general street scene. This will cumulatively have a negative impact upon the setting of the scheduled monuments and the listed building through large scale development within their setting.

However, as previously mentioned, we understand the need for this car park. The less than substantial harm caused by the cumulative visual impact upon the scheduled monuments and the grade II listed building, would therefore be outweighed by the public benefits of the

Planning Committee
24 April 2023

scheme. Changes to the materials and colour palette of the car park could go some way to mitigating the harm. We therefore recommend that conditions be applied relating to materials and colour.

Comments made on 23rd February: The Conservation Team have reviewed the submitted plans and the heritage statement submitted and, while we do not object to the scheme in principle, we have the following points to raise:

The site of the proposed car park lies in a sensitive location at the edge of the town of King's Lynn. It is the opposite side of the A149 from two scheduled monuments, one of which is also Grade I listed, and a grade II listed building.

The references for the buildings are as follows:

SAM - Moated site in Crow's Wood, 700m southwest of the ruined church of St James (NHLE Number: 1008353)

SAM - Remains of St James' Church and surrounding Saxon and medieval settlement (NHLE Number: 1019667)

GI LB - RUINS OF CHURCH OF ST JAMES (NHLE Number: 1077664)

GII LB - CHURCH FARMHOUSE (NHLE Number: 1077665)

The form, scale and mass of the proposed car park building creates a large monolithic block of a structure that does not respond to the sensitivities of the historic environment. While we recognise that the rural setting of the scheduled monuments has changed over time, the current hospital buildings are low key and relatively low scale. This allows them to be, for the most part, screened by vegetation and integrated into the landscape. The proposed car park would be tall, broad, an alien colour for this landscape and dominant within the streetscene. The position of the building means that it would be visible from the designated heritage assets despite screening, and the materials chosen would make the building even more dominant.

The Conservation Team understand the need for a car park; however, due to the sensitive location, we consider that more could be done with the design, materials, form and massing of it to reduce the impact upon the designated heritage assets.

The colour palette could do more to reflect its location on the rural edge of King's Lynn with a softer more natural colour palette and materials and the roof line could be broken up to avoid one large building block. While these changes would not avoid the harm to heritage assets, they would go some way to mitigating the impacts of it.

Arboricultural Officer: NO OBJECTION I generally have no objections to the proposed multi-level car park at the QEH and see the sense on rationalising the car parking. The trees that are to be removed are not of great merit and there are provisions for new planting.

I feel that the proposed planting will lack height and I think the landscaping plan could make better use of the limited space around the building to help soften it. The range of tall, upright trees that will tolerate the reflected heat of the building are limited however I would have preferred to see the addition of something like:

- *Pyrus calleryana* Chanticleer (Callery Pear)
- *Ginkgo biloba* (Maidenhair tree)
- *Pinus sylvestris* (Scots pine)
- *Cupressus italica* (Italian sempervirens)
- *Ostrya carpinifolia* Moree (fastigiate Hop Hornbeam)

Cercis will not be tall trees. And I am not sure of the Field Maple's ability to withstand heat (*Acer campestre* Queen Elizabeth).

Planning Committee
24 April 2023

If there is a sense from the planning department of wishing to soften the look of the building, then I would encourage the planting of taller trees.

Environment Agency: NO OBJECTION No comment to make on this application. Please append informatives relating to contamination and SUDS to any permission granted.

Internal Drainage Board: NO OBJECTION The site is within the Internal Drainage District (IDD) of the King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and therefore the Board's Byelaws apply. Whilst the Board's regulatory process (as set out under the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Board's Byelaws) is separate from planning, the ability to implement a planning permission may be dependent on the granting of any required Land Drainage Consents.

The Board's Officers have reviewed the documents submitted in support of the above planning application. Officers have noted works which require Land Drainage Consent from the Board as outlined in the table below and detailed overleaf. Please be aware of the potential for conflict between the planning process and the Board's regulatory regime.

As Land Drainage Consent is required, the Board strongly recommends that this is sought from the Board prior to determination of this planning application. The Board will only consider the proposals in detail on receipt of an application for Land Drainage Consent. The annexe at the end of this letter outlines the Board's regulatory function and how to apply for Land Drainage Consent.

Anglian Water: NO OBJECTION No foul water drainage is anticipated for the proposed development and we also note that the applicant is proposing to discharge surface water via watercourse and therefore this application is outside of our jurisdiction to comment.

Cadent Gas: NO OBJECTION information sent to applicant in relation to works in the vicinity of apparatus.

Ministry of Defence: NO OBJECTION The application site occupies the statutory safeguarding zones surrounding RAF Marham. In particular, the aerodrome height and technical safeguarding zones surrounding the aerodrome and is approximately 14km from the centre of the airfield.

After reviewing the application documents, I can confirm the MOD has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.

The MOD must emphasise that the advice provided within this letter is in response to the data and information detailed in the developer's document titled "Design and Access Statement", "Proposed Elevations Sheets 1-3" and "Proposed Landscape Planning" dated October 2022. Any variation of the parameters (which include the location, dimensions, form, and finishing materials) detailed may significantly alter how the development relates to MOD safeguarding requirements and cause adverse impacts to safeguarded defence assets or capabilities. In the event that any amendment, whether considered material or not by the determining authority, is submitted for approval, the MOD should be consulted and provided with adequate time to carry out assessments and provide a formal response.

