PLANNING COMMITTEE **Date: 4 February 2015**

Application Number	14/1633/REM	**Agenda Item**	
Date Received	13 October 2014	**Officer**	New Neighbourhoods Team
Target Date	12 January 2015		
Ward	Queen Edith's		
Site	Land to the West and South West of Addenbrooke's Campus (AKA Cambridge Biomedical Campus) Robinson Way, Addenbrooke's, Hills Road, Cambridge		
Proposal	Reserved matters application pursuant to outline approval 06/0796/OUT for a total of 59,821sqm (Gross External Area excluding plant) Biotech and Biomedical Research and Development floorspace, to include: i) R&D Centre and Corporate Headquarters, ii) R&D Enabling Building, iii) Support Building and Energy Centre, iv) Associated car, motorbike and cycle parking, v) Hard and soft landscaping, vi)Internal roads, supporting facilities and ancillary infrastructure.		
Applicant	AstraZeneca		

SUMMARY	The application is for a total of 59,821sqm Biotech and Biomedical Research and Development floorspace. The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: The application is a reserved matters application pursuant to an outline permission. The proposed use, and floorspace are consistent with that outline approval. The design of the development has been well considered with regard to its context and site constraints and is compatible with the other building and public realm designs coming forward within the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. The necessary mitigation measures, such as transport improvements have been secured through the outline consent and will be triggered as development such as this proposal come forward on the wider site. The large number of objections to the scheme is noted and these representations have been carefully considered in reaching this recommendation. None of the objections provide sufficient planning justification to depart from the approved development plan, and extant outline consent on the site.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 Addenbrooke's Campus sits to the South of Cambridge and can be accessed via Long Road to the north, and the Hills Road/Fendon Road/Robinson Way Roundabout to the east. As part of strategic growth in the south of Cambridge outlined within the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and subsequent Area Development Framework, access to the campus can also be reached from the south west via the Addenbrooke's Road.

1.2 The application site is split into two parts. The first plot (North Plot) sits to the west of the main Addenbrooke's Campus and is almost triangular in shape with Francis Crick Avenue running along the north western edge, Robinson Way along the eastern edge, and the proposed 'Circus' open space located to the south.

1.3 The second plot (South Plot) is almost rectangular in shape and bounds the existing Railway Line to the west, Francis Crick Avenue to the east and is situated close to the Cambridgeshire Guided Bus bridge to the north. To the south are undeveloped plots of land which are earmarked for further Biotech and Biomedical Research and Development floorspace.

1.4 To the south of the North Plot and the east of the South plot lies an area of open space known as the 'Circus' which will comprise just under 3ha of open space as well as accommodating an extended route of the Guided Bus. Beyond this to the south lies land where permission has recently been granted for the New Papworth Hospital. To the east of the North Plot on the opposite side of Robinson Way consent has been granted for 'The Forum', an education centre, private hospital, hotel and conference centre.

1.5 Both plots are part of the Addenbrooke's 2020 land released from the Green Belt in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and approved through outline planning permission 06/0796/OUT for the following uses: clinical research and treatment, clinical in-patient treatment and biomedical and biotech research and development.

1.6 The site is covered by policy 5/15 (Addenbrooke's) in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). There are no buildings of listed grade /Building of Local Interest on the site. There are existing

trees on boundaries of the site with Robinson Way; none of these are covered by preservation orders. The site falls outside the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 AstraZeneca is a global, pharmaceutical and biologics company specialising in the discovery, development, manufacturing and marketing of prescription medicines. Its primary focus is on three therapeutic areas: Respiratory, Inflammation & Autoimmunity; Cardiovascular & Metabolic Disease; and Oncology. AstraZeneca operates in over 100 countries and its medicines are used by patients worldwide.

2.2 The Company's decision to base its headquarters in Cambridge reflects the city's importance as a centre for biopharmaceutical research and development. Cambridge offers access to scientific expertise and provides opportunity for collaboration with key academic research institutions, preeminent hospitals and leading biotech companies. The Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) offers opportunity for collaboration with existing occupants such as the School of Clinical Medicine, Cancer Research UK, the Laboratory of Molecular Biology and the Addenbrooke's and Rosie Hospitals as well as the New Papworth Hospital.

Overall Proposal

2.3 The proposed development comprises 59,821sqm of Gross External Floorspace (excluding plant) across both the North and South Plots. This includes a Research and Development (R&D) Centre, Corporate Headquarters, R&D Enabling Building, R&D Site Support Building and Energy Centre as well as the proposed car, motorcycle and cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping, internal access roads and supporting facilities, utilities and infrastructure.

2.4 Given the number of representations received which identify the proposal as an animal testing facility it should be noted that the proposal is for B1(b) research and development space, and that the nature and type of research and development within the buildings will vary considerably in nature, animal testing facilities are a small part of the overall proposal. The laboratories proposed

are flexible in nature enabling change over time to adapt to different research requirements.

The North Plot

2.5 The North Plot comprises the Global R&D Centre and Corporate Headquarters (50,563sqm) as well as providing a gas farm enclosure, disabled parking spaces, taxi drop off facility, cycle parking and hard and soft landscaping to complement the building.

2.6 The building has three above ground storeys, along with a basement. It is configured as a series of three linked blocks arranged around a central courtyard. At the ground floor the three blocks are separated to allow entry into the central courtyard, at the upper floors the separate blocks are connected by non-laboratory spaces and write up areas which allow circulation around the building and form a canopy over the ground floor.

2.7 Each of the three blocks comprise two blocks with a central core. The block fronting Robinson Way acts as the 'front door' to the development with an entrance from Robinson way which corresponds to the taxi-drop off area and majority of disabled parking bays. This block contains the more public functions such as café, restaurant, auditorium and conference facilities. The other two blocks have entrances that face the internal courtyard and contain laboratory space.

2.8 The predominant material at ground floor is proposed to be oak to with clear glazed sections to support the concept of 'visible science' where the laboratory work can be seen by visitors and passers-by. At first floor and above, a facetted concrete and glass ovoid shape, containing laboratory, meeting and circulation spaces encircles the courtyard and creates the sculptural form to the building. This is best understood in 3-dimensions which reveal the subtle changes in the facets and the 'sawtooth' roof form.

2.9 The central courtyard contains three oak trees along with associated hard and soft landscaping to complement the feature trees. Lime trees are planting along the Robinson Way frontage, and a series of Plane Trees will line Francis Crick Avenue.

2.10 In the Northern Corner of the plot sits the gas farm enclosure which sits behind a green wall screen and can be accessed from

the service yard entrance to the west. The service yard entrance ramps down running south westerly to the basement level. The basement includes facilities management, plant, loading bays, waste storage, changing rooms and additional laboratory space.

The South Plot

2.11 The Southern Plot comprises two separate buildings, at the North and Northeast is the R&D Enabling Building (total 7,744sqm) which contains a reception area and café, along with non-laboratory workspace and meeting rooms. An additional building, the energy centre (1,514sqm), is provided to the north west which will serve the proposed development.

2.12 The South Plot also includes landscaping that runs north-south through the centre of the proposals, as well as a Landscape corridor that runs from the west of the site into the development. The South Plot also includes 524 staff car parking spaces and 50 visitor spaces many of which are temporary during the first phase (see para 2.14 below). Cycle and motorcycle parking are also proposed as well as a servicing area and turning circle.

2.13 The R&D Enabling buildings are four storeys in height and share the same materials palette as the North Plot along with some of the architectural language but are far more conventional in form. The energy centre is three storeys in height (approximately 19m excluding roof-top plant and flues).

Masterplan for future AstraZeneca proposals

2.14 While significant development is proposed the applicants intend to carry out further development on the CBC site within the South Plot. To that end much development to the southern end (at grade parking spaces) of the South Plot is proposed as temporary at this stage. While the landscape corridor running East-West, and the ‘at grade’ parking spaces along the western boundary will remain, the intention is that the majority of the parking spaces will be removed and further buildings will front Francis Crick Avenue and address the Country Park to the west.

2.15 The applicants have submitted a site masterplan for information only at this stage. This drawing holds no weight and does not approve any additional buildings, but serves to show that the first

phase proposed within the application submitted can be successfully incorporated within a comprehensive development. As part of this second phase a multi-storey car park is envisaged that would compensate for the lost phase 1 parking spaces, and also provide additional spaces for any further development.

2.16 The application was accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Plans and Drawings
2. Design and Access Statement
3. Materials Schedule Report
4. Sample Panels
5. Nature Conservation Management Plan
6. Drainage Strategy Report
7. Combined Construction Document
8. External Lighting Planning Report
9. Extraction Equipment Statement
10. Insulation Details Statement
11. Operation Waste Management Strategy
12. Report on Ground Investigation
13. Renewable Energy Strategy
14. Tree Survey and Method Statement
15. Landscape Report
16. Transport Report (and Travel Plan)
17. Public Art Delivery Plan

2.17 Through consideration of the application small changes to the materials and elevations for the energy centre have been made, and details with respect to the North Plot central planting area, and cycle store detail were clarified.

2.18 In addition to this additional cycle spaces have been provided along with further information on public art, waste, piling impact, noise insulation and the Gas Farm. Clarification over air quality modelling was also provided, all in response to the original consultation. None of these changes were so significant, or related to comments made by third parties to warrant re-consultation beyond those the relevant technical consultees.

2.19 This reserved matters application also includes a number of discharges of conditions relating to the outline consent. These are listed below and are addressed in the main report where relevant:

Condition 07: Strategic Gaps
Condition 12: Materials
Condition 13: Site levels
Condition 16: Ecology: Reserved Matters Applications
Condition 18: Individual Site Surface Water
Condition 23: Construction Method Statement
Condition 24: Detailed waste management plan
Condition 25: Foundations (piling)
Condition 29: Lighting
Condition 30: Extraction Equipment
Condition 31: Insulation
Condition 32: Operational waste
Condition 33: Contamination: Assessment and Remedial Strategy
Condition 34: Contamination: Gas Risk
Condition 35: Renewable Energy
Condition 36: Renewable Energy percentage flexibility
Condition 37: BREEAM and NEAT building standards
Condition 38: Tree assessment
Condition 39: Tree protection: Method Statement and plans
Condition 40: Tree protection: Fencing
Condition 41: Tree protection: Excavation trenches
Condition 42: (a): Structural Landscaping (woodland landscaping)
Condition 45: Development Plot Scheme
Condition 47: Landscaping Development Plot Management Plan
Condition 48: Earthworks
Condition 49: Hard Landscaping
Condition 56: Cycle Parking (model share)
Condition 57: Cycle Parking (trip estimation)
Condition 58: Cycle Parking (calculation of spaces required)
Condition 59: Cycle Parking (detail of spaces)

2.20 The application was subject to a screening opinion prior to submission in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (EIA) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011. Following consideration by the local authority it was considered that an Environmental Statement was not required.

3.0 **SITE HISTORY**

3.1 The table below shows the planning history for the site subject to this application and also the relevant applications from the CBC site.

Reference	Description	Outcome
06/796/OUT	Up to 215,000sqm floor space (excluding plant areas) comprising 60,000sqm of clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment), 115,000sqm of biomedical and biotech research and development (B1(b)), 15,000sqm of biomedical and biotech research and development (B1(b)) or clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment), and 25,000sqm of either clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment) or higher education or sui generis medical research institute uses, and including related support activities within use classes A1, A3, B1, D1 (creches/nurseries) or sui generis uses, with no individual premises used for support activities to exceed 500sqm; new areas of public realm; landscaping; parking areas; highway works; drainage works and all other associated infrastructure.	Approved with conditions
07/0651/FUL	Laboratory of Molecular Biology and Energy Centre, of usable floorspace, excluding plant, of 25209 square metres, Use Class b1(b)	Approved with conditions
C/05009/12/CW	Erection of Energy Innovation centre (EIC) of 2,675sqm GEA as part of the wider expansion of Addenbrooke's Hospital to form part of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus authorised under planning application ref:06/0796/OUT	Approved with conditions

11/0780/REM	Reserved matters application (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale details) for a 1,228 space multi-storey car park (33,141sqm gross external floor area) and perimeter access road at the south west corner of Addenbrooke's campus, to serve Addenbrooke's as it expands and the new Papworth Hospital (pursuant to outline approval 06/0796/OUT).	Approved with conditions
14/0120/FUL	Redevelopment of existing parking area to provide education centre (3,985 sqm), private hospital (10,405 sqm), hotel and conference centre (12,540 sqm), ancillary hot food takeaway (Class A5, 605 sqm) and ancillary D1 (530 sqm) and associated car parking and public realm works known as The Forum Cambridge	Approved with conditions
14/1411/REM	Reserved matters application pursuant to outline approval 06/0796/OUT for New Papworth hospital and associated amenity space, planting, vehicle drop off area, cycle parking, energy centre/plant room and servicing area.	Approved with conditions

4.0 **PUBLICITY**

4.1

Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes
Public Meeting/Exhibition	Yes
DC Forum:	No

4.2 A public consultation event was organised by AstraZeneca on the 18th and 19th of July 2014 at Long Road Sixth Form College. The event was attended by around 86 people. Prior to this on the 18th July a Stakeholder Preview Event was held

4.3 There was a pre-application developer presentation to Planning Committee members on 17th July 2014.

4.4 AstraZeneca attended the Southern Fringe Community Forum on 4 June 2014 to highlight their proposed move to Cambridge and advertise the public consultation identified above.

4.5 A presentation was made to the disability panel on 26 August 2014 as part of the pre-application process.

4.6 A presentation was made to the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel on 11 June 2014.

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/2 3/3 3/4 3/5 3/6 3/7 3/11 3/12 3/13 4/1 4/3 4/4 4/8 4/13 4/14 4/15 5/15 7/1 7/2 7/4 8/1 8/2 8/3 8/4 8/5 8/6 8/7 8/9 8/10 8/11 8/16 8/17 8/18 9/1 9/2 9/3 9/5 10/1

5.2 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 Circular 11/95 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010
Supplementary Planning Documents	Sustainable Design and Construction Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP) : Waste Management Design Guide Planning Obligation Strategy Public Art
	<u>Citywide</u>: Biodiversity Checklist Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Development Framework (2006)

5.3 **Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan 2014**

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, the following policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance:

Policy 16 – Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's) Area of Major Change

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Urban Design Team

6.1 The scheme is parameter plan compliant and in that respect is supported in design terms. The approach to Plot 7 will create a distinctive building at the heart of the CBC campus and is supported in design terms. The approach to Plots 10-13 are more restrained but relate well to the plot 7 proposals in terms of materials, scale and function and are supported. Details of the proposed cycle store need to be provided and further design of the energy centre is need to address concerns relating to the proposed elevations, materials, plant/roofscape and the design of the flues. With the amendments to the energy centre, the application would be supported in urban design terms.

The applicant has submitted sample boards and a 'materials schedule report' in order to discharge Condition 12 of the Outline 06/0796/OUT. The materials proposed are generally acceptable in principle but some minor changes are required.

Response following amendments

6.2 The applicant has undertaken further design development and the elevations and submitted clarifications about the proposed screen material including the orientation of the mesh for the Energy Centre and details of the cycle store.

The changes made to the elevations have addressed previous concerns although a shadow gap should be introduced to demarcate the floors.

The plant enclosure has been extended to create a more uniform and cleaner roof profile and is proposed to be darker and more recessive in colour. This change has resolved previous concerns.

Details of the bike store have been submitted. The proposals are for a simple mesh structure with climbing plants to soften it. The approach is supported in design terms.

Overall the application is now supported in design terms with the changes made to the scheme addressing our concerns. However, further clarification is needed to show the detail of the horizontal breaks between the screen panels. Materials are now fully supported.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.3 The proposed scheme is parameter plan compliant and is generally supported from a landscape and amenity perspective.

There are some queries with respect to drainage and irrigation of the feature trees in the North Plot which needs to be resolved.

The potential visual impact of the proposed Energy Centre should be looked at from across the Country Park. Subject to these views being acceptable, the landscape team will be in a position to support the application.

Response following amendments

6.4 Overall the proposed scheme continues to be generally supported from a landscape and amenity perspective. Issues with respect to the central tree have been overcome, although there are still some concerns over the two London Plane trees being too close to each other on Francis Crick Avenue. Some longer distance views would

be helpful to fully assess the potential visual impact of the proposals within the landscape context. Subject to these views being acceptable, the landscape team will be in a position to fully support the application.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

6.5 The information provided is acceptable. However, further clarification is required with regard to the how the swift boxes on the energy centre will be integrated in terms of design and material.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

6.6 The submitted information demonstrates that flood risk will not be increased as a result of this development. However, items that still need addressing are; appropriate seed mix specification for the dry detention areas/swales, and bespoke headwalls for the dry basins and swales in keeping with the high quality landscape.

Response following amendments

6.7 The information that has been submitted is adequate to demonstrate that flood risk will not be increased as a result of this development. The recent submission of information addresses any concerns raised in the initial consultation.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

6.8 The approach that has been taken to integrate the principles of sustainable design and construction and to reducing carbon emissions through the use of low and zero carbon technology is fully supported.

Access Officer

6.9 Agrees with the comments made by the disability panel, with no further comments to add.

Head of Environment and Refuse

6.10 In terms of construction impacts the submitted information in terms of the CMS, Detailed Waste Management plan and Piling information is generally acceptable save for some queries relating to sensitive nearby premises.

In terms of operational impacts the lighting information is acceptable however some points of clarification are required in terms of noise impact from plant and the operation of the gas farm, where a condition of delivery times is suggested. There is information lacking on noise from emergency generators. A condition is suggested for a completion report to show adherence with the specified levels.

Further information is required with regard to further ground gas monitoring before the contamination condition can be discharged. Some queries in relation to waste in terms of tracking and waste location/volumes have been raised and require clarification.

For air quality, the reports presented to date have shown erroneously high emissions due to the modelling presenting all plant and oil-fired emergency generators running continuously. It is suggested that the model is re-run showing a realistic scenario, and the updated information presented for comment.

6.11 *Response following amendments*

With Regard to construction subject to confirmation that a survey of sensitive areas will be taken in accordance with BS5228-2:2009 both the Construction Method Statement condition (Condition 23) and piling condition (Condition 25) can be discharged.

All the information submitted pursuant to conditions 30 and 31 (Extraction Equipment and Noise Insulation respectively) is considered acceptable, however there are still some elements unconfirmed and therefore full discharge of the conditions cannot be recommended at this stage. Conditions are suggested in relation to plant and a completion report.

The testing in terms of Contamination is now complete and it is considered that the site is Characteristic Situation 2 and that a remediation strategy for ground gas is required before the condition can be recommended for discharge.

The updated Air Quality information clarifies the previous queries and the results are considered acceptable subject to a condition limiting the discharges and on-going monitoring.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Walking and Cycling Officer)

6.12 Supportive of the number of cycling spaces provided although ideally some cycle parking like those on the South Plot could be provided on the North Plot too. There may not be enough width in the internal cycle storage area on the South Plot although this will be dependent on the high capacity rack specification which is unknown at this stage.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Public Art Officer)

6.13 The Public Art Delivery Plan is supported subject to some minor revisions to the programme which should be undertaken in collaboration with arts expertise, the addition of an indicative art programme set against the development programme which includes key milestones in the commissioning process.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Waste)

6.14 The County Council is satisfied that the Detailed Waste Management Plan for Construction (DWMP) is appropriate.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Transport Assessment)

6.15 Overall the trip assessment provided shows that although the development could potentially lead to more trips than the CBC transport assessment initially predicted, these will include more cyclists and bus passengers but fewer car drivers and is therefore acceptable to the County Council.

Car parking numbers have been determined by the model split although there is a question as to whether the amount of visitor spaces is enough. Cycle parking provision needs to clarified and based on 41% (10% points above the current mode pattern).

The travel plan overall is a good document, some points for incorporation are suggested.

