

Application Number	15/0893/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	1st May 2015	Officer	Lisa Lamb
Target Date	21st August 2015		
Ward	Cherry Hinton		
Site	Land West Of ARM 1 Peterhouse Technology Park Fulbourn Road Cambridge CB1 9PT		
Proposal	Detailed planning application consisting of: the demolition of ARM2; the construction of new buildings for B1 use; two multistorey car parking structures; additional temporary car parking spaces; new cycle parking spaces; hard and soft landscaping works; new internal roads, foot and cycle paths; ancillary and associated facilities and site infrastructure		
Applicant	Mr Nick Lee		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan and the very special circumstances argument for the development to take place in the Greenbelt is accepted for the following reasons, but the application will need to be referred to the Secretary of State for their consideration:</p> <p>The proposals would not be detrimental to highway safety.</p> <p>The proposals would not be detrimental to residential amenity.</p> <p>The proposed design, scale and bulk of the development is acceptable.</p> <p>The landscaping scheme is acceptable.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>Minded to approve:</p> <p>Subject to referral to Secretary of State as a Departure from the Local Plan (Greenbelt).</p>

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The existing Peterhouse Technology Park is sited to the southern side of Fulbourn Road in Cherry Hinton. It is characterised by low rise (maximum 2 storey) modern commercial buildings with associated parking. ARM currently occupy 4 of the 5 buildings on site, with the building to the north east of the site occupied by the Medical Research Council. Cambridge Water Company occupy a distinctive building fronting onto Fulbourn Road immediately to the west of the Technology Park. The pedestrian and vehicular access is from Fulbourn Road and there is an access road through the site which is wide and has a planted edge between the road and pavement.
- 1.2 The application site is sited immediately to the west of the existing ARM 1 building. This site is within the greenbelt as allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.
- 1.3 The north of the sited is bounded by the Cambridge Water Company, which is a distinctive building fronting onto Fulbourn Road and further to the west by residential properties on Limedale Close and Tweedale.
- 1.4 The east of the site is bounded by a strong hedge field boundary and there is farmland beyond this. The eastern boundary of the Peterhouse Technology Park is also the administrative boundary with South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- 1.5 To the west of the site is designated Limekiln Close site of Local Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) which comprise the Limekiln Close (and West Pit) LNR and the East Pit LNR. To the south west of the site (400m) is the Cherry Hinton Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)
- 1.6 The south of the site currently has no discernible physical boundary and blends into the farmland to the south, which is also designated as greenbelt.
- 1.7 The topography of the site is important and the site is essentially 'bowl' shaped. The land rises up from north to south with its lowest point to the north and reaches its highest point to the south-east adjacent to the existing ARM building.

- 1.8 There are some mature trees within the site, particularly to the west of the ARM building, although none of these are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) in their own right or the subject of a group TPO.
- 1.9 The site lies outside of the Controlled Parking Zone and the site does not contain any listed buildings or Buildings of Local Importance.
- 1.10 There are no Public Rights of Way that pass through the Site or within close proximity, surrounding land is all in private ownership. The nearest public footpaths are situated off Cherry Hinton High Street and beyond the railway to the north. There is access to the Limekiln Close and West Pit Local Nature Reserve to the west.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposals seek full planning permission for the demolition of the existing ARM2 building and the construction of new buildings for B1 (office) use, two multi-storey car parks, additional temporary parking spaces, new cycle parking spaces, hard and soft landscaping works, new internal roads, foot and cycle paths, ancillary and associated facilities and site infrastructure.
- 2.2 The application has been the subject of extensive pre-application discussions and has been reviewed by Design Panel at pre-application stage.
- 2.3 The proposed new B1 office building (ARM A&B) is sited immediately to the west of the existing ARM 1 building. This building would front onto the extended access road through the site and would have a maximum height of 13.5m. Each block would have an overall frontage of approximately 80m and this would be punctuated by the recessed main entrance/lobby area, which would be set approximately 18m back from the main elevation. The proposals would provide approximately 20,000 sqm of B1 office space (Gross External Area) and 761 parking spaces.

2.4 The proposals comprise:

- Demolition of the existing ARM2 office building and construction of a multi storey car park to the north of the site (3 decks). The Northern Car Park will have footprint dimensions of approximately 112.5m (l), 48.7m (d), 9m(h) and will accommodate 500 car parking spaces (of which 16 will be for disabled access) and 452 cycle parking spaces.
- The construction of a multi storey car park to the east of the site (3 decks). The Eastern Car Park will have footprint dimensions of approximately 65.9m (l), 51m (d), 7.6m(h) and will accommodate 261 car parking spaces and 176 cycle parking spaces
- Construction of 2 linked office blocks ARM A & B to the west of the existing ARM 1 building
- ARM A will be two commercial storeys in height at its main elevations, with a third commercial storey set back (partly for enclosed plant rooms, partly for office-related use). ARM A will have footprint dimensions of approx 85.3m (l), 55.3m (d), 11.7m(h) (14m top of atrium roof).
- ARM B will be two commercial storeys in height at its main elevations, with a third commercial storey set back (partly for enclosed plant rooms, partly for office-related use). ARM B will have footprint dimensions of approx 79.3m (l), 55.3m (d), 11.7m(h).
- Associated landscaping, internal roads and pathways and a cycle/pedestrian link into the site from Limekiln Close.

2.5 The proposed development is one which would require an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and an Environmental Statement has been submitted with the application. The application has also been advertised as EIA Development.