National Air Traffic Services: NO OBJECTION The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.

Planning Committee
24 April 2023

Environmental Health & Housing – Environmental Quality: NO OBJECTION In terms of air quality / emissions and contaminated land we have no objections, subject to the full suite of contamination conditions and a condition requiring EV charging details.

Community Safety and Neighbourhood Nuisance (CSNN): NO OBJECTION

Drainage: No foul drainage is proposed.

As discharge consent from the IDB has not yet been received please condition surface water drainage to be carried out in accordance with drawing no: MSCP-HEX-XX-XX-DR-C-9500 Rev.P03.

As they have not got discharge consent from the IDB, I would like this to be addressed due to the scheme reliance on this, i.e., a pre-commencement condition to confirm the final proposal and discharge rates etc.

Noise from completed development: In the EIA Screening Report, section 5.54, it was identified that noise is highly unlikely to result in any detectable noise changes.

The lowest recorded background noise level overnight was 34.3dB, however average levels were 39-42dB and overnight use will not be significant. I have considered that there is already a parking area in this location, so this is not unused land. The noise impact assessment advised there will be no significant adverse impact on the hospital and therefore further mitigation is not required. It further identified, whilst noise can be heard at residential dwellings, the proposed car park will not give rise to any discernible negative noise impacts / there should not be any adverse noise impacts and no further mitigation is required. CSNN has no reason to question these findings.

However, plant has not been considered at this stage. Therefore, please condition prior to installation details should be submitted and agreed covering types of plant, noise levels and locations.

Noise from construction and demolition: The INSPIRE BUILDING DEMOLITION SPECIFICATION document is welcomed and as this includes some detail regarding control measures, I would welcome this being listed as a document to be adhered to via a planning condition.

However, this document does not list any hours of work regarding demolition or construction and could include more specific mitigation detail. Please therefore condition this separately.

No Construction Management Plan has been submitted. Please condition this if permission is granted.

Dust: Measures to mitigate dust emissions have been proposed in section 5.2.3 of the Air Quality Assessment. I request these are incorporated into the CMP document – as long as this is required, I have no further concerns.

Lighting: Please condition the lighting for the scheme to be as proposed in the LIGHTING SCHEME & LIGHT POLLUTION ASSESSMENT document. To confirm all lighting locations, I also request a site plan with all lighting locations/mounting positions is conditioned, so this can be finally assessed prior to any installation of lighting.

Norfolk Fire and Rescue: NO OBJECTION Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service (NFRS) are grateful for the opportunity to make comment on this application and would like to consult

further on what is considered a major development in the local community with potentially far-reaching consequences in an emergency.

NFRS are only too aware of the risks of fire in multistorey car parks following the Kings Dock car park fire on Liverpool Waterfront in December 2017 (amongst other high profile car park fires) which led to the destruction of almost 1400 vehicles and the subsequent demolition of the entire structure. Car park design, and the associated statutory design guidance, has not significantly changed over the decades to keep progress with the design of modern vehicles, where construction materials were previously steel, wood and textile and vehicles easily parked in 4.8 x 2.4m bays. Modern vehicles incorporate far more plastic (including fuel tanks) and are bigger, reducing the gaps between them when parked. Fire loading for modern vehicles exceeds those of vehicles from 20-30 years ago when the parameters for car park fire resistance was laid out in guidance, so the risk of fire spread between vehicles, and subsequent potential for structural damage of a multistorey car park involved in fire has increased markedly.

A point of note regarding the Kings Dock car park in Liverpool, is that the replacement building was installed with an automatic sprinkler system throughout.

Further to the above, the proposed development also includes the provision of electric vehicle charging points (EVCPs), which will obviously lead to EVs being parked and charged at the premises. The additional risks posed by EVs <https://www.evfiresafe.com/risks-ev-fires>, and of fire spread in a covered car park where EV charging is taking place, is considered as not being addressed in sufficient detail. NFRS would therefore, in lieu of other information, suggest the provision of EV charging spaces being removed from the premises is considered, and placed at various locations around the site away from buildings and in the open.

The design and access statement suggests the majority of EV charging points would be used by staff and we concur that people visiting the hospital from the local area would not require charging facilities, so parking for staff could remain around the grounds and EV charging points organized accordingly, removing an additional fire risk from the new car park.

Following on from the above, whilst we appreciate the developer has attempted to address concerns in Section 3 of their Design and Access Statement on page 13 with their inclusion of the conditions specified by NFRS on the Pre-application, we request additional detail to ensure the solutions proposed by the developer meet the requirements for the potential risks should the EVCPs be included.

- Provision of sprinklers - what category, what type, coverage, what is the design specification, how does the design mitigate the risk of EVs and modern internal combustion engine vehicles?
- Induction fans at ground floor – why only the ground floor and how does this proposed ventilation address the risks posed by EVs?
- Dry risers – where will they be located, how will they be protected, how will these assist the FRS in having appropriate access and facilities into the premises to deal with any fire, EV or otherwise?
- Existing hydrants – will these provide enough water to deal with an EV fire or subsequent multi-vehicle fire?
- Ventilation standards relating to EV charging have been proposed to the relevant guidance documents – what standards are these, what are the relevant guidance documents and are they specific to EV charging?
- What type of Automatic Fire Detection is proposed?
- Appropriate signage will be provided where required and in line with statutory guidance and requirements of Norfolk Fire Service – again, more information is required.