Information is provided regarding the diversion of footpath 47 which sits adjacent to this site.

Environment Agency

6.16 Conditions 17 & 18 are acceptable in principle provided it is acceptable to the City Council's drainage engineer and is in accordance with the overall drainage strategy.

Condition 33 is acceptable in principle, in view of the sites historic usage as agricultural land no further investigation is deemed necessary.

Health and Safety Executive

6.17 The HSE, based on safety grounds, does not advise against the granting of planning permission in this case.

As the proposed development is within the consultation distance of a major hazard pipeline you should consider contacting the pipeline operator before deciding the case.

National Grid (Pipeline operator)

6.18 No objection to a suitably designed ground level parking area adjacent/on the pipeline. This assumes depths and parking design is such it does not impose loading on the pipeline.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

6.19 It is clear that the applicants want to produce a facility that is open and available to all users and visitors to the Addenbrooke's site. As stated in the DAS they are seeking a culture of 'visible science'. It is understood that the internal courtyard to the north building will be gated. During normal working hours these gates will be open but secured overnight. The security arrangements for the building are adequate for what is proposed.

Cycle crime has historically been problematic across the Addenbrooke's site albeit only 19 cycles were recorded as stolen in the last year. The problem is that many of the cycle stores are open and suffer from poor levels of surveillance. I would normally recommend that any cycles stored for staff be in secure cycle

stores. The proposal however shows 450 cycle storage spaces under the main structure of the building security provided with cycles secured to Sheffield stands. These cycles should be under continued surveillance given the open nature of what is proposed.

Cambridgeshire Quality Panel (Meeting of 15 July)

6.20 A summary is contained within the main body of the assessment in para 8.78 with the full minutes attached as appendix 3.

Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 29 July)

6.21 The Panel were very pleased to be presented with a scheme with input from a dedicated access consultancy as such proposals are rare.

Panel felt the blue badge parking was adequate and welcomed the covered drop-off space, covered cycle parking and scooter charging points. Panel suggested some detailed design elements for the reception area, along with offering advice on the wayfinding for the building

Panel supported the intension to integrate the site with the 'circus and piazza' for greater coherence across the CBC. It was suggested that a follow-up presentation at a more detailed stage would be most welcome.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service

6.22 The fire authority asks that adequate provision for fire hydrants be secured through condition or Section 106 agreement.

The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 1224* Representations have been received from the following:

- 89 Objections from residents of Cambridge

- 50 Objections from residents of the wider Cambridgeshire area
- 444 Objections from residents of the UK
- 70 Objections from residents outside the UK
- 565 Objections from people who did not leave an address and/or the address was incomplete.
- 4 Objection letters from organisations
    - United Front 4 Animals
    - National Anti-Vivisection Society (NAVS)
    - Cambridge Friends of the Earth
    - National Operation Anti-Vivisection (NOAV)
- 2 Letters of Support from organisations
    - Understanding Animal Research
    - Cambridge Past, Present and Future

- The addresses of those representations are listed in appendix 2

- In addition to the above an online petition has been signed by 5148 (as of 21 Jan 2015) supporting the CAP Campaign. A summary of the points are listed below with the detail of the petition grounds are identified in appendix 2

*26 additional representations have been received but are from duplicate addresses.

7.2 The objections can be summarised as:

(More detail information is provided in Appendix 2)

Animal Testing/ Obligation through EU Directive

- There is little information included in the application about the proposed use of animals.
- The UK has an obligation to work towards ending animal experiments: EU Directive 2010/63/EU, which is now in UK law, creates a duty to work towards the "full replacement of procedures on live animals for scientific and educational purposes as soon as it is scientifically possible to do so".
- The use of animals in experiments is set to decline.

- If approval should be granted for this application, I hope that AstraZeneca will commit to the continued reduction of its use of animals, and ultimately the replacement of all research on animals.
- The government has a commitment to the reduction of the use of animals in research (Directive 2010/63/EU). Given the abundance of animal research facilities in Cambridge and surrounding areas, another animal lab would be counter to this government objective.
- AstraZeneca's proposal goes against the spirit of the EU Directive (Directive 2010/63/EU) in as much as it will include an animal laboratory. Yet another animal laboratory in Cambridge would be diametrically opposed to the objective of the EU Directive to reduce the number of animals used in experiments.
- If a project like this is to be approved anywhere, within the borders of a busy city is the wrong place for it. Something as controversial as this should be hidden in the depths of the countryside where protests can be held without disruption to the wider community.
- AstraZeneca plans to use animals in experiments on the site despite the fact Directive 2010/63/EU creates an obligation on the government to reduce the numbers of animals used in research.
- Developments in science and technology have provided new techniques to replace animals, which provide data relevant to humans. An intelligent, cross- disciplinary approach is needed, which draws upon the very best in technology.
- Moral concerns that animal testing is wrong and they are not here for experimental reasons.
- Animal testing should not be a requirement anymore; there are lots of other ways we can test products that don't involve animals.
- Object to the use of dogs, they have requirements that cannot be met by laboratories and their use in experiments may well become illegal in the near future.
- No description of the type/breed of animals to be used- if larger animals are used then outside runs must be available.
- These animal testing laboratories are a waste of time and money, no real breakthroughs have been achieved using animals to experiment on .
- There are profound physiological differences between humans and animals that make results from these tests unreliable

Transport

- The increased traffic from the staff at the AstraZeneca site will impact upon access to Addenbrooke's Hospital and create issues around the residential streets in the immediate vicinity.
- Increased traffic flow due to animal rights demonstrators who would inevitably plan peaceful but large demonstrations at the site will cause a disruption to the traffic flow in the area. It is likely that activists will park in the surrounding residential streets causing additional traffic problems and problems for residents in terms of access to parking.
- Marches will cause massive and unavoidable disruption to traffic in Cambridge. This will have an impact on the hospital and other amenities within Cambridge.
- In addition, delivery vehicles coming to and from the site would strongly affect pedestrian and cycle safety. Particularly as there is a cycle path in close proximity to the site.

Design

- The proposal will be an eye sore
- The one weakness of the scheme is the surface car parking which should ideally be in a multi-storey car park from the outset, or at least provided with adequate planting. Either way it should not just be a sea of tarmac.

Sustainability

- If the number of animals to be tested on is to be reduced, the animal laboratory is unsustainable and is likely to fall into disuse in the next few years as the government implements its objectives of cutting down the numbers of animals used, and as scientific discovery allows more advanced methods of research.

Public Safety

- Inevitable protests against the site will unavoidably pass through Long road. This is a very busy road and it is close to Addenbrooke's Hospital as well as having a Sixth form College situated on it. It is likely therefore that public safety will be jeopardised.
- Without knowing the exact type of research going to take place at the site how can the public comment on the risk they may face.
- AstraZeneca must submit a detailed breakdown of the exact type of experiments, compounds and illnesses they will be using at this site.

- Long Road is likely to be used for protests for and against the development; this is a very busy road. Long Road and other surrounding roads provide emergency access to Addenbrooke's Hospital. Having a controversial site at this location with possible clashes of demonstrators may put public safety at risk.

Environment and Waste Disposal

- AstraZeneca has not provided detailed explanations as to the exact type of research on animals that is going to take place. Details are required about the nature of the research and procedures to be used in order to establish whether the activities will give rise to hazardous substances or waste.
- What kinds of chemicals and compounds are going to be kept at the site and what bio-security measures are going to be taken in storage and disposal? The application does not contain enough information for the public to be able to give informed comments on this.
- Toxic chemicals will be released by plant.
- Pollution caused by delivery vehicles

Alternative use of the site

- We recognise the importance of scientific research and the following suggestions are for alternative uses of the site:
    a) AstraZeneca build their HQ and instead of an animal laboratory host exclusively human relevant research, making the promised
    b) The site be used to build a centre for the replacement of animal experiments

Noise

- There will be an adverse impact on adjacent properties due to inevitable protests and demonstrations and the associated noise, disturbance and disruption to traffic.
- Noise and disruption will be caused by marches and static protests both for and against the development. These events will be regular and continuous. Many of the protests may be staged on Long Road and marches may go along residential streets.

Other Issues

- If this development goes ahead there will be a long-term need to increased policing funds for Cambridge. Protests will need to be facilitated and if there is any criminality on either side there will need to be enough officers to deal with public order and any resulting investigations.
- Tourism will be affected as a result of the development.

7.3 The letters of support can be summarised as

(More detail information is provided in Appendix 2)

Animal Testing/ Obligation through EU Directive

- By law (the Animals in Scientific Procedures Act), no animal can be used for research in the UK if there is a non-animal alternative available that would give the same results. Thus all users of animals for research in the UK have, by law, to use replacements if they are available.

Design

- Impressed with the vision for the site and the way that this has translated to the quality of the design of the buildings and detailed choice of materials. We are also pleased by the way that the overall greenspace development is informed by the pattern of historic landscapes in the city centre.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Principle of development
2. Design, Landscape and the Public Realm
3. Drainage and Utilities
4. Ecology
5. Employment
6. Transport
7. Amenity
8. Sustainability
9. Waste Strategy

10. Construction
11. Public Art
12. Archaeology
13. Planning Obligation Strategy
14. Other issues

Principle of Development

8.2 In 2009 outline planning permission was granted for the expansion of the hospital site at Addenbrooke's (called the 2020 vision). The permission relating to the land to the west and south of the existing built up area, approved a further 215,000 square metres of floorspace for a range of uses including clinical research and treatment, in-patient treatment, biotech and biomedical research and development, and higher education use. The campus is referred to now as the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC site)

8.3 As part of the outline approval a number of parameter plans were agreed which allocates certain uses within certain parts of the site and establishes a number of limitations with regard to design such as maximum heights.

Floorspace and proposed use

8.4 The proposed use is biomedical and biotech research and development B1(b). The floorspace (excluding plant) proposed is 59,821 sq metres, which falls within the ceiling set out, when combined cumulatively with other consents; see table in Appendix 1. The space proposed here, along with an expected 20,884sqm of potential floorspace in a later phase. when combined with the LMB floorspace (25,209sqm) provides a residual floorspace value for B1(b) uses of 9,086sqm (this assumes that clinical floorspace will occupy the remainder of the CBC land to the east of this proposal).

Relationship with parameter plans

8.5 The proposal within the North Plot falls within the area set aside for clinical research and treatment OR biomedical and biotech research and development OR higher education/sui generis medical research institute uses. The North Plot use is therefore compliant with parameter plan 1.

8.6 The proposal within the South Plot falls within the area set aside for biomedical and biotech research and development. The South Plot proposed use is therefore compliant with parameter plan 1 also.

8.7 Parameter plan 2 sets limits to heights, along with other design factors such as requirements for building frontages. The North Plot building is 19.75m high which sits well under the maximum height allowable (36m). The North Plot is also required to provide between 20% and 70% plot width facing Francis Crick Avenue and building facades exceeding 60% fronting the Circus. The frontage to Francis Crick Avenue is 53% which complies, however the curved form of the building set against the circus frontage only occupies 5.9%.

8.8 Condition 6 which enforces these percentage figures stipulates that these frontages need to be achieved 'unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority'. In assessing whether the local authority can agree otherwise, one needs to look at the reasons for the condition in the first instance and see whether the alternative proposal achieves the same aim. The purpose of requiring the frontage is to ensure that 'subsequent development responds positively to key areas of public realm'. While the curved building falls short of the target it does achieve a strong frontage to the public realm, one which responds positively and is acceptable in design terms. It is therefore considered that the proposal can be considered compliant in this instance.

8.9 The South Plot buildings are required to be no greater than 31m (excluding flues which can rise up to 39m), with at least 60% of the buildings being no greater than 26m. The buildings on the South Plot sit under the 26m complying comfortably with the parameter plan. The required frontages will need to be assessed when the balance of the South Plot is developed in a later phase (see paras 2.13-2.14 above).

8.10 Parameter Plan 3 limits the height of the building but also the height of any flues proposed. The flues proposed on the energy centre sit at 32m above ground complying with the maximum height. The main buildings proposed (this excludes elements such as secure bike parking and gas farm building) exceed the minimum building height requirement set out in parameter plans 4

and 5. Frontage requirements on parameter plan 4 are covered above.

8.11 The parameter plans (and condition 7 on the outline approval) require a minimum of two strategic gaps of at least 25m width to be provided from the western boundary adjacent to the railway to the eastern boundary adjacent to Francis Crick Avenue. The location of the first gap needs to be submitted with the first reserved matters application within the land allocated for biotech and biomedical R&D, the location of the second gap needs to be submitted with the second reserved matters submission in that area.

8.12 As this is the first reserved matters submission, the location of the first gap needs to be identified. This has been shown within the submitted information both in terms of provision within the first phase (i.e. the landscape strategic gap is identified and will be delivered in this first phase), but also shown through the indicative masterplan that this gap can/will be retained as the later phases build out. In addition to this a second gap has been identified. This will comprise 12.5m in the red line of this development at the southern end, and 12.5m in the plot to the south.

8.13 The first gap being assessed here is in an acceptable location, which leads a vista through the gap in buildings into the green space to the south of the New Papworth Hospital, and is an acceptable width (i.e. 25m specified in the outline approval). It therefore complies with the parameter plan requirements.

8.14 Parameter Plans 6-10 inclusive at the outline stage covered strategic elements such as strategic landscaping, access roads, public transport, pedestrian and cycle access which is covered in the assessment below, where relevant to this application.

Outline permission conditions

8.15 There are a number of conditions attached to the outline consent that are required to be discharged prior to commencement of any development for each individual application coming forward at the reserved matters stage. These discharge of condition applications have come forward parallel to this reserved matters application. Conditions for discharge have been identified in the relevant sections below.

Material planning considerations

8.16 In deciding planning applications the local planning authority has regard to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

8.17 There have been a substantial number of representations objecting to the proposed development on strongly held moral and ethical grounds relating to animal testing. Many of these objections points towards the government's commitment to the reduction of the use of animals in research (following Directive 2010/63/EU), and that given the abundance of animal research facilities in Cambridge and surrounding areas, another animal laboratory would be counter to this government objective. Objectors also cite that this proposal goes against the spirit of the EU Directive.

8.18 Officers have considered carefully whether these moral and ethical objections are a material planning consideration in relation to this application. One would not normally expect to find that moral considerations amount to a material planning consideration. Officers are not aware of any decision to date made by the Courts to the effect that such moral/ethical considerations would amount to a material consideration in such an application. Furthermore, separate legislation exists to control the use of animals in research (the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986, which was amended in 2013 to transpose the requirements of the EU Directive identified above into UK law). The applicant, regardless of any planning decision, would need to ensure that it has the relevant licences from the government pursuant to the legislation before being able to carry out any research involving the use of animals.

8.19 The objectors to the application point to the number of facilities that exist in Cambridge already as reason to resist this application as an additional facility would conflict with the government's objective. As stated above it would be for the government, through separate legislation to make a decision on whether animal facilities are in this instance, justified. There is no planning policy that controls the amount of animal testing facilities, the proposal before the local planning authority seeks consent for a B1(b) biotech and

biomedical research use, and this is consistent with both the development plan and the existing outline consent.

Representations in respect of the principle of development

8.20 Representations also point towards alternative uses for the site recognising the importance of scientific research and suggesting that the site should accommodate an exclusively human relevant research facility, or be used to build a centre for the replacement of animal experiments. The local authority are required to determine the application put before them; the proposal before the local planning authority seeks consent for a B1(b) biotech and biomedical research and development use, which is consistent with both the development plan and the existing outline consent therefore while alternative uses could also be acceptable in their own right, they cannot be a reason to refuse this application.

8.21 Concern has been expressed about the proposal becoming redundant as the EU Directive takes effect and research on animals is reduced. The research and development space proposed has been designed to ensure that it is flexible in nature and can adapt for different types of research and development. This ensures that should the use of animal testing in research decline in the future then then the spaces proposed won't fall into disuse and be unsustainable. The flexibility will allow the proposals to adapt to future methods of research and to ensure that the building and the applicant can meet the current legislation and any future requirements through separate legislation. The applicants have confirmed that the proposal submitted has been designed to ensure that requirements set through the EU Directive and other legislation can be met.

8.22 A number of representations have objected on several other grounds such as transport, noise and sustainability. These are dealt with under the relevant sections below.

8.23 While there are a substantial number of objections to this application in terms of the principle of development, the objections either do not constitute material planning considerations or do not constitute a material consideration that justifies departing from the development plan and the outline planning consent. It is therefore considered that the principle of the development is acceptable as it complies with the terms of the outline consent and it is in

accordance with policies 5/15 and 7/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan.

Design, Landscape and the Public Realm

8.24 The site for the proposed buildings are sited within the CBC extension, the North Plot is located to the south east of the LMB building and to the west of the Forum building (not yet built). The South Plot is located to the western part of the CBC extension bounding the Cambridge to London railway line. In between the two plots will be public realm known as the 'Circus' with the New Papworth Hospital situated to the south of the North Plot and to the east of the South Plot. The proposed scheme was presented to Cambridgeshire's Quality Panel on the 11 June 2014 and their comments have been addressed below and/or in paragraph 8.78 at the end of this section.

North Plot Height and Massing

8.25 The proposed building sit within the approved parameter plans, below the maximum height and above the minimum level. The R&D building situated on the North Plot is relatively humble in scale at only three storeys high, but is of a scale that addresses and complements the various public realm conditions to the east and northwest of the plot as well as presenting a strong address to the Circus to the south. The use of a ground floor recess underneath the first floor canopy, along with change in materials helps to humanise the scale of the building further. It is considered that the overall scale and massing of the North Plot is well considered and therefore supported.

North Plot Layout and Design

8.26 The North Plot is an irregular shaped plot with the challenge of addressing three different elements of the public realm. Furthermore the applicant's aim is to create an open and permeable development that facilitates connection and collaboration with other people and organisations.

8.27 The layout of the plot has evolved through responding to the site context and accommodating the applicant's brief for an open and connected layout. By reducing the number of storeys, and providing a deeper floor plan, the internal layout becomes

inherently more cohesive and adaptable for different uses/needs over time.

8.28 The building is based around six square blocks, where blocks are then paired to create three elements each having a central core. These six square blocks are replicated on each of the three floors and provide a total of twelve laboratory blocks on the first and second floor, with four additional laboratory blocks on the ground floor. The two additional blocks on the ground floor are given over to ancillary/complementary uses.

8.29 The three separate blocks at ground floor level are not connected allowing people to walk into the centre of the site between buildings and around the central courtyard. The entrance to all three blocks is from within the centre courtyard although the eastern block has an additional entrance from the external elevation facing Robinson Way (see para 8.33 below)

8.30 At the upper floors the building builds up using the six blocks and three central cores, but provides space around the laboratory blocks which creates non-laboratory workspace, meeting rooms and circulation space to connect the building.

8.31 At the ground floor the building uses the upper floor canopy to create covered cycle parking, and covered drop off area. A central courtyard is formed by the layout of the buildings which provides for a central landscape feature to include three oak trees.

8.32 It is considered that the decision to allow permeability through the plot, and deal with security internally within the buildings results in a proposal that responds well to its context on the CBC site. The layout of the building works both in terms of flexible, connected, research and development space, and sits within a well thought out plot layout, providing entrance points, car parking, cycle parking and drop off spaces in accessible locations.

North Plot Active frontages and interface

8.33 The ‘front door’ of the development faces onto Robinson Way, adjacent to the proposed disabled parking spaces and drop-off area. The lobby and reception area associated with this front door addresses the public realm well, and is complemented by the

design of the public realm making way finding easy, and the development legible.

8.34 The building is challenged with needing to provide three active frontages, which it successfully achieves by locating active uses on all of the ground floor and placing ‘back of house’ and servicing elements into the basement level. The effect of this is a seamless connection between the building and the public realm in which it sits.

8.35 Two of the ground floor blocks, one either side of the main entrance from Robinson Way provide more semi-public uses such as café, conference rooms, auditorium and staff restaurant. The café use particularly will benefit from being able to spill out into the central courtyard.

South Plot Height and Massing

8.36 The R&D Enabling Building on the South Plot is four storeys in height, and is compliant with the approved parameters. Like the North Plot building, this building utilises a reduced ground floor plan compared to the upper floors to enable a canopy to be formed around the entrance to the building and around the inner courtyard perimeter.

8.37 The South Plot building forms the key role in addressing the western end of the new Circus public realm. In officers view the height and scale proposed achieves a strong termination to the visa down the ‘high street’ and across the Circus fulfilling the aims of the masterplan /parameter plans.

8.38 The Energy Centre building complements the height of the R&D Enabling Building, albeit only three storeys, these storey heights are bigger than the neighbouring building creating an almost unified height between the South Plot buildings.

South Plot Layout and Design

8.39 Like the North Plot the culture of openness exists within the South Plot proposal. The more conventional rectangular building is split at the ground floor to enable people to walk through the building into the central courtyard. On the upper floors the building connects creating a ground floor canopy. The building

accommodates support functions and those R&D operations that don't require laboratory or specialist equipment.

8.40 The layout responds to the North Plot creating connectivity between the two buildings, but also sets the precedent for potential future buildings within the Southern Plot located around a central landscape clearing which connects with the strategic gaps envisaged by the parameter plans at the outline stage.

8.41 Cycle parking is provided for at the entrance to the building as well as in an enclosed building towards the northwest corner of the plot. The southern part of the South Plot comprises, at this stage, the main staff car park and vehicular entrance. Much of this car park is temporary in nature and is discussed in the landscape and public realm section below.

South Plot Active frontages and interface

8.42 The layout of the buildings and general orientation relate well to the North Plot and the Circus open space. The gap within the building, change of floor plan between ground and upper floors, and change of material at the ground floor help give clarity to the main entrance of the building.

Elevations and Materials

8.43 Each of the buildings responds to their context in terms of height, massing, design and layout, but are ultimately brought together by their architectural language. A large part of this language is the use of elevational treatment and materials. Condition 12 of the outline planning permission requires the proposed materials to be submitted and approved prior to commencement. A Materials Schedule Report, along with sample panels has been provided as part of the submission.

North Plot

8.44 The North Plot building proposes oak panels in the ground floor to create a warmer and more tactile quality with clear glazed sections enabling transparency into the building. At the upper floors the main elevation is provided through fritted glass, which includes solar/thermal protective high performance coating with bespoke frit pattern.

8.45 It is this fully glazed façade and ‘sawtooth’ roof form which gives this building its distinctive character. The zig-zag geometry of the roof continues down the façade which means that as one walks around the building the elevational detailing and proportions change.

8.46 The proposed building is a bespoke approach and will provide for an easily identifiable ‘landmark’ on the CBC site. The materials proposed are of high quality and complement the proposed design.

South Plot

8.47 The Research and Development Enabling building on the south plot is more convention in form and proposes fully storey high triple glazed panels to create a ‘clean’ smooth surface. The use of fritted glass on the outer layer unifies the building with that on the north plot, as does the use of wood on the ground floor. The elevation has a simply rhythm, with opening for natural ventilation at regular intervals across the façade.

8.48 The energy centre is functionally very different from the other buildings proposed with very little ‘habitable’ floorspace, comprising mostly of plant and equipment. This variance of ‘function’ has a direct impact on the elevational treatment of the building.

8.49 The challenge here is to provide a building that works functionally, that responds to its use in terms of the elevation and materials, but that also ties in with the other buildings within the south plot.

8.50 Following initial questions over the proposed design and materials used for the energy centre the applicant has undertaken further design development of the elevations and submitted clarification about the proposed screen material including the orientation of the mesh for the Energy Centre

8.51 This updated information shows how the proposed perforated metal panels will be extended upwards to create a parapet. This change enhances the more lightweight qualities of the screen, improves the proportions of the elevations and helps to screen the plant enclosure from street level. Louvres and vents sitting behind the screen mesh panels will create further subtle articulation of the

elevations. The changes made to the elevations which also varies the colouring subtly behind the mesh to demark differing functions of the building have addressed previous questions. The plant enclosure was altered slightly to create a more uniform and cleaner roof profile and is proposed to be a darker and more recessive colour.

8.52 It is considered that the elevations and materials schedule submitted pursuant to condition 12 of the outline permission are acceptable and can be discharged. One minor query remains over the detail of the horizontal breaks between screen panels will be treated, it is suggested that this is dealt by condition (Condition 2).

North Plot Landscape and Public Realm

8.53 The design of the North Plot, being circular in nature places importance on the central courtyard as the focus and hub of activity. This central courtyard is approximately 65-70m when measured across the courtyard from building to building, and contains an opening that is around 50m in width. The courtyard contains a green circular lawn with a cluster of trees in the centre. The adjacent spaces are organised to provide seating areas and pathways.

8.54 In the centre of the courtyard are three large oak trees which provide strong ‘centrepiece’ to the proposal. Officers have interrogated the proposal in terms of ensuring that there is enough space for the trees to be planted and thrive within this environment, as well as looking at whether the trees will receive the necessary amount of water required. Small amendments have been made to the soil depths and drainage in this area to overcome initial concerns of the landscape officer.

Public Realm Connections

8.55 The North Plot connects in with three separate areas of the public realm. The address to Francis Crick Avenue ensures that there is enough room for the Plane trees which are feature of the continuous ‘boulevard’ to mature, although these trees will be removed during the construction period and replaced with new trees once construction is complete. The openings into this site from the Francis Crick Avenue, allowing access into the drop off space, and disabled parking to the south west corner, and service

yard to the north are done so in a sympathetic manner using materials that will complement the existing situation. Two trees have been planted in very close proximity on this frontage (in between the two service yard access points). Landscape officers are concerned that these trees won't flourish as a result and so have requested that a condition (condition 3) is imposed to require one tree in this location rather than two.

8.56 The address to Robinson Way is the 'front door' of the building and has been designed to accommodate 12 disabled parking spaces, taxi drop-off area and pedestrian connection from Robinson Way/The Forum opposite as well as providing a tree belt along this frontage.

8.57 Small leaved limes are proposed along this frontage responding to Robinson Way which then changes into London Planes to turn the corner adjacent the roundabout helping screen the gas compound. Five trees are proposed which in the early years will provide screening. These trees may become too large and five trees may become counterproductive and impact on each other. In this instance the loss of two of the inner trees would be acceptable as the remaining three trees would be mature enough at that stage to provide the screening.

8.58 The gas compound albeit five metres in height is a necessary requirement given the nature of the use proposed, and is located to enable functional servicing and deliveries. The gas compound has been designed to use the smallest practical tanks given the proposed location and are screened in part by the trees identified above, and a green wall compound. The structure, which carries acoustic properties given the need to control noise, is designed to replicate the sawtooth roof of the North Plot building and has covering plants which require minimal care and intervention as well as low water demand to help mitigate any visual impact.

8.59 The southern frontage will address the new area of public realm, historically known as the 'circus'. The applicant has worked with the landscape architect for that piece of public realm to ensure a coordinated approach which effectively ignores planning application 'red lines' and will enable a seamless transition between this proposal and the adjacent space.

8.60 Overall it is considered that attention has been paid to each and every public address to provide bespoke landscape solutions both in terms of hard and soft landscape. The proposals complement their settings well in addition to enhancing the building frontages in each area. The proposed planting mix and species have been supported by officers and the hard landscaping materials identified through the relevant outline condition (Condition 12) are well considered and of high quality.

South Plot Landscape and Public Realm

8.61 The Landscape around the South Plot provides for a main address to Francis Crick Avenue facing the 'circus'. In addition to this the South Plot needs to respond to elements stipulated within the outline permission, namely condition 42, to provide a tree belt adjacent to the railway, and to provide a least one of the two landscape corridors to connect the adjacent green space into the development. In addition to this the plot needs to be adequately landscaped in terms of amenity and building setting.

8.62 Unlike the North Plot which is proposed in its entirety at this stage, the South Plot only proposes buildings to the north end of the plot, with future development identified to the south. To this end the proposals at this stage in terms of landscape provide a mixture of permanent and temporary solutions, where permanent, consideration has to be given to ensure they do not prejudice the comprehensive development of the plot.

8.63 The proposal fronts Francis Crick Avenue and creating a high quality and open elevation to the public realm. Two openings are created into the South Plot from Francis Crick Avenue, one to the south of the R&D Enabling Building allowing for taxi drop off area, disabled spaces and visitor spaces to be accessed without the need to go through the secure barrier. At the Southeastern tip of the site a vehicular entrance is created which towards a secure barrier for staff parking. This main access point to the south would be retained throughout all phases.

8.64 Central to the buildings proposed in the South Plot is 'the promenade', a central open space which provides for circulation between buildings, amenity space, tree planting and sustainable drainage. The northern part of the promenade is proposed in its final form now and sets a precedent to continue this linear space

within the later phase(s). Both the detail within this phase, and the principle of continuing this within the site is supported and ensures there is a good plot ratio between building and amenity.

8.65 Some concern has been raised by third parties over the extent of 'at grade' car parking in the first phase. Officers consider that this element would not be acceptable in a final form as it is inefficient in land use terms. The proposal is for this parking solution to be a temporary measure to accommodate parking for the first phase and once further phase or phases come forward a multi-storey car park will accommodate both the parking for the first and later phase(s) in a more land efficient and comprehensive form.

8.66 Some at grade parking will remain (the band of parking spaces to the western side of the plot), this parking is interspersed with trees, and any visual impact will be minimal as these spaces will lie between the future buildings and the western landscape buffer.

8.67 The temporary staff and visitor parking does not have any trees interspersed but mitigates the visual impact through planting willow around the outside of the car park which will provide for an attractive screen. Trees planted at this stage would need to be removed when later plans come forward; willow will grow quickly and can be easily removed at a later date. In a permanent situation trees within the car park would have been a necessary requirement, however given the situation is temporary, and given the presence of the willow on balance officers consider the proposal as it stands to be acceptable.

8.68 It is considered that the details submitted in terms of levels and landscape (Conditions 13, 45, 47, 48, 49) are acceptable and can be discharged.

Outline Condition 42 and the Western Buffer

8.69 Condition 42 requires several elements of structural landscaping to be provided on site, one of which (criterion a) is a structural woodland landscaping scheme along the western edge of the biotech and biomedical research and development area. Details of this scheme had previously been approved in December 2011, however this approval included Ash, which is currently under threat of disease.

8.70 An amended proposal through this application has been proposed which includes Lime trees along the western boundary, with Field Maple trees set behind either side of the internal road, spaced accordingly to provide a good depth of tree planting. SuDS have been incorporated within the buffer zone, along with wildflower meadow planting and smaller tree planting. Officers welcome the change of species and consider the solution acceptable in terms of the condition. While this application can only consider parts of the western boundary within its red line, the extent of these plots along the boundary is so vast that regardless of the tree planting to the south, the solution would look comprehensive.

Condition 7 Strategic gaps

8.71 Condition 7 requires two gaps of at least 25m linking the western boundary of the site to Francis Crick Avenue. The first gap needs to be identified within the first reserved matters submission in this area of the site, the second gap would be identified within the second submission. The first gap is identified and provided in its entirely through this application.

8.72 The strategic gap provides the opportunity to link the country park with the proposed development, and the nature of the planting reflects this. The location lines up with the adjacent Papworth open space to continue the openness further into the site. The strategic gap will be provided in phase 1, and will remain through later phase(s). The second gap is identified at this stage at the southern end of the plot, with 12.5m inside this red line and 12.5m in the plot to the south. Ultimately the space will be identified in full through the next reserved matters submission.

Designing out crime

8.73 The Architectural Liaison Officer (ALO) accepts the proposed ‘open nature’ of the buildings allowing access into the internal courtyards supporting the ‘visible science’ approach. Security is mainly provided internal to the buildings, although gates are proposed between the gaps in the North Plot for night-time and potentially weekend security. Security and control for vehicles and delivery are considered adequate.

8.74 Although the CBC site has low crime levels, cycle crime has historically been problematic. Comments on the cycle provision

proposed is highlighted below in para 8.130-8.133, however the ALO is comfortable with the proposals provided. Officers consider that designing out crime has been considered within the design evolution of this application and can support the application from this perspective.

Inclusive Access

8.75 The proposal was reported to the Council's Disability Consultative Panel at the pre-application stage. Inclusive design has been considered within the buildings and throughout the public realm from the outset, with the involvement of a specialist access consultant involved.

8.76 The panel and the Council's access officer made several detailed comments with regard to the internal design and fit out of the buildings to include (for example) a hearing loop system, holders for walking sticks/crutches, and a dropped section at the reception desk as well as a colour scheme to help identify different floors within the building.

8.77 Panel were encourage by the accessible WC facilities within each stair core, and welcomed the covered cycle parking and scooter charging points. Disabled parking spaces had been well distributed across the two plots. Overall the Panel were pleased with the proposals presented.

Cambridgeshire Quality Panel

8.78 The Cambridgeshire Quality Panel reviewed the emerging proposal on 11 June 2014. The Quality Panel raised the following issues at the meeting which were (where necessary) acted on. The full minutes are attached as Appendix 3.

(i) Panel welcomed the applicant's ambition and supported the principle of opening up access into the inner courtyards.

This aspect is supported by officers also.

(ii) Panel questioned how security and confidentiality would fit in with the open accessibility into the central courtyard. Subsequent discussion at the meeting satisfied panel.

Comments in relation to security are set out above in para 8.73 in relation to comments from the ALO.

(iii) The Panel noted that parking arrangements should be flexible in order to respond to longer term shift in transport patterns.

Parking numbers are closely linked to the required travel plan see para 8.114. Parking numbers will remain under review through travel plan monitoring.

(iv) The Panel considered the scheme extremely good and very refreshing, and supported the high quality nature of the proposal.

Officers are in agreement and support the proposed development from a design and landscape perspective.

(v) The Panel asked about landscape and public realm will be managed, and how much the landscape will be used.

The landscape will be managed in accordance with the landscape management plan carried out by a management company.

(vi) Panel asked about how the quality of the North Plot will be transferred on site and whether the circular orientation could be disorientating inside.

The build materials are subject to condition discharge and construction will be monitored through other regulatory processes. The building provides clear external views as wells as central core areas within the building, both will assist with internal recognition and orientation.

(vii) The Panel were supportive of BREEAM excellent.

Officers agree as stated in the sustainability section below.

(viii) Panel raised concerns over the use of drainage tanks which may impact tree planting.

Coordination has been looked at between the two aspects and officers, following the receipt of amended detail are satisfied that the two do not conflict.

Quality Panel Conclusion

8.79 The panel highly praised the proposals, and that this development will set high standards for the rest of the campus.

Third Party Representations

8.80 While some third party representations state that the development will be an 'eye sore', a representation has also been received in support of the design. The Council's urban design team and the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel are supportive of the design proposed.

Overall Design Conclusion

8.81 The proposals for both the North Plot and the South Plot will create a high quality, functional and recognisable buildings that accord with the parameters approved as part of Outline Permission 06/0796/OUT. The proposals have been well considered in terms of the site and the wider Cambridge context and have the support of both the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel and the Urban Design team. The scheme is therefore supported in design terms and satisfies Policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Drainage and Utilities

Surface water drainage

8.82 Condition 17 of the outline approval requires a strategic site wide surface water strategy to be approved by the local authority. This strategy was approved on 22 November 2011. Condition 18 of the outline permission requires each individual reserved matters application to provide a detailed drainage strategy to feed into, and be consistent with the strategic document.

8.83 The Environment Agency indicative flood plain map shows that the site is located within Flood Zone 1. This zone comprises land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of

river or sea flooding in any year. It is considered therefore that the site is not at risk of flooding in itself.

8.84 The design has, where possible, included Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) which enables the water quality to be improved as well as attenuating the flow. The strategy concludes that the outfall off the site of the proposed development is 2 litres per second, per hectare (2l/s/ha) which conforms to the rate set within the strategic document.

North Plot

8.85 The drainage principles for the north plot comprise a series of underground attenuation tanks along the Robinson Way Frontage, and the southern site boundary. The roofs of the new building will be drained via a series of symphonic systems and the surface water drainage will be collected via channel drains and gullies. The parking bays will be porous which will act as a treatment stage, helping to break down hydrocarbons. A petrol interceptor has been included within the service yard to collect potential contaminants. A small dry swale is located within the small parking area at the south west corner. Water within the central courtyard will discharge into the tree pit. Water will then be taken down to the basement and pumped to the new surface water network.

8.86 The flow at the outfall has been based on the 2 litres per second, per hectare (2l/s/ha) which complies with the strategic document, and has been designed not to flood anywhere on the site for a 1:100 year + 30% climate change event.

South Plot

8.87 The South Plot has the added complexity of being developed in two phases. The proposal being considered here provides the drainage solution for the first phase, and has been designed to ensure that it will not prejudice the ability to bring forward the later phase(s).

8.88 The surface run-off from the access road will discharge into gullies, some of which will be directed to the swale locate to the south west. Parking bays will be permeable and will have attenuated surface water prior to being discharged into the network. Underground storage tanks beneath the permanent road will

provide the required storage volume prior to discharging to the north. Again the outfall has been based on the 2 litres per second, per hectare (2l/s/ha) which complies with the strategic document.

8.89 The proposed surface water drainage strategy has been considered acceptable by the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer and complies with the strategic document that governs the outline permission. The development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant, and some SuDS techniques have been used to provide a sustainable drainage solution and therefore the proposal is compliant with National Planning Policy Framework guidance. The details are therefore sufficient to discharge Condition 18 of the outline planning approval.

Foul drainage

8.90 Condition 21 of the outline approval requires details of the foul water drainage details to be submitted and approved to the local authority. This detail has been provided as part of the wider drainage strategy for the proposed development.

8.91 The proposed North Plot building will be drained via a new foul water gravity network which will work towards the south west of the plot. Foul water from the basement will be connected to the manhole via a local pumping station.

8.92 A new foul water system will be constructed to the South Plot which will include an underground storage tank. The proposed tank will attenuate peak flows from the North Plot prior to discharging into the existing adopted network. This system will also accommodate the foul water from the South Plot. The foul drainage would then be discharged into the existing adopted network owned by the statutory body.

Utilities

8.93 Details within the submitted Design and Access Statement show that utilities and services have been well considered and integrated within the design of the buildings proposed. This ensures that the design integrity of the buildings can be carried through to the build out stage.

Ecology

8.94 A Site Wide Nature Conservation Management Plan (NCMP) was approved via condition 15 attached to the outline approval. Condition 16 of the outline consent requires any reserved matters application is required to provide a detailed NCMP to show how it accords with the site wide strategy with specific ecological measures.

8.95 The submitted NCMP seeks to provide a coherent strategic and integrated approach to management and maintenance, which protects and enhances nature conservation within the site. Ecological enhancements have been designed to provide habitats for a variety of species throughout the site.

8.96 Within elements of the public realm scattered trees will enable movement across the site as well as providing shelter, nectar and berries. Along the western boundary enhancements allow for a biodiverse woodland, wildflower meadow, swale habitat and willow planting. Several new hedgerows (Beech and Yew) will be provided within the site providing shelter, foraging ad commuting habitat.

8.97 A green roof will be provided on the R&D Enabling Building on the South Plot; this will replicate a wildflower meadow habitat. The swale provided at the south end of the western boundary will be planted with native aquatic flora with monocots (flowering plants).

8.98 The proposals include ecological enhancements designed to boost existing bird and bat species populations and attract new species onto the site.

8.99 Twelve bird boxes and ten bat boxes will be located within trees on the site, and will be monitored annually (outside of breeding birds and bat maternity seasons) to monitor occupancy and replace and maintain the boxes. The twelve integrated boxes will be provided on the energy centre building, this will encourage establishment of swifts which are a colonial nesting bird. Log piles, substrate and recycled building rubble will be located in the woodland belt to provide habitat for reptiles, amphibians and invertebrates.