In Section 3 the heading leads with “Fire Service: Installation of vehicle charging and Statutory Guidance”. Following discussion with the National Fire Chiefs Council Protection Policy and Reform Unit (NFCC PPRU) there is some concern regarding the Statutory Guidance mentioned, which suggests they are referring to guidance about the design of structures produced under statute. This is considered to be the Building Regulations (as amended), and under the Building Act of 1984 the secretary of state provides such guidance in the form of the Approved Documents, which for fire is Approved Document B (ADB).

NFCC PPRU and NFRS are of the opinion that the current ADB (and British Standards Institution guidance 9999/9991) are not appropriate fire safety design documents when considering the risks posed by EVs in a car park, as well as the risks posed by modern internal combustion engine vehicles (ICEV), and only a performance-based design/fire engineered design will suffice. We do not consider these to be a ‘common building situation’ as detailed in [Manual_to_building_regs_-_July_2020.pdf](#) (publishing.service.gov.uk) (chapter 7) and therefore, are outside of the scope of ADB.

NFRS would like the developer to confirm what guidance they are referring to in order to support their statements and proposals, which at the present time are qualitative assumptions and statements with no supporting technical detail or data to demonstrate the risk has been addressed.

While we understand this is not a Building Regulations consultation, we would like to ensure the developer is going to be able to demonstrate compliance with the functional requirements of the Building Regulations (as amended) prior to resourcing the project.

Police Architectural Liaison Officer: NO OBJECTION From reviewing the plans and information provided within the application, the proposed scheme appears of a high quality and designed generally in line with Park Mark standards and principles in the key assessment areas, therefore to protect the integrity of the design and to demonstrate our partnership working I strongly recommend that accreditation to the Park Mark Scheme is made a condition of planning for the Hospital Car Park.

REPRESENTATIONS THREE letters neither objecting nor supporting the proposed development have been received from third parties, including King’s Lynn West Norfolk Bike Users Group (KLWNBUG). The issues raised can be summarised as:

- Suggestion was made at the public presentation that an additional exit / entrance could be built further down the bypass to alleviate congestion caused by construction. An additional roundabout / junction on the bypass would in my opinion help to minimise these issues
- There is an error in the assessment and Hartlepool is mentioned
- The failure to include any cycle parking is noted and should be addressed in line with current standards
- Much of the current cycle parking on site falls below standard
- There is no direct access from the Gayton Road cycleway. A direct cycling and walking route past the car park to the hospital should be added as part of this development.

King’s Lynn West Norfolk Bike Users Group (KLWNBUG) – Further representations. Points out errors in the TA. Also raises the following concerns, summarised below:

- Disagree that the policies relate to only additional trips generated by the new development. CS11 promotes sustainable forms of transport
- Existing site is already below current standards and needs to be brought up to standard.

- Whilst an improvement for motorists but it will surely be expected to cause a modal shift towards car use, contrary to national and local policy, and more provision needs to be made for cycle infrastructure.
- Whilst new cycle provision is welcome, access is across the carriageway in front of motorists. This should be improved.
- Welcome news that the unambitious Travel Plan will be reviewed when the new hospital application is submitted. Planning for only 1% growth in cycle trips in 4 years does not fit with Government targets of 50% of all in town journeys to be walked or cycled by 2030.
- Current application should be considered on its merits without considering promises of what will happen in a future planning application. The Travel Plan submitted with this is at best incomplete, and its low targets are likely to be met by the council delivering their Local Cycling and Walking Implementation Plan.

LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

CS01 - Spatial Strategy

CS02 - The Settlement Hierarchy

CS03 - King's Lynn Area

CS08 - Sustainable Development

CS10 - The Economy

CS11 – Transport

CS12 - Environmental Assets

CS13 - Community and Culture

SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES PLAN 2016

DM1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

DM2 – Development Boundaries

DM9 - Community Facilities

DM12 - Strategic Road Network

DM15 – Environment, Design and Amenity

DM17 - Parking Provision in New Development

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

National Design Guide 2021

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main considerations are:

Principle of development
Form and character and impact on designated heritage assets
Highway safety
Impact on neighbour amenity
Flood risk and drainage
Ecology
Crime and Disorder
Any other matters requiring consideration prior to determination of the application

Principle of Development:

The development is for the provision of a Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP) within the grounds of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital which is within the development boundary for King's Lynn and is one of the borough's main employers and community / public health facilities. The hospital serves a large hinterland, as well as the town of King's Lynn.

Paragraph 96 of the NPPF states: *To ensure faster delivery of other public service infrastructure such as further education colleges, hospitals and criminal justice accommodation, local planning authorities should work proactively and positively with promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to plan for required facilities and resolve key planning issues... It also states, at para 123: Local planning authorities ... should support proposals to...b) make more effective use of sites that provide community services such as schools and hospitals, provided this maintains or improves the quality of service provision...*

Local policy also supports the provision of further community facilities, particularly Core Strategy Policy CS13 – Community and Culture, which makes specific reference to "...work with NHS Norfolk to ensure that new health facilities are provided to serve an expanded population particularly in growth areas in King's Lynn...'