8.100 The strategy cross references the lighting strategy and emphasises the importance that lighting can have on ecology. Overall the NCMP is a comprehensive document that is supported

by technical officers. A detailed condition (condition 10) with regard to the fixings of the swift boxes to the energy centre has been suggested following a query from the Ecology Officer. It is considered that the document provides the necessary information to satisfy condition 16 of the outline planning permission, and provides sufficient mitigation in ecology and biodiversity terms conforming to Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/8.

Employment

8.101 The proposed development (Phase 1) will employee approximately 2,500 staff when fully occupied. This will involve a wide range of people from medicines research and medicine development, along with support staff, corporate roles and service roles.

8.102 It is anticipated that of the 2,500 jobs, 500 of these will be staff already working within the Cambridge area (e.g Granta Park), 800 of these jobs will be staff relocated from other sites within the UK, and 1200 will be new jobs available for local people. While housing need and delivery of housing is a key issue locally the level of employment at this and the wider CBC site was considered strategically with the release of the land (both employment and housing land) through the 2006 local plan.

Transport

Transport Impact

8.103 The outline application for the CBC site was accompanied with a full Environmental Statement which assessed the full impact of the development including the transport impact and secured through either the section 106, or planning condition, mitigation measures to ensure that the transport impact of the development is acceptable.

8.104 This transport assessment used trip generation figures derived from the annual Addenbrooke's Travel survey and provided a good level of information over trip generation (looking at the AM peak, PM peak, and 12 hour numbers) as well as the predicted model share (those that arrive by bus, cycle, foot, car driver, car passenger etc.). The Biomedical and Biotech Research and Development floorspace proposed here was included within this assessment. The assessment assumed delivery of both the

Addenbrooke's Access Road (AAR) and the Cambridge Guided Bus (CGB). The County Council accepted the assessment for the site.

8.105 As identified above, a number of measures were secured as mitigation for the proposed transport impact of the CBC development. Contributions were secured for the AAR and CGB which enhanced the strategic vehicular access to the site, as well as strategic public transport links. Payments were also secured through the Section 106 for the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan and improvements to the nearby M11 junction. Through route traffic control was also controlled through the Section 106 as are travel plans and off site car parking (see para 8.196). Furthermore condition 63 of the outline consent requires work to be carried out at the following locations:

1) Hills Road/Fendon Road/Robinson Way Roundabout.
2) Long Road/Trumpington High Street/Trumpington Road intersection
3) Queen Ediths Way/Mowbray Road/Fendon Road.

8.106 As part of this application the applicants have produced updated trip generation information to cross check how the outline assessment compares with this detailed proposal. Table 3.2 within the submitted transport report applies the proposal's mode split to provide a comparison of trips by mode to those set out in the wider CBC Transport Assessment. The assessment applies the staff mode split to all trips rather singling out the visitor trips and applying a visitor mode share. This approach anticipates the number of car trips generated by the site and will be below the number of car trips identified in the outline application.

8.107 Overall the trip assessment shows that the although the development could potentially generate more trips than the CBC Transport Assessment predicted these will include more cyclists and bus passengers, but fewer car drivers and is therefore acceptable to the County Council. It will be for the Travel Plan (discussed below) to encourage staff to travel by sustainable demand to support the modal splits presented. The County Council are content that the application proposals are, in transport terms, consistent with the Outline Application.

Third Party Representations

8.108 Representations received have identified concern with the impact that traffic from the development will have on the adjacent hospital and create issues in the immediate surrounding streets. The impact from the development in transport terms has been fully assessed, and the County Council have confirmed that the development has been adequately assessed and mitigated for at the outline stage. Overspill car parking from the development into surrounding streets is already a key issue locally. The number of parking spaces proposed here have been identified using a credible, robust evidence base (see paras 8.122 to 8.126 below) and will form part of the wider transport strategy for the site and the wider campus. Parking controls on surrounding streets are already in place through the imposition of a recent traffic regulation order (23 November 2012) which imposed various waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on surrounding streets, and monies are identified in the S106 for consultation and implementation should demand arise. Further development on this site and the wider campus will require additional parking spaces to be provided.

8.109 Comments received also state that large demonstrations (linked to animal testing) will cause a disruption to traffic in the local area and will result in parking issues for local people. While transport modelling is based upon a 'typical' daily scenario which wouldn't account for events such as this, it is not considered that numbers would be so high on such a frequent basis that the impact on local traffic patterns and junctions would be materially impacted. Objectors consider that marches will cause massive and unavoidable disruption to traffic. This would be a matter for the Police to manage and consider at the time of any march.

Floorspace on the wider site/Transport impact

8.110 This proposal provides for 59,821sqm of B1(b) floorspace with a further 20,884sqm of potential floorspace in a later phase. This floorspace combined with the LMB floorspace (25,209sqm) provides a residual floorspace value for B1(b) uses of 9,086sqm (this assumes that clinical floorspace will occupy the remainder of the CBC land to the east of this proposal. Two plots on the CBC site (those to the south of the South Plot) remain undeveloped.

8.111 It is likely that the floorspace to occupy those plots to the south will extend beyond the floorspace approved at the outline stage, and while this would need to form a separate application or applications in their own right, some sensitivity testing needs to be carried out at this stage ahead of determining this application. Taking a pro-rata look at the adjacent site(s) one could reasonably consider that development of around 15,000sqm could fit on the site beyond the 9,086sqm that sits under the outline consent; this would represent approximately 7% of additional development.

8.112 While all impacts would need to be assessed transport impact is of key importance. While the additional floorspace would represent more trips, it does so in the context of the wider CBC site. At the outline stage the transport assessment assumed the modal split for single car occupancy would be over 40% of all trips and the assessment was based on this assumption- a figure that would have been identified through historic data. As developments have come forward car modal split has been presented at smaller percentages to this (for example this proposal looks at 27% single occupancy car mode share, the LMB building identified 33%), this is because the observed modal split for single car occupancy has reduced down over the years (Addenbrooke's travel survey shows employee car use was 74% of all trips in 1993, 40% in 2005 and 34% in 2013), and that new occupiers on the CBC site are required to meet the targets within the Addenbrooke's Travel Plan (see Travel Plan section below).

8.113 While a detailed assessment of the transport implications of any additional floorspace on the CBC site will need to be made at a time any application is submitted, the reduction in car trips across the schemes put forward thus far (and assuming that all future users target the travel plan modal shift for the wider Addenbrooke's site), when compared with the outline assumptions, which have been mitigated for through the existing Section 106, implies that additional floorspace could be potentially achieved without significant adverse impact on the transport network. Even if this work is able to demonstrate that the vehicular impact is insignificant, consideration will still need to be given to the impact of the site on sustainable modes.

Travel Plan Approach

8.114 A key aspect of the transport strategy on the CBC site is the approach to travel planning. Addenbrooke's has run a successful travel plan for a number of years and this is now evolving into a fully revised travel plan that recognises the importance of a partnership approach in delivering sustainable transport choices to the wider campus. Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust are the lead partner in this document however it has 'buy in' from all the main partners on the campus including the applicant of this proposal.

8.115 The new campus wide travel plan, titled Caring for our Campus Commuters: Access to Addenbrooke's Plus will look to progress transport initiatives, with greater economies of scale across the wider campus. Actions within the plan span across all modes of transport from walking, cycling and bus transport to looking at the use of the private car and reducing the need to travel in the first instance.

8.116 The applicant has included a draft workplace travel plan as part of their transport report. The travel plan is required through the Section 106 agreement attached to the outline permission and represents the strategy to encourage staff and visitors to the site to travel by more sustainable methods and reduce reliance on the private car.

8.117 The travel plan includes baseline targets to achieve 2 years after first occupation. This includes a modal breakdown which will need to conform to the Addenbrooke's site wide travel plan and will complement the parking provision provided on the site (in terms of car, motorcycle and cycle provision).

8.118 The document identifies Travel Plan Measures that the applicant will put into place to achieve the targets outlined above, and where necessary and beneficial these will link in with the wider campus initiatives. The Travel plan measures cover incentives for using public transport, as well as walking and cycling to work and identify how the applicant will utilise smarter working practices to minimise and ensure more efficient travel. The travel plan also covers conference events, working with partners on the site and looks at how deliveries and waste management factor into the travel plan. Crucially the travel plan covers how the sustainable travel options will be promoted and marketed.

8.119 The Travel Plan will be formalised with the County Council through the Section 106, and this mechanism will be used to monitor and review the travel plan on an on-going basis. Comments from the County Council in respect of the information submitted to date is supportive of the draft travel plan and consider the targets identified to be realistic and achievable. Some suggestions made by the County Council can be incorporated (if agreed by all parties) before the final travel plan sign off through the Section 106.

Access

8.120 Access points into both the North and South Plots are provided for vehicular ingress and egress. For the North Plot this occurs via a separate entrance and exit which serves the main entrance and most of the disabled spaces on Robinson Way as well as a smaller access point which serves the additional four disabled spaces and drop off point to the South west which comes from Francis Crick Avenue. A service and delivery entrance and exit also comes off Francis Crick Avenue to the north of the plot.

8.121 The South Plot provides two points of access, the main access to the car parking for staff and delivery and servicing which sits at the southeastern point of the plot with an ancillary access point for visitor and disabled parking half way along the eastern boundary from Francis Crick Avenue. All of these entrance points provide adequate visibility and width and have not raised objection from the County Council Highway team. There is no objection in terms of highway safety for pedestrians or cyclists from servicing and delivery vehicles as adequate room and visibility is provided for.

Car Parking

8.122 Biotech and Biomedical Research and Development uses are required to provide on plot parking provision for their floorspace proposals. The starting point for provision of parking is the maximum assumed through condition 52 of the Outline Planning Permission. This requires a ratio of 1 space per 72 square metres maximum or fewer spaces as agreed with the local planning authority.

8.123 There is however a need for the applicants to adhere to Travel Plan targets consistent with the wider campus, and in order to do that car driver model share (27%) needs to be adhered to. The car

driver model split can only be met by controlling car parking supply within the site and therefore car parking spaces need to be calculated with that in mind. Based on expected employee numbers (2477), allowing for 80% attendance (it is not expected that all employees will be on the site at any one time) and providing space for 27% of these employees to arrive by car, the number of spaces required are 535. 540 Spaces are provided. 38 Motorcycle spaces are also provided to accommodate the model shift for that mode of transport.

8.124 In looking at staff parking spaces a balance needs to be found between providing adequate spaces on site (to avoid overspill parking), but not over providing which would conflict with the requirement to conform to sustainable transport measures. It is considered that the numbers proposed here strike the right balance, and is based on sound methodology and evidence base (the existing Addenbrooke's model split). The management regime for allocation of these spaces will need careful management (to be identified in the travel plan once finalised), and along with a strong travel plan and good complementary facilities (such as cycle provision and public transport) the spaces provided are acceptable, and supported by the County Council. The proposal therefore complies with local plan policy 8/10 and the outline planning consent.

8.125 On top of the staff parking provisions is an additional 50 visitor parking spaces proposed. There is no outline condition stating the visitor parking numbers, therefore an assessment needs to be based on a case by case basis. Condition 54 stipulates that for clinical uses 1 space per 773square metres are required, which roughly equates to 1 visitor space, every 11 staff spaces. While the County are concerned that this may not be enough visitor spaces, taking that 1:11 ratio here, and looking at the applicants experience on existing sites, 50 spaces is based on a sound evidence base, and therefore considered acceptable.

8.126 Disabled spaces are required, by condition 55 of the outline planning permission, to represent 5% of the overall parking provision. Taking the total 590 spaces identified above 5% of this provision would equate to 30 spaces. 30 spaces are provided in strategic locations on both plots to ensure proximity to entrances. 12 spaces are located along the Robinson Way frontage (adjacent to the main entrance), 4 spaces are provided to the southwest of

the North Plot for proximity to other entrance points, 8 spaces at the northwestern corner of the South Plot close to the R&D Enabling Building and 6 spaces within the visitor parking area. The quantum and location of these spaces are considered acceptable and compliant with planning policy and the outline planning permission.

Cycle Parking

8.127 Conditions 56 and 57 of the outline planning consent require any reserved matters application to provide a summary of the Addenbrooke's Annual Travel Survey showing the current modal share for staff, patients and visitors cycling to Addenbrooke's along with the numbers of staff, patients and visitors visiting the building in any one typical day.

8.128 Condition 58 then requires applicants to calculate the number of staff (assuming 80% staff are on site at any one time) by the modal share for cycling (currently 31%) and add a further 10 percentage points to cater for cycling uplift in the future through travel planning. A similar exercise is then carried out for visitors (using anticipated numbers and the current modal shift). Each visitor space is assumed to be used three times daily.

8.129 These calculations result in the following demand: 812 spaces for staff, and 16 spaces for visitors. The spaces for visitors are based on 14% of modal share (10% over the 4% current model share). The proposed development proposes 828 cycle spaces consistent with the amount required through the condition.

8.130 The detail of the cycle parking itself is required by condition 59 of the outline consent. These details have been submitted as part of the reserved matters application which shows the location of the cycle facilities and the size and spacing of the stands.

8.131 Parking spaces are being provided in the following locations shown in the table below.

Location	Amount	Type
North Plot (North)	186	Sheffield Stands under building canopy
North Plot (East)	188	Sheffield Stands

		under building canopy
North Plot (South West)	76	Sheffield Stands under building canopy
South Plot (North East)	74	Sheffield Stands under building canopy
South Plot (North West)	200	Sheffield Stands and High Capacity racks enclosed facility
South Plot (internal courtyard)	104	Sheffield Stands under building canopy
Total	**828**	

8.132 Of the 828 spaces 628 of these are located under various building canopies, close to the entrance points convenient for users of the buildings. These spaces are Sheffield Stands spaced accordingly and covered by the canopy. Given the locations at clear activity points on the North and South Plot and overlooked by active frontages of the buildings adjacent it is considered that these are secure spaces which will be well used by the employees and visitors to the site.

8.133 For those who wish to add an extra level of security, a separate cycle building in the North Western corner of the South Plot is provided for. The cycle spaces within this building provides some high capacity racks which given the overall number of cycle spaces proposed is acceptable. Changing rooms with showers are provided for in both the North and South Plot close to the cycle provision provided. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policy 8/6 of the Cambridge Local Plan and the conditions (56-59 inclusive) set out in the outline permission.

Public Footpath 47

8.134 Public Footpath 47 runs adjacent to the proposed development. The development does not impact on the use of this footpath and does not prejudice its on-going public use. There is no objection to the development from the County Council.

Public Transport

8.135 This proposal in itself will be well served by the CGB through the provision of a new bus stop within the circus situated in between the North and South Plots (well within 400m specified by policy). Strategically the CBC site is well served by public transport with a number of bus routes running through the site, and Babraham Park and Ride in close vicinity. This level of public transport ensures that employees will be able to travel to the site by public transport.

Transport Conclusion

8.136 The transport impact of this development was assessed at the outline stage. Mitigation measures were identified and sought at that stage. Information submitted with this reserved matters application supports the initial findings of the transport assessment and as such means that the impact of traffic as a result of this development on the network can be accommodated. The applicants have put forward a credible and robust draft travel plan, which will be formalised through Section 106 obligations, and have provided sufficient car and cycle parking on site. While the objections are noted it is considered that the application in transport terms is acceptable and complies with Local Plan Policies 8/2, 8/3, 8/4, 8/5, 8/6, 8/7 and 8/10.

Amenity

Noise and Odour

8.137 The submitted proposal has provided an Extraction Equipment Statement (EES) which describes the various extraction and exhaust systems being designed and integrated into all the buildings proposed. This information is required by condition 30 of the outline planning permission. The EES provides the required supporting data where necessary. This document covers all the science area exhausts for the North Plot building which will be extracted by one of several ‘Strobic’ Fan systems located within the roof level plant rooms. Computational Fluid Dynamic modelling (described in terms of air quality below) has been used to model the discharges and fume extract dispersion patterns.

8.138 Other extraction equipment identified within the EES is kitchen exhaust, and toilet extractor fans for both the North and South Plots as well as Steam Boiler Flues and other odorous extracts from the North Plot. The EES goes on to identify all the differing types of fumes, odours and hazardous materials used on the site and confirms that no significant releases to the atmosphere from the roof extraction systems that would impact on the local safety, health and environment due to the limitations on what shall be released, and due to the extensive dilution factor in place with the strobic fans identified above.

8.139 The EES also covers extraction from the proposed Energy Centre. The main emissions equipment covers heating boiler flues, generator flue gas exhaust air, and CHP flue along with other discharges.

8.140 Environmental Health Officers have considered all the information submitted and are satisfied that the extraction information and data is acceptable. Not all extraction data/plant can be identified at this stage as some will come later on in the design process, and when more certainty is provided as to the type of cooking that will occur in the kitchen/restaurant area(s). Therefore while all the data provided at this stage is acceptable, the outline condition cannot be fully discharged until all of the information is available. This is a 'pre-occupation' condition and therefore will not be required prior to commencement of development. The proposals are therefore considered acceptable in terms of amenity compliant with Cambridge Local Plan Policy 4/13.

Noise Insulation

8.141 Outline condition 31 limits occupation of any building to take place until a scheme for the insulation of the buildings and/or plant is submitted and approved to ensure that the noise levels emanating from the building/plant is acceptable taking into account nearby residents and occupiers. An Insulation Details Statement (IDS) has been submitted in order to discharge this planning condition. The noise survey has been carried out at the 'red line' boundary of the site looking at the North and South Plot buildings which also includes the Energy Centre. The local authority requires cumulative noise emissions as a result of any new development during times of operation not to exceed the existing measured background level.

8.142 The lowest background noise levels ranged between 47and 48dBA during the day and 42-43dBA during the night for the North Plot. For the South Plot facing Francis Crick Avenue 47dBA was recorded during the day, with 40dBA facing the railway line, and 37 to 38dBA measured during the night.

8.143 The IDS identifies that the lowest measured background noise will represent the maximum noise emitted for the cumulative noise levels from plant at the North and South plots. This is considered acceptable and will ensure that there is no amenity harm in terms of noise resulting from this development.

8.144 The gas farm valve noise operations show a slight exceedance over the background noise level of 1-2dBA. These will be relatively short periods (30 to 45 seconds). This along with the delivery noise will be the main source of noise potentially impacting on the adjacent Forum development to the east and the LMB building to the north. Ultimately Environmental Health Officers are content that providing that a condition is imposed to limit deliveries to daytime hours then the adjacent sites are protected in terms of amenity. Therefore a condition limiting deliveries to the Gas Farm to 0700 to 1900 on any given day is suggested (Condition 7)

8.145 Emergency generators are proposed on the ground floor of the Energy Centre. These may exceed the levels stated however testing will only occur for very short periods during the daytime hours and will only be relied upon in the unusual event of a major power failure. Normal provision would be restored as soon as possible. A condition (condition 6) limiting the running of the generators for maintenance to length of time specified by the manufacturer and only between the hours of 8am – 6pm on any given day has been suggested to protect amenity.

8.146 While the information presented thus far in respect of condition 31 has been deemed acceptable by Environmental Health Officers, not all plant and therefore noise levels can be established at this stage. Therefore while all the information and assessment provided at this stage is acceptable, the outline condition cannot be fully discharged until all of the information is available. This is a ‘pre-occupation’ condition and therefore will not be required prior to commencement of development. A condition requiring a post completion verification report has been suggested (condition 5).

The proposals put forward are considered acceptable in terms of amenity, compliant with Cambridge Local Plan Policy 4/13.

Third Party Representations

8.147 Within the objections made to the application concern is raised over noise resulting from protests harming the amenity of local people. While protests may give rise to noise, and noise is a material planning consideration, this noise is not directly related to the development and is the result of third party actions, it cannot therefore be considered reasonable to refuse the application on these grounds.