The principle of development is therefore strongly supported subject to consideration of other relevant planning policy and guidance.

Form and Character and Impact on Designated Heritage Assets:

The application is to provide 1,383 car parking spaces within a multistorey car park (MSCP) over two phases; 500 in phase 1 and 883 in phase 2.

Phase 1 would take place where an existing 218 space car park is located; with Phase 2 in the location of the Inspire Building. Because phase 1 would result in the loss of 218 car parking spaces, these have been secured by permission granted under application 23/00146/FM for temporary car park provision of 227 spaces over three areas within and adjacent to the wider hospital site. Any permission granted under the current application would be conditioned to ensure these temporary spaces are provided in their entirety before works on the MSCP commences to ensure continued parking provision on the overall hospital site.

Phase 1 would take place regardless of any future proposals at the hospital, whereas phase 2 would only take place if funding was secured for a new hospital building. If a new hospital building were to be built it would have to be built on the existing main car park (to enable continuation of services in the existing building whilst construction takes place) thus requiring alternative car park provision.

Phase 1 would comprise four stair cores which provide vertical access to the car park at all floors via stairs and lifts. These would be in the northeast and southeast corners (external) and the northwest and southwest corners (set behind the fins (internal).) The positioning of the latter two stair cores behind the fins would enable a seamless continuation of the building if / when phase 2 is constructed.

Phase 1 would comprise 6 levels of parking with the top deck siting c.18m above the ground level of the car park. The top of the vertical fins would measure 21.7m and the top of the stair cores (the tallest elements) 23.4m above the ground level of the car park.

However, land levels change across the site with land rising from east to west. The western end of phase 1 is c.1.5m higher than the eastern end of phase 1, and the western end of phase 2 is c.3.5m higher than the eastern end of phase 1.

The width and length of the Phase 1 building would be c.70m x 42m respectively.

If / when phase 2 is erected the length of the resultant building would increase by 64.5m to 106.5m, the width would remain the same.

Both phases are to be built from the same materials; materials that the applicant states reflects and compliments materials in the newly erected Endoscopy building, and comprise: Split face blockwork – buff / plasma_Cotswold yellow at the base of the four (external) corner stair cores

Powder coated aluminium interlocking panels and frames (anodised bronze (analok umber)) to the sides of the four (external) corner stair cores

Natural finish blockwork to the two 'internal' stair cores

Flattened expanded mesh panel - anodised bronze (analok pale umber) along the base of the building

Powdercoated profiled fin with stainless steel webnet sire rope behind

- Colour 1 silver
- Colour 2 yellow
- Colour 3 blue
- Colour 4 green.

It is clear that the proposed MSCP would be a large and imposing building in a prominent location at one of the main entrances to King's Lynn as well as one of the main bypass routes. As such the development will have a definite visual impact, and will be by far the tallest building within the overall street scene.

In relation to the scale, mass and position, these are firmly fixed. The building needs to be this size to accommodate the number of car parking spaces required. Likewise, this is the only location available within the wider site that can accommodate the building whilst future proofing the ability of the MSCP to be used if / when a new hospital is both under construction and completed.

Notwithstanding this, it is to be located within the existing hospital complex which includes a wind turbine that will remain the tallest structure in the locality. The building will also demarcate the entrance to the hospital site, and it is hoped that it will mark the start of the overall development for a new, modern hospital on the site.

Additionally, however, it must be noted that the building is in the vicinity of four designated heritage assets, and the impact upon these must be assessed. These are as follows:

- Scheduled Ancient Monument - Moated site in Crow's Wood, approximately 800m east of the site
- Scheduled Ancient Monument - Remains of St James' Church and surrounding Saxon and medieval settlement is 1.25 km to the north-east of the site
- Grade I Listed Building - Ruins of Church of St James is 1.5 km to the north-east
- Grade II Listed building - Church Farmhouse is 1.38 km east of the site

In relation to the historic environment, the over-arching aim of the NPPF is to Conserve and Enhance the Historic Environment as outlined within Chapter 16.

This chapter reasserts that heritage assets can range from sites and buildings of local interest to World Heritage Sites considered to have an outstanding universal value. The NPPF subsequently requires these assets to be conserved in a *manner appropriate to their significance* (Paragraph 189).

The NPPF directs local planning authorities to require an applicant to *describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting* and the level of detailed assessment should be *proportionate to the assets' importance* (Paragraph 194).

Paragraph 199 of the NPPF requires that *When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.* It is then clarified that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, either through alteration, destruction or development within its setting, should require, *clear and convincing justification* (Paragraph 200). This paragraph outlines that substantial harm to grade II listed heritage assets should be exceptional, rising to 'wholly exceptional' for those assets of the highest significance such as scheduled monuments, Grade I and grade II* listed buildings or registered parks and gardens as well as World Heritage Sites.

In relation to harmful impacts or the loss of significance resulting from a development proposal, Paragraph 201 states the following: *Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:*

- the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site*
- no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation*
- conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible*
- the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

The NPPF therefore requires a balance to be applied in the context of heritage assets, including the recognition of potential benefits accruing from a development. In the case of proposals which would result in *less than substantial harm*, paragraph 202 provides the following: *Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.*

These principles are reiterated in the Development Plan is policies CS01, CS08, CS12 and DM15.

In order to assess the impacts on Heritage Assets additional visual aids were produced from viewpoints agreed with the Conservation Officer and a Heritage Statement was submitted. The viewpoints were taken from the heritage assets as well as from the QE Hospital Roundabout (looking northwest) and from Gayton Road looking east towards the hospital.

The Heritage Statement concludes that: *... the proposed scheme would result in a neutral impact to the significance of the Grade I listed Church of St James, and the setting of the surrounding Saxon and medieval settlement, and a nil impact to the significance of the Grade II listed Church Farmhouse and the moated site in Crow's Wood.*

Following the findings of the Landscape & Visual Appraisal Baseline (January 2023) and the AVR 0 technical visualisations (March 2023), we acknowledge that in landscape terms, the proposed scheme could result in a slightly greater awareness of urban features within one sector of the wider setting of the Church of St James. This slightly increased awareness would have a very limited impact on the appreciation of the rural character and sense of tranquillity experienced at the church.

In terms of an effect on the setting of the church, the aspect of minor, additional built form within the existing context of the Hospital in the views from the Church would represent only a slight adverse impact on setting, equating to a nil impact the significance of the heritage asset. The church ruins will remain to be fully understood within a rural and landscape context.

We therefore find that the proposed alterations to have had special regard for the desirable objective of preserving the special interest of the listed buildings and their settings in accordance with Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. In addition to satisfying these provisions of the Act, the NPPF Paragraphs 194-206 are also satisfied.

Whilst not objecting to the principle of the development the Conservation Officer considers that the development could be made less damaging by, amongst other things, changing the colour of the proposed materials. This could be dealt with by condition if Members consider it necessary. But ultimately the Conservation Officer concludes that the development, rather than having a minor or nil impact, would result in less than substantial harm, but acknowledges that that harm would be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposed development, which supports such an important community facility.

In conclusion it cannot be argued that the development would not have a material impact on visual amenity and on designated heritage assets. However, in this instance, your officers agree with the Conservation Officer, that the unquestionable public benefits of the proposed development, both in terms of the short-term parking improvements that phase 1 would bring, but the fact that phase 2 would enable the existing car park to be redeveloped with a new hospital, outweigh this less than substantial harm to the historic environment.

It is therefore considered that the development accords with the overarching national and local policy and guidance outlined above relating to the impact on heritage assets.

Highway Safety:

The applicant has updated the Transport Assessment (TA) and confirmed that reference to Hartlepool was a typographical error and that the analysis is specific to King's Lynn. The TA has been amended in response to representations received, particularly from the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Bike Users Group (KLWNBUG).

Upon completion of phase 1, access to the MSCP will be via the existing surface level car park and be accessed off the existing land to this car park via a filter lane. This would also apply

to phase 2, however, if / once the new hospital construction works commence the access to the MSCP would be off the main hospital road via a right-turn ghost lane that is proposed as part of this application.

The vehicular exit from the car park for both phases would be via a two lane barriered exit point and a left-hand turn onto the existing hospital road towards the A1076 (Gayton Road.) The main vehicular access and exit to the hospital site will remain unchanged.

Pedestrians and users of the MSCP would access the main hospital site on foot through the provision of new dropped kerbs and tactile paving and the enhancement of existing zebra crossing facilities, also proposed under the current application.

Existing car park provision across the hospital site is stated to be 1,610.

The following outlines car park provision across the construction periods.

Car parks 3 and 4 (Inspire Centre (218 spaces)) are to be lost to enable construction of phase 1 of the MSCP. However, before these are closed 227 spaces are to be provided in temporary car parks approved under application 23/00146/FM. This would give 1619 spaces, a net gain of 9 on the present situation.

When Phase 1 of MSCP opens , this will add a further 500 spaces. At that point temporary car park area 1 closes (-155), which will leave 1964 at that point in the construction on site.

If/when Phase 2 of the MSCP opens, this will add 883 spaces, giving a total of 2847 spaces. However, this is stated as being dependent upon the new hospital, so in that scenario, the loss of the existing car parks to facilitate the new build hospital, would mean a reduction of 1151 spaces.

Ultimately, there would be a final figure of 1696 spaces to serve a new hospital. This is higher than the current figure of 1610.

On this basis, the LHA raises no objection to the development.

Eighteen EV charging bays were originally proposed within the MSCP. However, on the advice of Norfolk Fire and Rescue, they have been removed from the MSCP. It has been agreed that they will be provided within the wider hospital site. This will be suitably conditioned if permission is granted. The removal of the EV chargers from inside of the car park, is considered to deal with the concerns raised by Norfolk Fire and Rescue, and the car park will need to meet the Building Regulations in relation to fire safety.

The applicant has confirmed that the relocated bus stop which is now at the entrance to the main car park, has been agreed with local bus operators. The location was chosen because it does not affect blue light routes, drop off zones or cause disruption across the site.

Signage, directing people to the new bus stop, as requested by KLACC, will be conditioned if permission is granted.

In response to a query regarding cycle provision, whilst no cycle provision is being lost, and therefore the LHA could arguably not sustain a request for more, the applicant has proposed improved cycle provision, and as a result the proposal now includes both visitor (10) and staff cycle parking (20) to the north of the MSCP in covered cycle storage. This is in additional to cycle provision already provided across the site.