Local High Pressure Pipeline

8.148 The proposed site sits adjacent to the Teversham to Madingley Road local high pressure pipeline (pipeline 1660). This pipeline has recently been diverted and upgraded to facilitate development on the CBC site. Notwithstanding this, both the Health and Safety Executive, and the pipeline operator (National Grid) have been consulted with regard to the application and offer no objection to the proposal.

Air Quality

8.149 The application submission provided air quality information in the form of Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) modelling to identify and quantify the impact of the development. The CFD modelling simulated the discharges from the laboratories, from the flues of the proposed buildings and modelled the effect of wind across the site.

8.150 The initial modelling submitted with the application drew concern from Environmental Health Officers who were concerned that the results indicated an impact on air quality. Upon seeking clarification this model run had assumed that the oil-fuelled emergency back-up generators were in continuous use, whereas in practice they are likely to be run for emergency situations only and tested once a month for approximately 5 minutes, and then only one at a time and under ‘no load’ conditions. Following the advice from technical officers the applicant remodelled the impact, looking at a realistic scenario in terms of usage and modelling this

with the worst-case scenario (determined from earlier model runs) of below average wind speed from the south west direction.

8.151 The updated results identify maximum concentrations as follows:

- Maximum NO2 at 1.5m is 0.0006 ppm (0.6 ppb) – 1.15 micrograms per cubic metre

This is a worst case scenario, so officers consider that it is likely that the annual average increase, the process contribution, in nitrogen dioxide will be below 1 microgramme per cubic metre across the site, with the plant that has been modelled.

8.152 This level of impact is considered acceptable however this application must be viewed cumulatively with other such developments on the CBC site. More energy supply units are in the pipeline for the CBC site, some already have planning permission, a condition is therefore suggested to monitor the outputs on an on-going basis to ensure the impact does not escalate beyond the acceptable level identified. Subject to this condition (condition 4) it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and complies with policies 4/13 and 4/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan.

Third Party Representations

8.153 Concern has been raised from third parties that there is a lack of information in respect of extraction/fumes associated with the development. Environmental Health Officers consider the level of detail satisfactory to assess the planning application. The condition suggested will ensure the acceptable level identified is maintained. Pollution from traffic has also been raised by third parties, however this application is a reserved matters application, and transport impact including air quality was considered at the outline stage.

Lighting

8.154 A condition on the outline application (condition 29) requires details of the lighting proposals to be submitted and approved by the local authority. An External Lighting report has been submitted as part of this application in order to discharge this condition and show compliance with condition 28 which requires no external up-lighters or down-lighters to the western façade of any building

facing the railway line. The lighting report aims to achieve *ILP guidance for reducing obtrusive light* level E2 which is classified as 'rural' surroundings, with low district brightness typically found in village or relatively dark outer suburban locations. The lighting proposals (including confirmation of compliance with condition 28), identify the façade treatments as well as the lighting detail within the landscape for both the North and South plot showing angles of glare.

8.155 The strategy submitted shows that average building luminance is limited to less than 5 cd/m2 and therefore meets the criteria for zone E2. 'Timelock control' shall be used to enforce night time lighting ensuring that only lighting for safety and security shall be left on after 2300 at night. It is considered that the proposal strikes the right balance between sensitive lighting proposals which provide safety and security on site. The lighting proposals have been considered acceptable by both Landscape and Environmental Health Officers and it is therefore considered that the proposals are adequate to discharge condition 29 and comply with policy 4/15 of the Cambridge Local Plan.

Contamination

8.156 Parallel with this application the applicants are looking to discharge the existing outline conditions (33 and 34) with regard to contamination. A complete Factual and Interpretive Report on Ground Investigation has been provided and includes the necessary rounds of gas monitoring on the site. It is the view of Environmental Health Officers that the site is Characteristic Situation 2 and that a remediation strategy for ground gas is required. Upon receiving an acceptable mitigation strategy the pre-commencement parts of this condition can be discharged.

Sustainability

8.157 Sustainable design and construction has been successfully incorporated into the design of the proposal and include of a BREEAM advisor as part of the design team from the outset, to ensure that achievement of BREEAM 'excellent' has been integrated. From the outset, the buildings have been benchmarked against strategies employed the applicants other sites, with a goal to exceed these benchmarks, particularly in relation to energy. The

design of the buildings has also been evolved to retain capacity for future adaptability in terms of internal layout and use.

8.158 A variety of measures have been incorporated into the design of the proposals including the design of the façade of all buildings to maximise daylight, balanced by the use of solar control triple glazing and internal and external shading to minimise overheating. The landscape also uses a variety of SuDS features, including rills, swales, permeable paving and shallow depressions within the landscape as well as the use of rainwater harvesting for irrigation purposes.

BREEAM

8.159 From the outset, it has been the intention of the applicant to target a minimum of BREEAM 'excellent', which exceeds the requirement for BREEAM 'very good' as set out in Condition 37 of the outline planning permission. To this end, the Renewable Energy Strategy includes BREEAM pre-assessments for the North and South Plot buildings. It should be noted that due to the nature of the building, the energy centre is not being assessed as part of BREEAM, but its design is reflective of the wider aims for sustainable development, and as such elements of the BREEAM methodology has been incorporated into its design, including elements such as water management, responsible sourcing of materials, waste and pollution.

8.160 The BREEAM pre-assessments show that the R&D Enabling Building on the South Plot is achieving a score of 74.02%, while the R&D Centre on the North Plot is currently achieving a score of 72.99%, which means that both buildings will achieve BREEAM 'excellent'.

8.161 It should be noted that the applicants are continuing to work towards a number of other credits, which while their attainment is not certain, could lead the buildings to achieve BREEAM 'outstanding' if these credits can be achieved. Regardless of this the commitment to exceed the requirements attached to the outline permission is fully supported, and while attainment of 'outstanding' is not yet certain, this commitment to innovate and push for exemplar performance is welcomed.

Renewable Energy and Separate Energy Centre

8.162 A detailed Renewable Energy Strategy has been submitted identifying the approach being taken to reduce carbon emissions in line with the requirements of Condition 35 of the outline planning permission. This document sets out the hierarchical approach that has been taken to reducing energy and related carbon emissions with consideration given to both regulated and unregulated energy.

8.163 The comprehensive level of information contained within this document is welcomed, as is the approach to benchmarking the buildings against the energy performance of the applicants other sites, with the aim of exceeding these benchmarks. The design of the energy systems has adopted the energy-carbon hierarchy, which includes engagement with staff to encourage energy conscious behaviour, and approach which is supported.

8.164 The proposals include a separate energy centre to serve the site. It is recognised that discussions have taken place with Addenbrooke's hospital in order to investigate connection to the energy innovation centre (EIC), as opposed to a separate energy centre, but it is noted that agreement has not transpired, and that energy security is of prime importance. Renewable energy content and associated carbon reduction could also not be guaranteed with the approach to connect in to the EIC.

8.165 Notwithstanding this, commitment is made to making provision within the energy centre proposed here for connecting to a future district energy network, with allowances for the primary heating systems to be able to include extended pipework to connect to future networks. Such an approach will provide greater energy resilience across the Cambridge Biomedical Campus in the long term.

8.166 In terms of meeting the requirements of Condition 35 of the outline planning permission, which requires 10% of energy needs to be met by renewable technologies, two technologies are proposed. The first of these is an 1800m^2 ground source heat pump array, located beneath the south plot promenade, which when built will be one of the largest heat pump arrays in Europe. This system will provide both heating and cooling. The second technology is gas fired CHP, to provide both heat and electricity.

8.167 Together these technologies provide a low and zero carbon approach to energy, which, is considered to be the most appropriate energy strategy for the proposals. Together these technologies are predicted to reduce carbon emissions by around 867,237 Kg/CO_2/annum, which equates to a 20.7% reduction. Given that this significantly exceeds the requirements of Condition 35, this approach is supported. As such, given this high sustainability approach along with the need to secure energy the provision of a separate energy centre is accepted.

8.168 There is commitment contained in the Design and Access Statement (page 259) that there will be no additional energy centre(s) for future phase 2 developments. While plant may need to be accommodated within the allocated building footprints for these future buildings, these will be supported by the energy centre being brought forward in this first phase of development, albeit subject to upgrade or refurbishments of equipment, which provides comfort that energy is being looked at comprehensively at this stage.

Third Party Representations

8.169 A significant number of objections believe that if this project is to be approved then it should not take place on the outskirts of a busy city, but instead be hidden in the depths of the countryside where protests can take place without disruption to the wider community.

8.170 The planning authority can only consider the planning land use being considered which is for a B1(b) use. This is consistent with the outline planning approval for this type of floorspace on this site. Providing a B1(b) use in the countryside would go against the current national planning objectives of sustainable development and securing employment close to existing urban settlements and where people can live and work without reliance on the private motorcar, and can access the site by sustainable means of transport. Furthermore, the linking of research work carried out by the applicant with the other occupiers of the wider CBC site is something envisaged and supported as part of strategic planning of the area.

Conclusion

8.171 To conclude the approach that has been taken to integrate the principles of sustainable design and construction into the design of Phase 1 of the AstraZeneca campus, and the approach to reducing carbon emissions through the use of low and zero carbon technology is fully supported. The information is sufficient to discharge conditions 35, 36 and 37 of the outline consistent are compliant with Local Plan Policy 8/16.

Waste Strategy

8.172 Condition 32 of the outline consent requires the details of waste storage for both trade waste and storage to be submitted and approved prior to any development of a building. In order to discharge this condition the applicants have provided an Operation Waste Management Strategy document.

8.173 This document separates out all of the waste streams that will be present on the site (e.g clinical, chemical, radioactive, food, mixed recyclables and residual) and forecasts, based on information available the amount of waste generated and how this will be stored, managed and collected.

8.174 Waste room locations are provided to show how the capacity fits into these store rooms, which are generally located in the basement of the North Plot, and the ground floor of the energy centre building, both of which are close to the servicing collection points on each plot. Initial queries from Environmental Health officers with regard to waste store layouts and sweep path analysis have been addressed by the applicant through additional information/clarification.

8.175 Environmental Health Officers consider that the waste management strategy presented is acceptable and provides an acceptable solution to all the different strands of waste. The document provides all the necessary information in terms of a planning decision.

Third Party Representations

8.176 The representations received highlight concern that there is not sufficient information on how sensitive waste will be dealt and disposed of. Within the Operational Waste document Research Support Facility (RSF) wastes are identified and will follow the

same procedures as clinical waste. Notwithstanding any planning permission granted, the document is clear that for technical waste there are a number of relevant requirements specified in other legislation which will require the safe disposal of waste such as permits required by the Environment Agency for radioactive waste stores.

8.177 It is considered that for the purposes of assessing the planning application sufficient information has been presented, and that this information is acceptable, complies with Local Plan Policy 4/13 and that Condition 32 of the outline consent can be discharged.

Construction

8.178 As a reserved matters application pursuant to the outline consent the construction of this proposal will have to follow the agreement procedures within the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), approved at the outline stage through condition 22. In addition to this, condition 23 of the outline consent requires a site specific Construction Method Statement (CMS) to be submitted prior to commencement of development. This document has been submitted as part of a combined construction document that covers the CMS, as well as the Detailed Waste Management Plan (outline condition 24), Foundation details (outline condition 25) as well as confirming Construction times and Collection and Delivery times (outline conditions 26 and 27)

8.179 The CMS will control the construction process in terms of local impacts and residential amenity. The CMS identifies that construction traffic will access the site from the M11 (J11), and will travel along Hauxton Road, then Addenbrooke's Road before entering the site on Francis Crick Avenue. Exiting the site will follow the same route in reverse. Delivery times are specified in the document as 0730 to 1800 Monday to Friday and 0800 to 1300 on Saturdays. No Deliveries on Sundays or Public Holidays. Construction times are limited to 0730 to 1800 Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 on Saturday and no time Sundays and public holidays. These times are consistent with outline conditions 26 and 27.

8.180 In addition to this the document identifies the site set up and hoarding details, along with proposals for dust management, wheel washing measures, and drainage control measures. Detail on

noise and vibration management is also included within the document.

8.181 Officers have considered the CMS element within the Combined Construction Document and are satisfied that the proposals represent sound construction methods and will ensure that the project is suitably managed ensuring that impact on the highway network and residential amenity is adequately dealt with. It is therefore considered that the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan Policy 4/13 and is sufficient to discharge Outline Condition 23.

8.182 The Detailed Waste Management Plan (DWMP) section for construction identifies the anticipated nature and volumes of waste during construction, and requires the applicant to identify how it will maximize the reuse of waste.

8.183 The measures proposed to minimise the arising of waste e.g. through design and format of materials are welcomed, including the requirement for sub-contractor to also complete a Sub Contractor Waste Minimisation Plan. The continuous auditing of waste management will aid the management of waste and the completion of the Waste Management Closure Report. The project will work against any material being sent to landfill with less than 3% of waste going to landfill, with a ultimate target of 0%; this aim is welcomed.

8.184 Officers consider that the proposed DWMP is acceptable and meets all the requirements set out within the outline condition (24).

8.185 Outline Condition 25 requires that should piling be required a method statement is submitted and approved looking at potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations. This information has been provided and is considered acceptable by Environmental Health Officers, and is therefore considered compliant with Cambridge Local Plan Policy 4/13; the condition can therefore be discharged.

Public Art

8.186 As part of the strategic approval a public art strategy has been approved for the wider site which focuses on two main ‘strands’. The CBC Artist In Residence (AIR) programme and the Circus

Public Realm Commission. This proposal is deemed to have 'paid into' these strands which formed the strategic approval and therefore there is no requirement for individual reserved matters applications to input beyond this. The evolving design for the Circus is currently taking place which will include the main public art for the campus.

8.187 Notwithstanding this, the public art strategy does however encourage further art commissions and interventions funded by stakeholders, and in this context the applicants have come forward with public art proposals of their own.

8.188 A public art delivery plan has been submitted with the reserved matters application which sets out how the applicant will introduce public art into this site. The applicant will explore two themes for art; Visible Science and Connections and Interactions, these themes have are supported. Officers welcome the applicant's willingness to add further public art to the site and welcome the vision within the document to create a strategic approach to development of public art.

8.189 The delivery of the public art within the document is based on developing the AIR programme first in order to influence the main commission on the site. However there is concern that by the end of this AIR process the design development and build will be too advanced for a commission(s) to integrate into the any design stages. Officers therefore propose that the a programme of commissions is set within an indicative timetable which show key milestones in the development process against the stages of art. A condition is therefore suggested to require an updated Public Art Delivery Plan to be submitted and approved six months after the date of any consent granted which will enable the evolution of the document.

8.190 The application site will also contribute to the Cambridge Community Collection and will accommodate apple trees within the landscaping proposals as part of that scheme.

8.191 The proposed PADP along with the public art strategy art secured through the outline consent are, subject to the suggested condition, compliant with local plan policy and consistent with the public art SPD. These details submitted are beyond the requirements for the outline permission and therefore do not need

to be submitted pursuant to conditions 64 to 66 of the outline consent and do not require discharge as such.

Archaeology

8.192 An archaeological investigation was secured as part of the outline approval and has been undertaken for this site in advance of the planning application. The main phase of excavation has now been completed. Post excavation assessment is the next step which will involve specialist assessments to be undertaken.

Planning Obligations

8.193 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.

In bringing forward the recommendation in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development officers have considered the above requirements

8.194 This application is a reserved matters application pursuant to an outline consent that was approved with a section 106 agreement. Below is a summary of the mitigation measures were necessary as a result of the proposed development.

Transport

8.195 Financial contributions were secured towards the following:

- Addenbrooke's Access Road (phase 1 and 2)
- Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan.
- M11 junction improvements
- Cambridge Guided Bus

- Cambridge Guided Bus revenue
- Local transport initiatives

Other S106 requirements

- Travel plan
- Control of through traffic
- Limitation of off plot car parking
- Parking survey contribution
- Parking management contribution

8.196 It should be noted that many of these requirements have been triggered by the recent New Papworth Hospital approval and further triggers will come forward if this application is approved. In terms of the AAR and CGB payments these works have already been carried out and are operational. This is also the case with the M11 junction improvements. The SCATP payments have only recently been triggered (and therefore paid) and the County will look to spend these monies through there agreed procedures.

Public Art

- A budget for public art provision was secured at the outline stage and a public art strategy for the wider site has been approved and is being carried out in accordance with that approved document.

In addition to this finanacial contributions have been secured towards the following:

S106 monitoring

- Performance monitoring

Landscape/ Ecological improvements

- Ecological mitigation measures at Nine Wells
- Off-site landscaping

Proposed occupiers

- Requirement for future occupiers to agree they fall under the terms of the local plan policy prior to application submission.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.197 The outline permission secures adequate mitigation for all the entire build out of the CBC site. Some of the provisions above will be triggered when certain milestones in floorspace are passed. Ultimately there is no requirement for any additional S106 measures on the back of this application as it falls entirely within the parameters of the outline approval. The contributions for the performance monitoring and ecological improvements have been paid to the city council in full.

Other Issues

8.198 Concerns have been expressed from the objectors that there is not enough information included within the application with respect to the use of animal testing. The application provides all the necessary information required in order for the planning authority to make a land use planning decision and information has been submitted to cover all the planning impacts of the development. Further information on animal testing would need to be supplied by the applicant in respect of any permits or consents through separate legislation. These permissions/consents/licenses do not come through the planning authority.

8.199 The applicant has supplied a list of such permits that would be required from other regulatory bodies which has raised concern from an additional third party representation asking the applicant to expand on the nature of what activities will occur on site due to potential public safety concerns. For a land use planning decision detailed knowledge of the exact nature of activity on site is not required, and the Council is content that the level of information supplied has enabled it to make a considered decision on the proposed B1(b) Biomedical and Biotech Research and Development use put before it.

8.200 Objections state that if approval is granted then there is hope that the applicant will commit to the continued reduction of its use of animals in testing and ultimately replace all research on animals. Any commitment on this issue by the applicant is not material to this planning decision and is controlled by separate legislation.

8.201 Objections also state that there will be public safety issues with protests passing through busy roads, adjacent to the hospital and other sensitive uses. This will also be a concern for emergency access associated with the hospital. Objections also identify an issue with Police resources associated with increased protester activity.

8.202 While protests may occur the route, and any public safety considerations will need to be considered by the Police. Any public safety issues, and noise resulting from demonstrations are a matter for the police to deal with. Officers do not consider it would be reasonable to refuse any planning application on these grounds. Cambridgeshire Constabulary has commented on the planning application and have not raised the issue of capacity as a concern. The possible impact on tourism cannot be considered reason to refuse this application.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposal sits within the outline consent and has been developed in line with approved parameter plans and site wide strategies, and has evolved further through detailed discussions with technical officers at the local authority. Through assessment of the application it is considered that the proposal complies with the approved development plan.

9.2 While there are a large number of representations received, and the points made in these representations have been carefully considered, none of the points raised offer sufficient reasoning or justification to part with the development plan in this instance.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

Building Signage

1. Prior to the erection of any signage on the buildings hereby approved, details of the signage identifying the proposed location(s) size, wording and materials of the signage shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The signage shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

   Reason: To ensure that the signage complements the design approach to the building (Local Plan Policy 3/4)

Materials fixing

2. Prior to the erection of the mesh screen panels on the Energy Centre building hereby approved, full details showing how the horizontal breaks will be detailed shall be submitted to, and approved by the local planning authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

   Reason: To ensure that some form of horizontal demarcation is achieved between floors. (Local Plan Policy 3/4)

Landscape

3. Notwithstanding the approved plans listed in Condition 11, specifically plan no. CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-94-1231 P02, Only one London Plane tree shall be planted in the section between the entrance and exit to the service/delivery yard.