However, it was not considered reasonable nor proportionate to require further improvements to existing cycle connectivity and infrastructure, as suggested by a third party, because as confirmed by the applicants and NCC Highways, that aspect will be reviewed when / if an application for a replacement hospital is made. There would be extra cycle parking provision associated with a new hospital, and that would be spread across the site, to better cater for staff and patients, depending on the unit they are working at/visiting. The internal layout will also undoubtedly change at that time, to accommodate the new hospital, so new/revised cycle infrastructure will be an integral part of that.

Future proofing, to enable use of the MSCP if / when the new hospital is under construction, is being accommodated by widening the access road to enable a right turn lane into the MSCP at a later date. However, when first operational the MSCP will be entered from the east via the existing main car park.

The development would not affect highway movements given it is replacement provision and therefore the proposed development therefore accords with the NPPF and Development Plan in relation to highway safety and parking provision and has received no objection from either the Local Highway Authority or National Highways.

Impact on Neighbour Amenity:

No objections have been received from occupiers of neighbouring properties considered to be most affected. These are the properties opposite the new car park on Barrett Close and on Gayton Road itself, and they will clearly have a change in their outlook when compared to the existing street scene. However, there is no right to a private view in planning, and rather it is the impact in terms of whether the proposal is overbearing or causes undue overshadowing that needs to be considered.

With regards the properties on Barrett Close, the nearest distances between the façades of the MSCP Phases 1 and 2, to the nearest property facades are approximately 67m - 81m. There is also a belt of mature trees in between, which will help to screen the development.

With regards properties on Gayton Road, especially numbers 136, 138 and 140, the distances from the façade of phase 2 of the MSCP, which will be opposite those properties, ranges from approx. 51m – 56m. Phase 1 is even further away, and is at an angle (to the north-east), not directly opposite. There are also mature trees in those properties which will help to a degree to screen it, although the MSCP will still be visible.

Overall there are no impacts on overshadowing or the structure being unduly overbearing on those neighbours, that would warrant a refusal of consent, given the relatively large distances between the car park and the nearest affected properties, and the existing screening.

The Community Safety and Neighbourhood Nuisance Team (CSNN) are satisfied that whilst the development, when operational would have some negligible impact, it would not cause any material disamenity to occupiers of neighbouring properties, given existing and assessed noise levels.

CSNN suggest that construction disamenity could be suitably mitigated by conditions relating to noise and dust and other impacts as well as construction hours, and a condition requiring a construction management plan can be conditioned.

Flood Risk and Drainage:

Whilst the site does not lie in an area at risk of flooding, the site area, being greater than 1ha, means that it was necessary to produce a Flood Risk Assessment.

Neither the LLFA, Anglian Water nor Environment Agency had any specific comments to make.

The IDB require their Byelaws to be complied with. In this regard the applicant has confirmed they have applied for the requisite consent.

Ecology:

The Ecological Impact Assessment that accompanied the application, unsurprisingly, concludes that the presence of habitats and species can be ruled out and that no further surveys are required.

However, the loss of the small number of trees, none of which showed any signs of bat roosts, have some limited scope for bird nesting. Therefore, clearance and lighting should be considered in terms of mitigation and the provision of bat boxes on the larger of the new trees would be appropriate enhancement. This can be suitably conditioned if permission is granted.

Crime and Disorder:

The Police Architectural Liaison Officer considers that the proposed scheme is of a high quality and therefore raises objections or concerns in relation to crime and disorder.

Other matters requiring consideration prior to the determination of this application:

Trees:

The development will require the removal of 1 no moderate quality (Category B) and 7 no low quality (Category C) trees as follows:

- T7 Walnut C
- T8 Walnut C
- T9 Walnut C
- T10 English Oak B
- T11 Walnut C
- T12 Walnut C
- T13 Apple C
- T14 Pear C

The arboricultural report therefore concludes that the impact to the site is low, as a limited number of mostly low-quality trees are to be removed. This is supported by the lack of objection from the LPA's Arboricultural Officer.

The landscaping plan shows 26 new trees (8 acer campestre (field maple), 3 betula pendula (silver birch), 11 cercis canadensis (forest pansy) and 4 cercis chinensis (red bud)) It is therefore considered that the number of replacement trees, that far exceeds those being removed, is acceptable.

However, the Arboricultural Officer has suggested that the proposed trees may not all be appropriate both in terms of their size and location. Therefore, further landscape details, to include preferred species, will be appended to any permission granted.

Third Party Comments: In relation to third party comments made, your officers comment as follows:

- Suggestion was made at the public presentation that an additional exit / entrance could be built further down the bypass to alleviate congestion caused by construction. An additional roundabout / junction on the bypass would in my opinion help to minimise these issues – such development was not considered necessary either by National Highways or the Local Highway Authority to make the application acceptable
- There is an error in the assessment and Hartlepool is mentioned – covered in report
- The failure to include any cycle parking is noted and should be addressed in line with current standards – covered in report
- There is no direct access from the Gayton Road cycleway. A direct cycling and walking route past the car park to the hospital should be added as part of this development – covered in report.

CONCLUSION/PLANNING BALANCE

The proposal is for a 6 level multi-storey car park (MSCP) of 1,383 spaces, to be delivered in two phases.

The requirement for the MSCP is driven by the need to improve parking for staff and visitors to the hospital in the short-term (phase 1) and also to tie in with the future strategic vision of the Trust by way of a new hospital (phase 2.)

In order to deliver the proposal there are number of objectives which needed to be addressed:

- Accommodate displaced parking temporarily (as approved by application 23/00146/FM)
- Temporary relocation of the bus stop adjacent to the entrance to the main hospital car park
- Provide landscaping to soften the proposed development

However, it is acknowledged that the development would result in a significant and dominant building that would impact on the location in general and would result in less than significant harm to nearby heritage assets.

That said, this application must be considered against the significant and unarguable public benefits that the proposed development would deliver. The car park is proposed to help support the functioning of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital (QEH), which is a vital public facility serving the town and a wider hinterland. National and local policy set out earlier in this report strongly supports the provision of key infrastructure such as this. This is considered to be of significant weight in assessing this application.

There are no other technical objections to the scheme that would warrant a refusal, and remaining issues can satisfactorily be dealt with by conditions.

In applying the planning balance, it is clear that this application should be recommended for approval, subject to the following conditions.

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE subject to the imposition of the following condition(s):

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

- 1 Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.

- 2 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans drawing nos:
 - H5541-EX1-100-P3 Location Plan
 - H5541-EX1-102A-P2 Proposed Site Plan A
 - H5541-EX1-102B-P1 Proposed Site Plan B
 - H5541-EX1-103-P3 Proposed Site & Ground Floor GA Plan
 - H5541-EX1-200A-P2 Proposed Ground Floor GA Plan – Sheet 1
 - H5541-EX1-200B-P2 Proposed Ground Floor GA Plan – Sheet 2
 - H5541-EX1-201-P3 Proposed Context GF Plan
 - H5541-EX1-201-P3 Proposed Context Levels 1 to 4 Plan
 - H5541-EX1-201A-P2 Proposed Levels 1 to 4 Plan – Sheet 1
 - H5541-EX1-201B-P2 Proposed Levels 1 to 4 Plan – Sheet 2
 - H5541-EX1-202-P3 Proposed Context Level 5 Plan
 - H5541-EX1-202A-P2 Proposed Level 5 Plan – Sheet 1
 - H5541-EX1-202B-P2 Proposed Level 5 Plan – Sheet 2
 - H5541-EX1-203-P2 Proposed Context Roof Plan
 - H5541-EX1-203A-P1 Proposed Roof Plan – Sheet 1
 - H5541-EX1-203B-P1 Proposed Roof Plan – Sheet 2
 - H5541-EX1-301-P2 Proposed Elevations – Sheet 1
 - H5541-EX1-302-P2 Proposed Elevations – Sheet 2
 - H5541-EX1-303-P2 Proposed Elevations – Sheet 3
 - H5541-EX1-304-P2 Proposed Context Street Elevations
 - H5541-EX1-400-P2 Proposed Site Sections
 - H5541-EX1-401-P2 Proposed Site Sections
 - H5541-EX1-402-P2 Proposed Site Sections
 - H5541-EX1-850-P1 Proposed Sprinkler Tank Enclosure
 - H5541-EX1-900A-P1 Cycle Parking Elevation – Sheet 1
 - H5541-EX1-900B-P1 Cycle Parking Elevation – Sheet 2
 - 600544-HEX-00-00-DR-TP-0100 Rev.P01 Revised Bus Route
 - 600544-HEX-00-00-DR-TP-0200 Rev.P02 Bus Stop Relocation
 - 600544-HEX-00-00-DR-TP-0400 Rev.P02 MSCP Access
 - EML EX1 1202 01 Rev.E Proposed Landscaping Plan

- 2 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 Condition: Prior to the commencement of development hereby permitted a construction management scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include, amongst other things, proposed timescales and hours, deliveries/collections and any piling. The scheme shall also provide details of the location of any fixed machinery, their sound power levels, the location and layout of the contractor compound, the location of contractor parking, the location and layout of the materials storage area, machinery storage area and waste & recycling storage area, proposed attenuation and mitigation methods to protect residents from noise, dust, vibrations and litter and communication methods to the wider community regarding the construction phases and likely disruptions. If piling is required, full assessment of noise and vibration impacts should be included. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

- 3 Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the locality and occupiers of nearby residential properties in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan. This needs to be pre-commencement given it relates to construction.

- 4 **Condition:** Prior to the commencement of groundworks, an investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:
- (i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
 - (ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:
 - * human health,
 - * property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
 - * adjoining land,
 - * groundwaters and surface waters,
 - * ecological systems,
 - * archaeological sites and ancient monuments;
 - (iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s). This must be conducted in accordance with the Environment Agency's Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM).
- 4 **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. This needs to be a pre-commencement condition given the need to ensure that contamination is fully dealt with at the outset of development.
- 5 **Condition:** Prior to the commencement of groundworks, a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.
- 5 **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. This needs to be a pre-commencement condition given the need to ensure that contamination is fully dealt with at the outset of development.
- 6 **Condition:** The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of groundworks, other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