   Reason: To ensure that the tree has adequate space to reach maturity and maintain the setting of the public realm (Local Plan Policy 4/4)

Air Quality

4.

   a) Prior to occupation of the development, details of fuel sources and plant associated with the energy centre, including any abatement mechanisms shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Resulting emissions from the development hereby approved shall not result in an increase in the annual average level of more than 1 microgramme per cubic metre of nitrogen dioxide and 1 microgramme per cubic metre of particulate matter. The

scheme as approved shall be fully carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall be thereafter retained.

b) The plant and any necessary abatement equipment shall be associated with a written schedule of maintenance, which shall be submitted to the local planning authority prior to installation. Annual maintenance reports shall be submitted to the local planning authority for the lifetime of the plant or until the Local Planning Authority confirms in writing that the report is no longer necessary.

c) The plant and any necessary abatement equipment shall be subjected to emissions monitoring agreed in writing with the local planning authority prior to its installation.

d) The plant and any necessary abatement equipment shall be maintained and monitored in accordance with the approved details. The applicant should supply a schedule for provision of data and reports (monitoring and maintenance) for each 12 month period. The plant equipment shall be monitored post-installation for a proving period of every 3 months for 2 years to demonstrate compliance with the emissions limits, using UKAS accredited methods.

e) Monitoring shall take place every 12 months thereafter and annual reports shall be submitted to the local authority for the lifetime of the plant, or until the local planning authority confirms in writing that the report is no longer necessary.

f) If monitoring results show that emissions will lead to ambient levels above those expressed above, a method statement to bring the levels back under the emissions limits shall be submitted for approval by the local planning authority. Works shall then be carried out as approved and monitored to ensure compliance.

Reason: To ensure that emissions do not adversely impact on air quality. Local Plan Policy 4/14

Noise

5. Prior to occupation a post construction / installation verification / completion report for the development to incorporating details of

the plant installed, and demonstrating compliance with the approved noise insulation scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The completion report shall include details of the mitigation of noise emissions from the emergency generators, which shall include all reasonably practicable measures to reduce noise during testing and operation.

The noise insulation/attenuation scheme as approved shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved details and shall not be altered without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties. Local Plan Policy 4/13

Emergency Generator Use

6. The Emergency generator(s) shall only be used in the event of mains power failure or running for maintenance purposes.

Running of the generator as part of routine maintenance and repair shall only take place for the length of time specified by the manufacturer between the hours of 0800hrs and 1800hrs on any given day.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties. Local Plan Policy 4/13

Gas Farm

7. There shall be no deliveries to the Gas Farm other than between the hours of 0700hrs and 1900hrs on any given day.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties. Local Plan Policy 4/13

Fire Hydrants

8. Prior to occupation a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the

approved details and the approved scheme shall be fully operational prior to the first occupation of that development parcel.

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate water supply infrastructure to protect the safe living and working environment for all users and visitors (Policies 3/7, 3/12 and 8/18 of the Cambridge Local Plan).

Public Art

9. Within 6 months of the date of this planning permission a public art delivery plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, which sets out the due process and project milestones in relation to construction and how public art proposals will integrate with the construction timeline. The public art proposals shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and within the timescales specified in the agreed document.

Reason: To ensure the adequate provision of public art on the site (Policies 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan).

Bird Boxes

10. Prior to the erection of the of bird boxes on the Energy Centre building hereby approved, full details and specification of the bird boxes showing how they will integrate with the Energy Centre hereby approved shall be submitted to, and approved by the local planning authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the swift boxes are effective for the purposes of ecological mitigation and are integrated within the proposed design. (Local Plan Policies 3/4 and 4/8)

Drawing Numbers

11. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings and technical documents.

CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-000001 P01
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-000111 P05
CB001-BDP-XX-L00-DR-A-201200 P04

CB001-BDP-XX-L10-DR-A-201210 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-L20-DR-A-201220 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-L30-DR-A-201230 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-R00-DR-A-201240 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-B10-DR-A-201260 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-B05-DR-A-201265 P04
CB002-BDP-XX-L00-DR-A-201200 P03
CB002-BDP-XX-L10-DR-A-201210 P02
CB002-BDP-XX-L20-DR-A-201220 P02
CB002-BDP-XX-L30-DR-A-201230 P02
CB002-BDP-XX-R00-DR-A-201240 P02
CB002-BDP-XX-R10-DR-A-201250 P01
CB005-BDP-XX-L00-DR-A-201200 P06
CB005-BDP-XX-L10-DR-A-201210 P06
CB005-BDP-XX-L20-DR-A-201220 P06
CB005-BDP-XX-L30-DR-A-201230 P06
CB005-BDP-XX-R00-DR-A-201240 P06
CB005-BDP-XX-R00-DR-A-201260 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-203201 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-203202 P06
CB002-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-203201 P02
CB005-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-203201 P06
CB001-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-204201 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-204202 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-204203 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-204211 P01
CB002-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-204201 P02
CB001-BDP-XX-L00-DR-A-211200 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-L10-DR-A-211210 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-L20-DR-A-211220 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-L30-DR-A-211230 P02
CB001-BDP-XX-R00-DR-A-211240 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-B10-DR-A-211260 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-B05-DR-A-211265 P04
CB001-BDP-XX-L00-DR-A-212200 P02
CB001-BDP-XX-B05-DR-A-212265 P02
CB002-BDP-XX-L00-DR-A-211200 P02
CB002-BDP-XX-L10-DR-A-211210 P01
CB002-BDP-XX-L20-DR-A-211220 P01
CB002-BDP-XX-L30-DR-A-211230 P01
CB002-BDP-XX-R00-DR-A-211240 P01
CB002-BDP-XX-L00-DR-A-212200 P02
CB005-BDP-XX-L00-DR-A-211200 P01
CB005-BDP-XX-L10-DR-A-211210 P03
CB005-BDP-XX-L20-DR-A-211220 P03
CB005-BDP-XX-L30-DR-A-211230 P03
CB005-BDP-XX-L00-DR-A-212200 P01
CB005-BDP-XX-R00-DR-A-211240 P01
CB001-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-214201 P03
CB001-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-214202 P03

CB001-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-214203 P03
CB001-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-214204 P03
CB002-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-214201 P01
CB005-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-214201 P06
CB001-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-214401 P01
CB001-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-214402 P01
CB001-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-214403 P01
CB002-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-214401 P01
CB001-EPP-XX-L00-DR-Y-216808 P03
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-201300 P01
CB005-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-214401 P03
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941221 P03
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941231 P02
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941241 P02
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941332 P01
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941333 P01
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941334 P01
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941335 P01
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-943201 P01
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-943601 P03
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-943621 P03
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-943642 P01
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-943745 P01
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941251 P04
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941252 P02
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941261 P02
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941262 P02
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941271 P02
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941272 P02
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941363 P01
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-941364 P01
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-943631 P01
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-943651 P02
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-L-946801 P01
CB000-BDP-XX-B10-DR-A-001260 P01
CB000-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-M-963701 P01
CB-006-SUK-XX-XXX-DR-D-520201 P02.01
CB-006-SUK-XX-XXX-DR-D-520202 P02.01
CB-006-SUK-XX-XXX-DR-D-520203 P02.01
CB-006-SUK-XX-XXX-DR-D-520251 P02.01
CB-006-SUK-XX-XXX-DR-D-520252 P02.01
CB-006-SUK-XX-XXX-DR-D-520253 P02.01
CB-006-SUK-XX-XXX-DR-D-520254 P03.01
CB005-BDP-XX-XXX-DR-A-204201 P06

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

Food Safety

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is reminded that under the Food Safety Act 1990 (as amended) the supermarket and any other premises run as a food business will need to register with Cambridge City Council. In order to avoid additional costs it is recommended that the applicant ensure that food areas including food preparation and food storage areas comply with food hygiene legislation, before construction starts. Contact the Commercial Team of the Refuse and Environmental Service at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457890 for further information.

Health and Safety

INFORMATIVE: As parts of the development are intended to be run as businesses, the applicant is reminded of their duty under the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2007 to ensure that the that all significant risks related to the design and operation of the premises are minimised. Contact the Health and Safety Executive for further information on 03000 031747.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Floorspace table
Appendix 2: Detailed representations and address list
Appendix 3: Cambridgeshire Quality Panel

Appendix 1- Cambridge Biomedical Campus Approved Floorspace

Floorspace Type	Biomedical and Biotech R&D (B1(b))	Clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment)	Clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment) OR Higher Education OR Sui generis medical research institute uses	Biomedical and Biotech R&D (B1(b)) OR Clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment)	Total
Approved by outline permission Square metres	115,000	60,000	25,000	15,000	215,000
LMB Building (07/0651/FUL)	25,209	-	-	-	25,209
New Papworth Hospital (14/1411/REM)	-	-	18,300	15,000	33,300
AstraZeneca (14/1633/REM)	59,821	-	-	-	59,821
Total Detailed Floorspace Approved	25,209	0	18,300	15,000	58,509
Total Pending	59,821	0	0	0	59,821
Total remaining	29,970	60,000	6,700	0	96,970

Key	
Approved	
Pending	

Appendix 2- Detailed Representations

1. Objections

Animal Testing/ Obligation through EU Directive

There is little information included in the application about the proposed use of animals: Despite having submitted a planning application which runs to hundreds of pages and contains a great level of detail about many aspects of the project, there is very little mention of animal use or facilities.

The NAVS has noted that there is very little mention of animal use or facilities in the hundreds of pages submitted by AstraZeneca supporting its planning application, aside from a general note of their use in the Planning statement (pg 37), in which it is claimed that *"Animal studies are a small but vital part of the research process. They are also required by regulators before they will approve a new medicine to be tested in humans. AstraZeneca is committed to the responsible use of animals and their welfare is a top priority at all times. Wherever possible AstraZeneca use non animal methods such as cell culture, computer modelling and high-throughput screening that eliminate the need to use animals early in drug development, or reduce the number needed. They also work to refine existing methods. The 3Rs (replace, reduce, refine) are at the centre of AstraZeneca's commitment to good science and the responsible use of animals".*

According to AstraZeneca, in 2013 they used or commissioned the use of 280,606 animals. This is a reduction on the total of 328,000 used in 2012. AstraZeneca claim that the number of animals they use *"will continue to vary because it depends on a number of factors including the amount of pre-clinical research we are doing, the complexity of the diseases under investigation and the regulatory requirements".* Contrary to the statement that they reduce the number of animals wherever possible, AstraZeneca will allow other factors to dominate the number of animals they use

The UK has an obligation to work towards ending animal experiments: EU Directive 2010/63/EU, which is now in UK law, creates a duty to work towards the "full replacement of procedures on live animals for scientific and educational purposes as soon as it is scientifically possible to do so". AstraZeneca continue to use a large number of animals in research, 280,606 in 2013, questioning the

company's commitment to the goal of full replacement.

The use of animals in experiments is set to decline: The market for non-animal research is now about the same size as the contract research testing industry, and is projected to double by 2017. AstraZeneca should acknowledge this shift away from animal use and highlight how they will facilitate the development of alternative methods. AstraZeneca operating profit for the third quarter of 2014 was $1,770 million, with an operating profit of $5,753 million for the first nine months of 2014. With such levels of profits to invest in advanced and cutting edge technologies, few non-animal tests should be out of reach to AstraZeneca. It would be an economic advantage to Cambridge as sophisticated new technologies which do not involve outdated animal testing are developed and this new knowledge built upon.

If approval should be granted for this application, I hope that AstraZeneca will commit to the continued reduction of its use of animals, and ultimately the replacement of all research on animals, the ultimate goal of the EU Directive, which is now UK law. In the meantime I hope that they will outline in some detail the steps which will be taken to ensure that the facilities comply fully with UK regulations.

AstraZeneca's proposal goes against the spirit of the EU Directive (Directive 2010/63/EU) in as much as it will include an animal laboratory. Yet another animal laboratory in Cambridge would be diametrically opposed to the objective of the EU Directive to reduce the number of animals used in experiments. Any new developments in Cambridge, considering the already plentiful animal research facilities, should be solely focussed on other human relevant methods of research, making the promised "The Uk are the leaders in medical research" which means following examples from other countries i.e., biomedical engineering from the wyss institute, this is human relevant and helping humans and not supporting research using animals that is proven scientifically invalid. This is of a national importance.

AstraZeneca plans to use animals in experiments on the site despite the fact Directive 2010/63/EU creates an obligation on the government to reduce the numbers of animals used in research. The Coalition government published it's Delivery Plan in February 2014 (ISBN 978-1-78246-4 BIS/14/589). This means that the government must reduce the number of animals used in research.

The current development is in direct opposition to this objective. Animal

experiments do not help scientific progress or medical advancement. Many studies have shown that animals predict correctly for humans less than 50% of the time. (See Perel, P and colleagues. British Medical Journal (2007) 27: 197–200; Hackam, DG and Redelmeier DA. Journal of the American Medical Association(2006) 296: 1731–1732; Bailey, J. Biogenic Amines, vol.19, N° 2, pp 97-146, May 2005).

When experiments are done on animals data relevant to the species experimented upon is obtained. The problem is data cannot be accurately extrapolated between species. Drugs that are found to be useful in other species harm or kill human beings once they make it to human clinical trials or to market.
92% of new drugs fail in clinical trials, after they have been found safe in animals (See US Food and Drug Administration (2004) Innovation or Stagnation, Challenge and Opportunity on the Critical Path to New Medical Products.)

We need to move forward and the government is legally committed to doing so. If you allow this development to go ahead you will be dragging science back into the dark ages! Given the government's commitments this development is unsustainable and not in the national interest.

The NAVS opposes animal experimentation as **there are profound physiological differences between humans and animals that make results from these tests unreliable**. This fundamental flaw of animal-based research is referred to as ‘species differences’. Each species responds differently to substances, therefore animal tests are unreliable as a way to predict effects in humans.

Furthermore, there are now many non-animal replacement methods which negate the need for animal research. Every year millions of animals suffer and die in experiments that can never be trusted. It is claimed vivisection is essential to medical progress; however our research and scientific studies indicate that, not only are animal experiments misleading, they can actually hold up medical progress.

The unreliable nature of animal testing was highlighted in the media in March 2006 when the trial of test drug TGN1412 went disastrously wrong. The drug was given to healthy volunteers in doses 500 times weaker than that given to laboratory monkeys, but in an hour the volunteers were so seriously ill that they had to be transferred to intensive care at London’s Northwick Park Hospital.

Transport

The increased road usage from the staff at the AstraZeneca site will impact upon access to Addenbrookes Hospital and create issues around the residential streets in the immediate vicinity.

Increased traffic flow due to animal rights demonstrators who would inevitably plan peaceful but large demonstrations at the site will cause a disruption to the traffic flow in the area. This could be especially harmful as Addenbrookes Hospital and Long Road Sixth Form College are immediately adjacent to the site**. It is likely that activists will park in the surrounding residential streets causing additional traffic problems and problems for residents in terms of access to parking.** We argue that this is a material planning consideration given the inevitability of these protests which are protected by Article 10 and 11 of the European Convention of Human Rights as transposed into domestic law by the Human Rights Act 1998.

Marches will cause massive and unavoidable disruption to traffic in Cambridge. This will have an impact on the hospital and other amenities within Cambridge. AstraZeneca staff and animal rights protesters will increase the traffic flow on the road on a daily basis only further exacerbating the problem. Animal rights activists and pro-animal research advocates coming to protest for and against the site will inevitably park in the near-by residential streets causing problems for residents and workers in the area. Protests can be expected daily and to be of a reasonable size, this must be considered before any application is accepted.

Sustainability of the Development

With the number of animals to be tested on being reduced by the EU Directive, the animal laboratory is unsustainable and is likely to fall into disuse in the next few years as the government implements its objectives of cutting down the numbers of animals used, and as scientific discovery allows more advanced methods of research.

Public Safety at The Site

Inevitable protests against the site will unavoidably pass through Long road. This is a very busy road and ir is close to Addenbrookes Hospital as well as having a Sixth form College situated on it. It is likely therefore that public safety will be

jeopardised. Similar concerns to the planning application for the Girton Primate Experimentation Laboratory submitted by the University of Cambridge in early 2000 were raised. The planning permission was consistently rejected at a local level.

Animal labs are dangerous places where all sorts of compounds, illnesses and conditions are forced upon animals. AstraZeneca has not provided detailed information of the exact types of experiments to be conducted and what safety measures will be put in place in terms of bio-security.

What if animals escape? **Without knowing the exact type of research going to take place at the site how can the public comment on the risk they may face.** Will the site be using GM technologies and could an escape of animals destroy local biodiversity and human health? Are contagious illnesses going to be researched? Could human lives be at risk in the local community if something was to leak out or an animal was to escape?

The public cannot comment without knowing what the risks to public safety might be.

AstraZeneca must submit a detailed breakdown of the exact type of experiments, compounds and illnesses they will be using at this site. There must be a full independent risk assessment of the worst case scenarios including effect of the escape of infected animals, chemicals or illnesses. Once full and detailed information has been provided there must be an adequate public comment period.

Long Road is likely to be used for protests for and against the development, this is a very busy road. Long Road and other surrounding roads provide emergency access to Addenbrookes Hospital. Having a controversial site at this location with possible clashes of demonstrators may put public safety at risk.

Animal experimentation public relations group Speaking of Research has asked Cambridge students to start a pro-animal testing protest group in Cambridge so such clashes are a real possibility.

The proposed location, near the hospital and busy roads, puts the safety of animal rights activists, pro-animal testing advocates and uninvolved members of the public at risk. For the safety of the people of Cambridge this application must be rejected.

Environment and Waste Disposal

AstraZeneca has not provided detailed explanations as to the exact type of research on animals that is going to take place. Details are required about the nature of the research and procedures to be used in order to establish whether the activities will give rise to hazardous substances or waste. Public health and safety is a material planning consideration and information is therefore required in relation to the nature of the experiments. AstraZeneca must account for and explain in detail whether it will be using hazardous organisms and chemicals and, if so, how the waste (ie. Contaminated blood, faecal matter, body tissues and other waste materials) will be disposed of.

What kinds of chemicals and compounds are going to be kept at the site and what bio-security measures are going to be taken in storage and disposal? The application does not contain enough information for the public to be able to give informed comments on this.

What is the worst case scenario if something leaks/escapes from the site to the local ecosystem? How could it impact biodiversity? Are non-native species going to be held at the site? Without a full detailed breakdown of the exact type of experiments, the compounds, chemicals, species/breeds of animals to be held at the site it is impossible for informed comments to be made. All this information must be made available to the public. Once full and detailed information has been provided there must be an adequate public comment period.

Proposals for Alternative Use of The Site

We recognise the importance of scientific research and the following suggestions are for alternative uses of the site:
a) AstraZeneca build their HQ and instead of an animal laboratory host exclusively human relevant research, making the promised "The Uk are the leaders in medical research" which means following examples from other countries i.e., biomedical engineering from the wyss institute, this is human relevant and helping humans.
b) The site be used to build a centre for the replacement of animal experiments, example above - given the large number of animal testing facilities within Cambridge and surrounding areas.There is no need for an additional animal laboratory. However, there is need in line with the government's obligations to reduce the number of animals used in

research (as per Directive 2010/63/EU) although i don't agree with the 3Rs, because its impossible to reduce something when it is scientifically proven to have failed, it might as well be abandoned now.

Noise

There will be an adverse impact on adjacent properties due to inevitable protests and demonstrations and the associated noise, disturbance and disruption to traffic.
Amplified sound is a lawful part of peaceful protest as per Justice Holland's Ruling in the High Court (HLS Group PLC v SHAC 2007 WL 919475 [2007] EWHC 522 (QB) QBD
Such demonstrations would have consequences that are relevant to planning interests eg. Interference with the normal enjoyment of neighbouring property such as Addenbrookes Hospital (including emergency access) and Long road Sixth Form College and childcare facility, Kids Unlimited. Also the residential properties in the neighbouring streets.