- 6 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.
- 7 Condition: In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of condition 4, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 5, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition 6.
- 7 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.
- 8 Condition: No development shall commence on site in relation to the development hereby permitted until the temporary car parks approved under application 23/00146/FM have been provided to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. The temporary car parks permitted under application 23/00146/FM shall remain open and available until Phase 1 of the MSCP hereby permitted is open to the public.
- 8 Reason: To ensure that parking levels are maintained across the wider hospital site in the interests of highway safety in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan. This needs to be a pre-commencement condition as it ensures parking provision is relocated prior to the loss of the existing car park.
- 9 Condition: No development shall commence on site in relation to the development hereby permitted until a scheme detailing provision for on-site parking for construction workers for the duration of the construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented throughout the construction period.
- 9 Reason: To ensure adequate off-street parking during construction in the interests of highway safety. This needs to be a pre-commencement condition as it deals with the construction period of the development.
- 10 Condition: No development shall commence on site in relation to the development hereby permitted until a Construction Traffic Management Plan which shall incorporate adequate provision for addressing any abnormal wear and tear to the highway together with wheel cleaning facilities has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the duration of the construction period all traffic associated with (the construction of) the development hereby permitted will comply with the Construction Traffic Management Plan.
- 10 Reason: In the interests of maintaining highway efficiency and safety in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan. This needs to be a pre-commencement condition as it deals with safeguards associated with the construction period of the development.

- 11 Condition: Prior to first use of the development hereby permitted a Car Park Management Strategy Plan for the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall thereafter be implemented as approved.
- 11 Reason: In the interests of maintaining highway efficiency & safety and to ensure that the development offers a wide range of travel choices to reduce the impact of travel and transport on the environment.
- 12 Condition: Prior to first use of the development hereby permitted, details of a suitable electric vehicle charging scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA. The scheme shall be implemented as approved prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted.
- 12 Reason: To ensure the charging is safe, accessible and convenient in accordance with section 112(a) of the NPPF, AQAP, emerging local policy LP14/18 and the NCC's parking standards (July 2022).
- 13 Condition: Notwithstanding the drainage details proposed within drawing ref MSCP-HEX-XX-XX-DR-C-9500 Rev. P03, no development shall commence on site in relation to the development hereby permitted until either discharge consent (formal or 'in principle') is received from the IDB or full details are submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that includes full final surface water drainage scheme details, including discharge rates. The development shall be carried out in accordance with either in accordance with the IDB's consent or in accordance with the details approved by the LPA.
- 13 Reason: To ensure that there is a satisfactory means of drainage in accordance with the NPPF. This needs to be a pre-commencement condition as drainage is a fundamental issue that needs to be planned for and agreed at the start of the development.
- 14 Condition: The only trees to be removed are those shown on drawing no: RSE_6227-TPP Rev.V3 contained within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan that accompanied the application (Ref: C10749/Arb/1.0, dated October 2022, produced by OMNIA)
- 14 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.
- 15 Condition: All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with Drawing no: EML EXI 1202 01 Rev.E (Proposed Landscape Plan) and the Landscape Management Document (Ref: EML EXI 1202 02, dated 14 March 2023, produced by East Midlands Landscaping Limited) that accompanied the application other than in relation to the proposed new tree planting, of which further details are required to be submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants that within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species as those originally planted, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 15 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and to ensure the development is properly landscaped in a timely fashion in the interests of the visual amenity of the locality in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.

- 16 Condition: Prior to commencement of development, timescales for the relocation of the current bus stop shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and then implemented as agreed. Concurrently with the relocation of the bus stop currently located to the north of the Inspire Building to its new position adjacent to the entrance to the existing main car park, new bus stop signage shall be erected in a location to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority informing users of the location of the temporary bus stop location. The signage shall be erected concurrently with the relocation of the bus stop and shall be retained as approved for the duration of the bus stops relocation.
- 16 Reason: In the interests of users of the bus service, and to enable the hospital to be properly accessed by public transport. This needs to be pre-commencement as the bus stop must be relocated before development commences..
- 17 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Lighting Scheme & Light Pollution Assessment that accompanied the application (Ref: MSCP-EXI-XX-XX-DN-E-500101 Version P2, dated 26th September 2022), together with a lighting location plan that shall be submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall be provided as approved prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted.
- 17 Reason: In the interests of minimising light pollution and to safeguard the amenities of the locality in accordance with the NPPF.
- 18 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the Mitigation measures outlined in Chapter 5 of the Ecological Impact Assessment that accompanied the application (Prepared for Hexa Consulting Ltd, Ref: C10749/PEA/1.1 dated October 2022), and prior to first use of the development hereby permitted the Enhancement measures listed in Chapter 6 of the same report shall be implemented and thereafter be retained and maintained.
- 18 Reason: In the interests of ecology and biodiversity in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.
- 19 Condition: Notwithstanding the approved plans in condition 2, or the details submitted with the application, prior to their fixing, full details of the colour scheme for the proposed powdercoated profiled fins, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall be implemented as agreed, and retained as such thereafter.
- 19 Reason: To ensure the impact upon the street scene and heritage assets is appropriate, and any adverse impact is minimized, in accordance with national policy set out in the NPPF.
- 20 Condition: Prior to first use of the car park hereby permitted, the new cycle parking area shall be fully implemented, to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
- 20 Reason: To ensure there is suitable provision for cycle parking, and to encourage its use to access the site, in accordance with national and local planning policy to encourage sustainable travel.