Noise and disruption will be caused by marches and static protests both for and against the development. These events will be regular and continuous. Many of the protests may be staged on Long Road and marches may go along residential streets.

The NOAV network will encourage activists to work with the police to minimise any disruption. However some activists may not do this (as a decentralised network we have no power to compel anyone) and even where all good-faith efforts are made some disruption will be inevitable.

Other Issues

NOAV respects the difficult and important job done by the police. **If this development goes ahead there will be a long-term need to increased policing funds for Cambridge. Protests will need to be facilitated and if there is any criminality on either side there will need to be enough officers to deal with public order and any resulting investigations.**

In order to deal with the increased risk to public order there may be a need to use undercover officers or police informants within groups either opposed or supportive of the development. This will cost large sums of money.

Cambridge needs its police out on the beat dealing with crime and antisocial behaviour not dealing with continuous protest. This development's location is totally inappropriate, this busy city is not the place for it. If this development was in the countryside protests, disorder and police would be easier to deal with.

Cambridge does not have the budget to waste on astronomical policing costs for the benefit of a single company, who are bringing in many of their staff from outside Cambridge!

2. Support

Animal Testing/ Obligation through EU Directive

I know that the whys and wherefores of animal research are not pertinent to planning law, but I would like to point out that, **by law (the Animals in Scientific Procedures Act), no animal can be used for research in the UK if there is a non-animal alternative available that would give the same results. Thus all users of animals for research in the UK have, by law, to use replacements if they are available.** No-one wants to use animals, but until more alternatives are created, we still need to use a small number of animals if we are to progress medical research and find treatments and cures for diseases such as cancer, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, Ebola and the many others that we currently cannot cure.

3. Ground of objection for the Petition

Traffic

The increased road usage from the staff at the AstraZeneca site will impact upon access to Addenbrookes Hospital and create issues around the residential streets in the immediate vicinity. Increased traffic flow due to animal rights demonstrators who would inevitably plan peaceful but large demonstrations at the site will cause a disruption to the traffic flow in the area. This could be especially harmful as Addenbrookes Hospital and Long Road Sixth Form College are immediately adjacent to the site. It is likely that activists will park in the surrounding residential streets causing additional traffic problems and problems for residents in terms of access to parking. We argue that this is a material planning consideration given the inevitability of these protests which are protected by Article 10 and 11 of the European Convention of Human Rights as transposed into domestic law by the Human Rights Act 1998. In addition, delivery vehicles coming to and from the site would strongly affect pedestrian and cycle safety. Particularly as there is a cycle path in close proximity to the site.

National Interest/Importance

AstraZeneca's proposal goes against the spirit of the EU Directive (Directive 2010/63/EU) in as much as it will include an animal laboratory. Yet another animal laboratory in Cambridge would be diametrically opposed to the objective of the EU Directive to reduce the number of animals used in experiments. Any new developments in Cambridge, considering the already plentiful animal research facilities, should be solely focussed on other human relevant methods of research.

Sustainability of the Development

With reference to point 2 (ie. the number of animals to be tested on is to be reduced), the animal laboratory is unsustainable and is likely to fall into disuse in the next few years as the government implements its objectives of cutting down the numbers of animals used, and as scientific discovery allows more advanced methods of research.

Public Safety at The Site

Inevitable protests against the site will unavoidably pass through Long road. This is a very busy road and ir is close to Addenbrookes Hospital as well as having a sixth form college situated on it. It is likely therefore that public safety will be jeopardised. Similar concerns to the planning application for the Girton Primate Experimentation Laboratory submitted by the University of Cambridge in early 2000 were raised. The planning permission was consistently rejected at a local level.

Public safety - Environment Factors

AstraZeneca has not provided detailed explanations as to the exact type of research on animals that is going to take place. Details are required about the nature of the research and procedures to be used in order to establish whether the activities will give rise to hazardous substances or waste. Public health and safety is a material planning consideration and information is therefore required in relation to the nature of the experiments. AstraZeneca must account for and explain in detail whether it will be using hazardous organisms and chemicals and, if so, how the waste (ie. Contaminated blood, faecal matter, body tissues and other waste materials) will be disposed of. There is a strong possibility that the increased incineration of waste will lead to the creation of dioxins from the burning of heterogeneous waste streams. This makes optimum temperatures for the safe destruction of individual waste stream components impossible to achieve. There is a likelihood of organic material and plastics forming a high proportion of waste, especially chlorinated compounds exacerbating the aforementioned dioxin risk. There is the possibility of heavy metals in the waste stream which won't be destroyed but dispersed over a wide area. Delivery vehicles coming to and from the site would increase pollution levels both locally and in terms of the wider environment. As regards biosecurity – there is very little information about the type of experiments that may be conducted on the site. There is considerable risk to the environment and public safety should rodents escape into the surrounding area. As concerns all these points - we would like to remind you that this site will be in close proximity to a hospital, sixth form college and childcare facility.

Proposals for Alternative Use of The Site

We recognise the importance of scientific research and the following suggestions are for alternative uses of the site: a) AstraZeneca build their HQ and instead of an animal laboratory host exclusively human relevant research. b) The site be used to build a centre for the replacement of animal experiments, given the large number of animal testing facilities within Cambridge and surrounding areas.There is no need for an additional animal laboratory. However, there is need in line with the government's obligations to reduce the number of animals used in research (as per Directive 2010/63/EU) for additional capacity for research into alternatives and replacements for animal experiments.

Noise/Disruption

There will be an adverse impact on adjacent properties due to inevitable protests and demonstrations and the associated noise, disturbance and disruption to traffic. Amplified sound is a lawful part of peaceful protest as per Justice Holland's Ruling in the High Court (HLS Group PLC v SHAC 2007 WL 919475 [2007] EWHC 522 (QB) QBD Such demonstrations would have consequences that are relevant to planning interests eg. Interference with the normal enjoyment of neighbouring property such as Addenbrookes Hospital (including emergency access) and Long road Sixth Form College and a large childcare facility. Also the residential properties in the neighbouring streets.

Animal welfare

Whilst we are aware that this is not a material planning consideration, we would ask you to acknowledge that whilst AstraZenrca claims high standards of animal welfare, the project licenses granted allow them to cause “pain, suffering, distress or lasting harm.” Animals are sentient beings and should be treated as such, There is not enough detailed information about animal welfare at the site. I n conclusion we suggest to you that the proposed planning application involves too great a risk to the public and the environment in terms of safety and security. In addition we would like to again remind you of the government's commitment to a reduction in the numbers of animals used in research (EU Directive Directive 2010/63/EU).

Please do consider the immense opposition there is to this planning application and all the points we have raised. Based on the material planning objections within we believe that the only logical course of action is for you to reject the application – Thank you for your time.

Third Party Representations- Cambridge

House name/number	Street	City
employee at Ward G14	Addenbrookes's Hospital	Cambridge
448 Harston House	Adrian Way, Long Rd	Cambridge
93	Alpha Road	Cambridge
131	Arbury Road	Cambridge
225	Arbury Road	Cambridge
22	Argyle Street	Cambridge
50	Armitage Way	Cambridge
52	Bateson Road	Cambridge
39	Bliss Way	Cambridge
38	Bourne Road	Cambridge
8	Brunswick Terrace	Cambridge
Flat G, 15 Campbell House	Campbell Street	Cambridge
120	Catharine Street	Cambridge
127A	Cavendish Road	Cambridge
33	Chariot Way	Cambridge
8	Cherry Close	Cambridge
Resident at	Christs College	Cambridge
50	City Road	Cambridge
8	Cocburn Street	Cambridge
6	Cockcroft Place	Cambridge
86	Cockerell Road	Cambridge
6	Cody Road	Cambridge
245	Coldhams Lane	Cambridge
82	Consort Avenue	Cambridge
10	Conway Close	Cambridge
1	Cunningham Close	Cambridge
17	Cunningham Close	Cambridge
20	Cyprus Road	Cambridge
16	Darwin Drive	Cambridge
53	Darwin Drive	Cambridge
3	Ditton Fields	Cambridge
20	Earl St	Cambridge
32a	Ekin Road	Cambridge
6	Fairsford Place	Cambridge
27	Fitzroy Street	Cambridge
45	Franks Lane	Cambridge
168	Gilbert Road	Cambridge
Resident at	Girton College	Cambridge

38	Golding Road	Cambridge
69	Green End Road	Cambridge
69	Gunhild Way	Cambridge
27	Hobart Road	Cambridge
8	Hobart Road	Cambridge
165	Hobart Road	Cambridge
45	Humberstone Road	Cambridge
123	Kelsey Crescent	Cambridge
Suite 124, 23	King Street	Cambridge
808	Kings College	Cambridge
5	Kings Parade	Cambridge
5	Long Road	Cambridge
13	Long Road	Cambridge
31	Lovell Road	Cambridge
208	Lucerne Close	Cambridge
Flat 1, Broadmeadows	Manhattan Drive	Cambridge
64	Manor Place	Cambridge
20	Mawson Road	Cambridge
1 Pentland Place	Metcalfe Road	Cambridge
27	Mill Road	Cambridge
27	Mill Road	Cambridge
257	Mill Road	Cambridge
12	Mill Road	Cambridge
154A	Milton Road	Cambridge
13	Minerva Way	Cambridge
86	Minerva Way	Cambridge
53	Newmarket Road	Cambridge
Resident at	Newnham College	Cambridge
Resident at	Newnham College	Cambridge
16	North cottages	Cambridge
13	Railway Street	Cambridge
10	Ross Street	Cambridge
223	Ross Street	Cambridge
48	Ruth Bagnall Court	Cambridge
104	Scotland Road	Cambridge
2	Short Street	Cambridge
St Andrew's House	St Andrew's Road	Cambridge
67	St Bedes Crescent	Cambridge
14	St Matthews Gardens	Cambridge
12	Strathcarron Court	Cambridge
22	Stretten Ave	Cambridge
175	Sturton Street	Cambridge

2	Sweetpea Way	Cambridge
7	The Brambles, Girton	Cambridge
4C	Thoday Street	Cambridge
3 Whitlocks	Trumpington High Street	Cambridge
16 North Cottages	Trumpington Rd	Cambridge
11	Ventress Farm Court	Cambridge
37	Victoria Road	Cambridge
17-19	Willow Walk	Cambridge
9	Woodhouse Way	Cambridge

Third Party Representations- Cambridgeshire

House Name/Number	Street	Area
4	Robin Close	Bar Hill
41	Otter Close	Bar Hill
32	Martin Road	Burwell
83	Barrons Way	Comberton
57	Silverdale Ave	Coton
Miller Cottage	High Street	Cottenham
3	High Street	Cottenham
62	Harlestones Road	Cottenham
25	High Street	Cottenham
44	Rooks Street	Cottenham
21B	Reads Street	Ely
278	Kings Ave	Ely
47A	Thorpe Way	Fen Ditton
19	Stanbury Close	Fen Ditton
Beltane Brownsfield	Green End	Fen Ditton
Beltaw Brownsfield	Green End	Fen Ditton
5	Vermuyden Way	Fen Drayton
Blair House	High Street	Fowlmere
2	Dunnowe Way	Fulbourn
Quince Tree Cottage	Moor End	Great Sampford
Quince Tree Cottage	Moor End	Great Sampford
20A	South Road	Gt Abington
28A	South Road	Gt Abington
106	Macaulay Ave	Gt Shelford
55	Clare Drive	Highfields Caldecote
8	Mill Quern	Highfields Caldecote
148	Cottenham Road	Histon
24	Daisy Close	Impington
5	Cooke Way	Impington
44	Sun Street	Isleham, Ely
28	High St	Linton
32	Hollybush Way	Linton
183	The Sycamores	Milton
135	The Sycamores	Milton
5	Hemington Close	Over
18	Mill Lane	Sawston
6	Tannery Road	Sawston
49	West Drive Gardens	Soham

7	Russet Close	St Ives
82	Derwent Close	St Ives
27	Greengarth	St Ives
11	Greengarth	St Ives
17	Priam's Way	Stapleford
72	London Road	Stapleford
7	Greenhead Road	Swaffham Prior
17	Thistle Green	Swavesey
Fernleigh Farm	Teversham Road	Teversham
6	Cody Road	Waterbeach
32	Providence Way	Waterbeach
74	The Russets	Wisbech

Third Party Representations- Rest of the UK

House Name/Number	Street	City/Area
8	Den View	Aberdeen
Eastland Lodge	Maryculter	Aberdeenshire
27	Cricketers Close	Ackworth
Old Rectory Chalet	Wasing Estate	Aldermaston
10	Kensington Gardens	Altrincham
Bourne House	Hurstbourne Tarrant	Andover
The Caravan	Spindles, Rew Road	Ashburton
The Poplars	Hornash Lane	Ashford
Peregrine	5 Chapel Lane	Ashurst Wood
5	The Rickyard	Ashwell
Gregor house	Dene lane	Aston
11	New Street	Aylesbury
6	Delapre Drive	Banbury
51	Old Torrington Road	Barnstaple
Ellesmere	Acacia Road	Basildon
4	Baynard Close	Basingstoke
58	The Hollow	Bath
25	Carriageway Court	Bedford
37	Olton Avenue	Beeston
40	Irwin Crescent	Belfast
Hawthorn Cottage	Parkside	Belper
4	Bowers Crescent	Berwick Upon Tweed
10	Linden Rd	Bexhill-on-Sea
26	Wrestwood Road	Bexhill-on-Sea
21	Lillie Road	Biggin Hill
157	Holme Court Avenue	Biggleswade
45	Skripka Drive	Billingham
5A	Sherbourne Road	Birmingham
240	Hubert Road	Birmingham
3	Heathcliff Road, Tyseley	Birmingham
3	Heathcliff Road, Tyseley	Birmingham
40	Foxland Avenue	Birmingham
6	Stockley Grove	Bishop Auckland
40	Bells Hill	Bishops Stortford
30	Dukes Ride	Bishops Stortford
38	Collingwood Avenue	Blackpool
6	Bookers Close	Bognor Regis
31	Windermere Road	Bolton

113	Aintree Road	Bolton
135	Hatfield Road	Bolton
135	Hatfield Road	Bolton
3	Church View	Brackley
Dorrington	London Road	Bracknell
16	Wendron Way	Bradford
12	Whimbrel Close	Bradford
	Forest Animal Boarding Kennels	Brandon
56	Grammar School Road,	Brigg
2	Wherwell Road	Brighouse
10	Princes Road	Brighton
36	Middlesex Road	Brinnington
St. Stephen's House	Colston Avenue	Bristol
31	Paulmont Rise	Bristol
20	St Johns Road	Bristol
17	Church Street	Bristol
57	Bristol Rd	Bristol
82	Alma Road	Bristol
87	North Road	Bristol
109	Bryants Hill	Bristol
139	Gloucester Road	Bristol
2	Teme Close	Bromyard
The Rosary,	Main Rd	Burgh on Bain
267	Anzio Crescent	Burgoyne Heights, Dover
Bell Bungalow	High Street	Burwash
4	Poynton Close	Bury
49	Winthrop Road,	Bury St Edmunds
36	Horsebrook	Calne
36	Horsebrook	Calne
3	Chapel Row	Camborne (Cornwall)
Walsall Cottage	Pentre Road	Carmarthen
Craigwen View	Tenby Road	Carmarthen
Craigwen View	Tenby Road	Carmarthen
148	Park Lane	Carshalton
56	East Bridge Road	Chelmsford
15	Purcell Cole	Chelmsford
54	School Lane	Chelmsford
20	Longlands Road	Cheltenham
1a	Fordson Road	chemsford
	Caird Street	Chepstow
Elmacres,	Church Westcote	Chipping Norton
9	Chorley Road	Chorley

17	Dalmuir Close	Cleveland
5	St Pauls Road	Colchester
5	5 St Pauls Road	Colchester
Maes Ednyfed	Llanddoged road	Conwy
The Hemel	Thornbrough	Corbridge
63	Parkville Highway	Coventry
78	Beaconsfield Road	Coventry
83	Trejon Road	Cradley Heath
47	Grattons Drive	Crawley
The Hollies,	Broich Terrace	Crieff
15	Abbotsfield Way	Darlington
234	Mansfield Road	Derby
Rock House	High Street	Dilhorne,
Mordros	West Camps Bay	Downderry
2	Parsley Way	Downham Market
68	Annsfield Park	Downpatrick
8	Fern Close	Driffield
22	Bennan Gardens	Dundee
7	Church Road	Dursley
53	Jackson Road	East Barnet
60	Cleland Place	East Kilbride
78	Upper Ratton Drive	Eastbourne
44	Broad Road	Eastbourne
44	Broad Road	Eastbourne
23	Beauchamp Close	Eaton Socon, St Neots
6	St Bernards Row	Edinburgh
7	Loganlea Terrace	Edinburgh
2	Hollybank Terrace	Edinburgh
27	Hermitage Park	Edinburgh
11b	Western Avenue	Epping
2	Tuckfield Close	Exeter
15	Wytham View	Eynsham
8	Castings Court	Falkirk
1	Solent House	Fareham
flat 2 214	gudge heath lane	fareham
2	Haflinger Drive	Fareham
1	Saxon Avenue	Feltham
Ty Bryntirion	Bwlch y Ddeufryn	Flintshire
67	Green Acres	Gamlingay, Beds
5	Birchmead	Gamlingay, Beds
20	Lumley Gardens	Gateshead
57	Staplehurst road	Gillingham

34	penrith court	Gillingham
6	Clifton Road	Gillingham
43	Baker Road	Giltbrook
86	Main Street	Glasgow
56	Main Street	Glasgow
2	Abercrombie Drive	Glasgow
132	Camphill Ave	Glasgow
6	Chapel Court	Glastonbury
Fir View	Drybrook	Glos.
52	Kingfisher Caravan Park, Browndown Road	Gosport
3 Thalia Court	Albion Terrace	Gravesend
45	Glenfield Drive	Great Doddington
Fernlea	Blackburn Old Road	Great Harwood
29a	Goring way	Greenford
7	Hibernia Street	Greenock
9	Fox Green	Gt Bradley, Newmarket
10	Brynteg Street	Gwynedd
Cysgod Y Llwyn	Llwyngwril	Gwynedd
33c	Eastway	Hackney Wick, London
3	Chapel Street	Halifax
35	Rectory Grove	Hampton
56	hitherwell drive	harrow weald
381	catcote road	Hartlepool
6 Pear Tree House	Saxton Close	Hasland
17	Newlands Close	Hastings
19	Old Humphrey Avenue	Hastings
19	Old Humphrey Avenue	Hastings
3	Dunwich Court	Haverhill
11	Lulworth Drive	Haverhill
19B	Hamlet Road	Haverhill
24	Colbeck Road	Haverhill
10	Somerset Court	Haverhill
8	Aldeburgh Close	Haverhill
27	Wortham Place	Haverhill
6	Henry Close	Haverhill
35	Duddery Hill	Haverhill
17	Piper Close	Haverhill
26	Mill Road	Haverhill
11	Chaplins Close	Haverhill
99	Burton End	Haverhill
14	Lilac Gardens	Hayes
35	Tarvin Ave	Heaton Chapel

	St. Keverne	Helston
9	Cumberlow Place	Hemel Hempstead
1	Chapel Close	Hilton
41	Stevenage Road	Hitchin
13	Beech Park	Holsworthy
Basement Flat, 6A	Medina Villas	Hove
50	Montgomery Street	Hove
35	Salisbury Road	Hove
8	Stuart Place	Huddlesfield
25	Newlyn Close	Hull
340	Wold Road	Hull
144	Norfolk Road	Huntingdon
9	Southsield	Ickleton, Saffron Walden
89	Awsworth Road	Ilkeston
Crossways	Town Road	Ingham
	Pinehurst Way	Ivybridge
20	Linton High Street	Keighley
Dunkirk	Banks Lane	Keighley
58	DITMAS AVENUE	Kempston
58	Ditmas Avenue	Kempston
16	Dencer Drive	Kenilworth
Bushy Lawan Barn	Brigstock	Kettering
6	bradley thursfield court	kidderminster
83	St Edmundsbury Road	Kings Lynn
7	Docking Road	Kings Lynn
Bells Meadow	Boughton	Kings Lynn
83	St Edmundsbury Road	King's Lynn
320	Kings Road	Kingston Upon Thames
employee at	Kingston University	Kingston upon Thames
1/160	High Street	Kirkcaldy
39	Sassoon Close	Larkfield
8	Brizen Lane, Farm Lane	Leckhampton
24	Well House Road	Leeds
11	Clayton Grange	Leeds
12	Littlemoor Gardens	Leeds
92	Helena Crescent	Leicester
41	Amy Street	Leicester
36	Dunkerley Court	Letchworth
12 Barber Court	St Pancras Road	Lewes
16	Leyfield Road	Leyland
8	Leconfield Close	Lincoln
	Westcliffe Street	Lincoln

54	Mourneview Park	Lisburn
1	Kirkhams Meadow	Little Fransham
15	Gosden Road,	Little Hampton
15a	Gosden Road	Little Hampton
13	Winslow Road	Little Horwood
95	Samuel Jones Crescent	Little Paxton, St Neots
9	Parkland Close	Liverpool
3	Redington Road	Liverpool
39	Barrington Road	Liverpool
101	Staunton Rise	Livingston Dedridge
The Glen	Torbreck	Lochinver
13	Pymmes Green Road	London
32	Rocks Lane	London
507	Forest Road	London
2	Banbury Street	London
55	Elfort Rd	London
11	Barker Walk,	London
13	Pymmes Green Road	London
20	Fenchurch Street	London
25	Winterbourne Road	London
145-157	St Johns Street	London
297A	Cambridge Heath Road	London
21	Sussex Way	London
54	Hawkdene	London
48	Oxford Road South	London
42	Cheverton Road	London
119	Sydney Road	London
84	Bonner Road	London
20	Kenilworth Road	London
5 Ireton Close	Cromwell Road	London
25	Pine Grove	London
82A	woolwich road	London
7 Matilda House	St Katherines Way	London
17	Elnathan Mews	London
10 Jagger House	Rosenau Road	London
	Algernon Road	London
	Algernon Road	London
180	Ferme Park Road	London
99	Dynes Road	London
Flat 1, 84	Auckland Road	London
9	Cornwall Gardens	London
4	Whistlers Avenue	London

Flat 2, 11	Muswell Avenue	London
21	Fairmile Avenue	London
9	Rose Joan Mews	London
213	Lessingham Avenue	London
329b	Horn Lane	London
18b	The Broadway	Loughton
7	Cabin Close	Lowestoft
willowdene	ludlow road clee hill	ludlow
	Baker Street	Luton
16	Russell Drive	Malvern
64	Moat Way	Malvern
85	Cotswold Road	Malvern
1	Ventnor Street	Manchester
6	Greencroft Road	Manchester
26	Bowers Street	Manchester
1	Ventnor Street	Manchester
employee at	Manchester Metropolitan University	Manchester
7	Reeves Yard	Margate
8	Hobbacott Lane	Marhamchurch
11	The Croft	Marlow
2	Greengage Riase	Melbourn
30	Woodcombe	Melksham
4a	Brook Lane	Melton Mowbray
61	Blakeney Crescent	Melton Mowbray
14	Hills View Road	Middlesborough
14	Hills View Road	Middlesbrough
9	Nursery Close	Mildenhall
39	Goodwyn Ave	Mill Hill, London
16	Mursley Court	Milton Keynes
32	Thorne Road	Minster
35	Castlehill Road	Moray
24	Oxford Street	Morecambe
1	Lady Hamilton Drive	Morpeth
11	Boughton Road	Moulton
6	South Bank	Netherhampton
44	Cartington Terrace	Newcastle
5	Earsdon Terrace	Newcastle upon Tyne
63	Mostyn Green	Newcastle Upon Tyne
52	St Andrews Street	Newcastle-upon-Tyne
26	Norfolk Avenue	Newmarket
2 Moorland Stud Cottage	Herringswell Road	Newmarket
7	Merbein Cottages	Newquay

67	Ballyeasborough Road	Newtownards
Crow Tree Farm	Yafforth Road	Northallerton
employee at	University of Northampton	Northampton
5	Parracombe Way	Northampton
40	Claines Rd	Northfield, Birmingham
13	Ipswich Grove	Norwich
1 Oak Cottage	Breck Road	Norwich
17	Cozens-Hardy Road	Norwich
9	Copenhagen Way	Norwich
145	Knowsley Road	Norwich
64	Castlegate	Nottingham
29	Ridgway Close	Nottingham
34	Ilkeston Road	Nottingham
20	Water Lily Way	Nuneaton
14	Richmond Way	Oadby
7	Southfleet Road	Orpington
Flat 37,	William Tubby House	Oulton Broad
12	Campbell Road	Oxford
1	Springfield Road	Oxford
17	Edgecumb Terrace	Par
	Lords Meadow View	Pembroke
Swn Y Nant	Brecon Road	Pen Y Cae
1	Teasel Avenue	Penarth
Locholly Farm	Murthly	Perthshire
89	Aster Drive	Peterborough
91	Hazeldene Drive	Pinner
91	Hazeldene Drive	Pinner
4	Ynyslyn Road	Pontypridd
144	North Road	Pontywaun
24	Pembroke Road	Poole
151b	Herbert Avenue	Poole
3	Heol Undeb	Port Talbot
25	Birch Walk	Porthcawl
311	New Road	Portsmouth
91	Old Rectory Road	Portsmouth
16	Broughton Tower Way	Preston
spring valley	sproatley road	Preston
spring valley	Sproatley Road	Preston
3	Jubilee Terrace	Radstock
1	North Street	Reading
20	Rowan Close	Reading
85	Silver Fox Crescent	Reading

8	Millview Park	Richhill
3	Chattenden Terrace	Rochester
1 Burloes Cottages	Newmarket Road	Royston
23	Highlands	Royston
Hilcroft Cottage	Hamstreet Road	Ruckinge
23	Arch Street	Rugeley
35	Beech Avenue	Ruislip
27	Stanley Street	Runcorn
25	Player Street	Ryde (IOW)
1	Chapel Lane	Ryton on Dunsmore
13	Fair Leas	Saffron Walden
6	Folkestone Road	Salisbury
101	Lower Road	Salisbury
92A	Yorktown Road	Sandhurst
23	Meadow Road	Seaton
664b	Abbeydale road	Sheffield
17	Malham Gardens	Sheffield
22	Thornton Road	Shewsbury
49	Greenfields Gardens	Shrewsbury
13	Melbreck	Skelmersdale
Flat 1, 59	Upton Park	Slough
29	Rowan Close	Sonning Common
32	Sutton Road,	Soudley, Cinderford
Moorview	Moorview Didworthy	South Brent
2	Whitegates close	South Chailey
Popplestones, 3A	Junction Road	South Croydon
13	scotstoun park	south queensferry
46	Bradwell Close	South Woodford, London
67	Willow Road	South Wotton
19	Central Avenue	Southend on Sea
22	Brierydean	St Abbs
9	South Close	St Albans
5	Lothian Park	St Asaph
10	Scott Ave	St Helens
17	Sycamore Avenue	St Helens
5	Albany Road	St Leonards on Sea
31	Ranelagh Grove	St Peters, Broadstairs
1	Stepaside	St Stephen
55	Avondale Avenue	Staines
1	Parishes Mead	Stevenage
16	Hyslop Road	Stevenston
17	Coxham Lane	Steyning

1	Greenbank Ave	Stockport
209	Old Chapel Street	Stockport
30	Hill Rise	Stockport
Harrow House	Langley	Stratford-upon-avon
1	Yarranton Close	Stratford-upon-avon
14	Dovecliff Road	Stretton
1	Chestnut Close,	Sunbury
3B	Green Street	Sunbury on Thames
46	Meden Bank	Sutton in Ashfield
18	Uplands Road	Swadlincote
105	Cyfyng Road	Swansea
23	Dolawel	Swansea
140	Woodcote	Swansea
34	Howard Close	Tadworth
21	Norton Close	Tamworth
81	Tristram Drive	Taunton
35	Cyril Street	Taunton
60	Lower Road	Temple Ewell
53	Weaverhead Close	Thaxted
10	Valerian Rise	Thetford
Thistle Cottage	The Green	Theydon Bois
34	Popham close	Tiverton
34	Popham close	Tiverton
3 Cumberland Court	London Road	Tonbridge
33	Burbridge Way	Tottenham, London
5	Hodge Close	Towcester
117	Longfield Road	Tring
Tucoyse Farmhouse	Tregony	Truro
80	Grandison Rise	Tupsley
Parkside	Jacks Lane	Turvey
2	Stephen Close	Twyford
2	2 Stephen Close	Twyford
6	Framfield Place	Uckfield
4	Lon yr eglwys	Vale of Glamorgan
33	Buckingham Court	Wakefield
1	Devon Avenue	Walmer
52	Jacobs Hall Lane	Walsall
100	Borneo Street	Walsall
8	Stoke Road	Walton on Thames
Northleigh House		Warwick
191	Horseshoe Lane	Watford
8	Hammond Green	Wellesbourne

	Fulmar Lane	Wellingborough
	Norwood Avenue	Wembley
36	Police Station Road	West Malling
Evergreen	Wellington St	Whitstable
Evergreen	Wellington Street	Whitstable
10	Wick House Close	Wick
9	Iona Way	Wickford
2	Galion Way	Widness
95	Farmhouse Road	Willenhall
40	Bourne Street	Wilmslow
Ashdale	Howlett End	Wimbish, Saffron Walden
1	Albert Street	Windsor
2	lower haigh street	winsford
111	Weaver Street	Winsford
38	Milton Road	Wirral
37	Alverstone Road	Wirral
13	Quarry Road	Witney
145	Broad Gauge Way	Wolverhampton
16	Eynsham Close	Woodley
71	St Georges Lane North	Worcester
6	Hawthorn Park	Worle
15	cedar avenue	worthing
17	Cedar Avenue	Worthing
65	High Street	Wreslingworth, Sandy
9	Church Close	york
14	Hill View	York
14	Fox Covert	York
9	Waynefleet Grove	york

Third Party Representations- Overseas

Address	Area	Country
2/37 Hutton Avenue	Ferntree Gully VIC	Australia
21 Eileen Street	Booval	Australia
Altair da Silva Bonfim 1185, Jardim Soares, 14784347,	Barretos-SP	Brazil
Bul. Maria Louiza 2	Sofia 1000	Bulgaria
02-2606 Moreau,	Montréal,	Canada
14, rue de la Tannerie	Baie-Saint-Paul	Canada
POBox 125	Coe Hill, Ontario	Canada
328 whytewold rd	winnipeg	Canada
Box 940	Beaverlodge, AB	Canada
7707-173 Street NW	Edmonton, AB	Canada
4 Anstead Cres	Ajax ON	Canada
875 Watson road South	Ontario	Canada
Rubesi 58	51215 Kastav	Croatia
Marie Majerove 1748	Sokolov	Czech Republic
Thrigesvej 6	Haderslev	Denmark
93 rue de Boussières	*Poligny*	France
5 rue du marais	60270 gouvieux	France
93 Rue de Boussieres	Poligny	France
11 quai lachaux	63160 Billom	France
La Val	Trans La Foret	France
Düppelstr.25	52068 Aachen	Germany
Nordwollestr. 31	27749 Delmenhorst	Germany
22455 Hamburg	Hamburg	Germany
Vohensteinweg	74523 Schwaebisch Hall	Germany
Marktstr	71672 Marbach	Germany
Vohensteinweg	Schwaebisch Hall	Germany
lavendelweg 5	52134 Herzogenrath	Germany
karakassi 80 kato touba	Thessaloniki	Greece
80 kato touba	hessaloniki	Greece
Rm 3710, Kin Ming Estate	Till Keng Leng	Hong Kong
Castle Peak Road	Kowloon	Hong Kong
Marwaripara, Sambalpur	Odisha	India
28,Lohunda Crescent	Clonsilla ,Dublin	Ireland
S. Lorenzo 66043	Vasto	Italy
S. lorenzo 66054	Vasto	Italy
Via del commercio 4	Monterotondo,	italy
Goodlands		Mauritius

ul. Nenckiego 118	Wroclaw	Poland
Leite de Vasconcelos, nr. 146	4610-170 Felgueiras	Portugal
Orizontului 32B	120003 Buzau	Romania
Malherbe Street	Wllingotn Cape	South Africa
Gullregnsvägen 42	263 76 Nyhamnsläge	Sweden
Östra Hed 2	43266 Veddige	Sweden
Hakankila Skattegarden 1	51199 Satila	Sweden
Hertistr. 8	CH - 5704 Egliswil	Switzerland
657 Ta Chien St	Taichung City	Taiwan
Sukhumvit 62-5	Bangkok 10260	Thailand
104 S. Indianwood Ave	Broken Arrow, OK 74012	USA
2315 Lupine Dr.,	Ashland, OR	USA
12484 Robert Dahl Dr	El Paso, TX 79938	USA
824 Cole St	San Francisco	USA
5301 Seville Rd	Seville, OH	USA
6992 FallsView Cir	Delaware OH	USA
141 Wood Avenue	Mastic, NY. 11950	USA
58 NIMMO ROAD	KALAMA, WASHINGTON STATE	USA
400 Rancho Rd	Thousand Oaks Ca 91362	USA
7 Lake Shore Dr.	Netcong, NJ	USA
321 East 69th	St. Apt. 2D, NY	USA
P.O. Box 180712	Fort Smith, AR 72918-0712	USA
15051 Moorpark St.	Sherman Oaks, CA	USA
TN 37921	Knoxville,	USA
POB 208	Conyers, Ga. 30012	USA
2379 Glenridge Drive	Lewisville, TX	USA
PO 2272	Idyllwild, Ca	USA
P.O. Box 1354	Utuado Puerto Rico. 00641	USA
Owings Mills	MD 21117	USA
5640 Netherland Avenue	, Bronx, NY	USA
2766 Diamond Dr	Camarillo, CA	USA
1147 Woodfield Drive	Jackson, MS	USA
748 E. Kensington Road	Los Angeles, CA 90026	USA

Appendix 3- Cambridge Quality Panel Minutes from the meeting dated 11 June 2014

CAMBRIDGESHIRE QUALITY PANEL

REPORT OF PANEL MEETING
Scheme: AstraZeneca Development
Date: 11th June 2014

1. Scheme description and presentation

Applicant AstraZeneca
Planning status Pre application stage

2. Overview

The new global research and development centre of AstraZeneca will be located on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC).

The development is split across two plots of land compromising:
North Plot (plot 7), bound by Francis Crick Avenue, Robinson Way and the future Circus Piazza. The proposal is to create a circular building envelope that contains six main buildings, over four floors, one of which is underground, with formal open space at the centre.

South Plot (plots 10-13), bound by the Cambridge-London railway to the west, Francis Crick Avenue to the east, the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway to the north, and future development site to the south.

The scheme will comprise a range of biomedical and biotechnology facilities comprising the following:

- Laboratories and support facilities;
- Site amenities and employee services;
- Building operations and maintenance facilities;
- Energy centre;
- Car and cycle parking; and
- Landscaping and access roads.

Following approval of the outline planning permission under reference 06/0796/OUT, it is anticipated that AstraZeneca will submit a Reserved Matters application in October 2014.

3. Cambridgeshire Quality Panel views

Introduction

The Panel welcomed seeing the proposal for this scheme at such an early stage. Quality Panel involvement early on provides an excellent opportunity to ensure that the Quality Charter principles are embedded into the core characteristics of the scheme and can then be taken through to the more detailed planning stages.

The Panel welcomed the site visit to the AstraZeneca and the Circus sites, which was useful in understanding the context for the proposed developments.

The AstraZeneca development fronts part of the proposed Circus and Piazza to the north, which will connect the current Addenbrooke's site to the new part of the CBC. Planning officers at Cambridge City Council proposed that both applicants of the Circus/Piazza and AstraZeneca proposals were present during both reviews of the schemes.

The Panel's advice reflects the issues associated with each of the four 'C's' in the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter. The comments below include both those raised in the open session of the meeting and those from the closed session discussions.

Community

The Panel welcomed AstraZeneca's ambition of making this proposal as a 'laboratory of the future' and highlighted the importance of the inclusion of community which has been carefully thought out within the development, specifically in respect of access to the proposed courtyard space within the centre.

The Panel noted AstraZeneca's intentions of establishing themselves on site for many years to come and for the proposed buildings to become part of the CBC community and not to be perceived as separate. It was recognised that creating something specific to Cambridge will be a challenge. AstraZeneca's ethos is to work closely with clinicians, doctors, the university, including students, and patients.

Connectivity

In respect of the proposed building at plot 7, the Panel welcomed the accessibility to the courtyard for the wider public which is an unusual but positive step for a pharmaceutical company. The Panel did question how security and confidentiality would be addressed given the very open appearance of the building and open plan office layout, which is on view to the general public. Through subsequent discussion they were satisfied that the openness reflected Astra Zeneca's culture.

The Panel noted that parking arrangements should be flexible in order to respond to changes in the longer term. The applicant explained that they would like to bring support to the Guided Bus, Park and Ride, etc. in order to achieve this vision.

It was also noted that all the roads within the CBC site are private, which would help realise the 'shared surfaces' element depicted on the draft plans presented during the panel review.

Character

The Panel considered this scheme, specifically plot 7, extremely good and very refreshing which contains the ingredients to become an enjoyable place to work. The proposed buildings are considered a delight, especially spaces between the buildings and the appropriate difference between them.

The Panel recognised this is a very high quality scheme and highlighted that the width of the public spaces in the south plot (plots 10-13) is very critical in terms of flexibility. The applicant explained that by having similar size plots the buildings cannot go further to the west, for example, due to the railway line. So what is currently proposed in the middle in terms of open space is the result of planning constraints.

The Panel welcomed the calmness and clarity the building provides (i.e. plot 7) by being 'clutter free', which would also help with the maintenance of the building.

The main concerns of the Panel were how the landscape and spaces around the buildings are going to be managed and how much landscape will be used. The applicant explained that there will be a management

company that has been already set up by the developer that will take care of communal places.

The Panel also asked how the quality of the building at plot 7will be transferred into the actual build on site, and will this simulate into its surroundings. The Panel also mentioned that there should be a clear relationship between the proposed buildings and of the public realm (i.e. Circus and Piazza), specifically with regard to plot 7.

Furthermore, in respect of plot 7, the Panel queried the circular orientation of the proposed building – whether there is a clear point of reference as the circular shape could be disorientating inside.

Climate

The applicant explained that the proposed building at plot 7 will have a target of BREEAM excellent, with a range of other possible measures to go beyond BREEAM excellent, which are currently being considered. The Panel were supportive of this approach.

As mentioned within section 2 of this report, it is proposed that there will be an ‘energy centre’ at the ‘heart’ of the campus, which will incorporate heat pumps and a planned ground-source cooling spray.

SUDs would also be used around the buildings, though the Panel did raise concerns over the proposed building at plot 7 and the use of drainage tanks which may effect the proposed tree planting around that particular area.

4. Conclusion

The Panel highly praised the current proposals. It was acknowledged that this development has set high standards for the rest of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. However, there are some details that still need to be delivered. Especially regarding the lack of detail regarding drainage, as each of the sites need to be self-contained.

The Panel recognised the quality this scheme could bring to the overall campus and the value of bringing the Circus/Piazza and Astra Zeneca teams together for a joint review. They recommended this would be valuable for the next public area review.