2.6 The application is accompanied by the following information:

- Planning Statement
- Environmental Statement
- Environmental Statement – Non-Technical Summary
- Design and Access Statement
- Landscape Strategy
- Tree Survey
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Transport Statement
- Travel Plan

- Energy and Sustainability Report
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Site Waste Management Plan
- Economic Statement
- Public Art Delivery Plan

2.7 Following receipt of the initial responses from the Landscape Officer, Highway's, Drainage Consultant and the Walking and Cycling Officer and following the conclusions of the Design & Conservation Panel the following plans and additional information have been submitted:

- Additional information/appendices to the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.
- Revised landscaping proposals.
- Response to Design Panel Comments.
- Phasing confirmation.
- Written confirmation in respect of queries raised by Urban Design relating to details of fixings for petrarch panel, colour codes and fixing of public art.
- Additional drainage information (in relation to SuDS)
- Landscape Management Plan
- CGI of northern car park

2.8 Following receipt of an objection from the National Grid due to encroachment over their easement area, the footprint of the northern car park has been amended to 1200mm further north than originally proposed. The residents in Tweedale and Limekiln Close have been notified of this change. At the time of the drafting of the report the revised plans are still out to consultation but Members will be updated by way of late comments if there are any additional representations received from third parties in respect of the re-siting of this building.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/82/0913	The erection of temporary accommodation and provision of temporary car parking facilities,	PERM
C/83/0734	Erection of 2nd floor extension to existing building,	REFU

C/84/0550	OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BUILDINGS, ANCILLARY OFFICES AND CAR PARKING FACILITIES,	APC 25.10.1984
C/87/0819	OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF RESEARCH and DEVELOPMENT BUILDINGS, ANCILLARY OFFICES and CAR PARKING FACILITIES, (EXTENSION OF PERIOD CONSENT),	REF 04.11.1987
C/90/0019	ERECTION OF A RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BUILDING, ANCILLARY OFFICES, CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING. (AMENDED BY LETTER and ACCOMPANYING DRAWINGS)	REF 06.07.1990
C/95/0418	VARIATION OF CONDITION 02 OF PLANNING PERMISSION C/1171/91 TO ALLOW FOR APPLICATION OF RESERVED MATTERS TO BE MADE BY 12 OCTOBER 1996.	APC 13.09.1995
C/95/0148	Research and development buildings, ancillary offices and car parking	APC 09.10.1997
05/0940/ADV	Installation of 2No. non- illuminated free standing signs.	PERM 27.10.2005
11/1409/FUL	Construction of Data Hall, switch rooms and associated plant with new access from adjacent car park. New planting and acoustic screening	PERM 13.01.2012

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes
Public Meeting/Exhibition (Pre App):	Yes
DC Forum (meeting of):	No

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Relevant Development Plan policies

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

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)

	<p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p> <p>Eastern Gate Supplementary Planning Document (October 2011)</p>
	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).</p> <p>Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003)</p> <p>Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridgeshire Sub-Region (2006)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth (2008)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council - Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) (2012)</p> <p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)</p>

	<p>LNR's</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p>
--	---

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 submitted to the Secretary of State on 28 March 2014 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.

The Examination hearing sessions commenced in November 2014. Following an exchange of letters on 28 July 2015 the Inspectors agreed to formally suspend the Examination into the Local Plan until March 2016 while further work was carried out.

For the application considered in this report, the following Policy in the emerging Local Plan is considered to be of relevance.

Policy 26 Site specific allocations (GB3 & GB4 allocations)

This policy proposes the release of 3.7ha Green Belt land for employment uses.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways)

6.1 Application as originally submitted: – **Initial Holding objection** on the basis of lack of information contained in the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.

6.2 Following additional information: - Having reviewed the information provided by the applicant the County Council are satisfied with the information provided by the applicant. On the basis of the above, **the holding objection can be removed**, subject to an agreeable mitigation package being agreed with the applicant based on the above measures and the following requirements being secured, should approval be given. These are:

- Parking management plan to be submitted and agreed.
- Parking surveys should be completed in surrounding streets every year for a period of 5 years post occupation.
- The Construction Management Plan should be submitted and agreed prior to commencement of development and should include, inter alia, travel plan measures for construction workers.
- Section 106 contributions.
- The Travel Plan targets to be agreed, and a revised travel plan to be submitted and approved and monitored through the S106.
- A contribution is required to cover the costs associated with consultation, scheme design, and implementation of a managed parking scheme should the surveys demonstrate a problem and there is support among local residents for this. This should be £50K.

Head of Refuse and Environment

Application as originally submitted: The development proposed is **acceptable** subject to the imposition of the condition(s)/informative(s) and submission of additional information outlined below.

- Details of bin stores and locations.
- Site Waste Management plan deals with construction waste.

Environmental Quality

Construction/demolition pollution

- 6.3 Pollution from the demolition and construction phases has the potential to affect the amenity of surrounding properties if not controlled. In the interests of amenity, the standard construction/demolition/delivery noise/hours and dust conditions are recommended.

Chapter H of the environmental statement dated April 2015 has been prepared by Brookbanks consultants Ltd. Section H5 discusses predicted construction noise levels. As detailed within the statement, site specific construction activity can be conditioned with a report/assessment to follow. Full details of demolition noise will also be required.

Construction/demolition informative recommended.

Plant Noise

- 6.4 Section H4.5 of the environmental statement dated April 2015 advises that assessment was made of the existing air handling installation and it was determined not to be of concern. Full details including acoustic calculations and any rating level penalties will be required of any plant associated with this application to ensure local amenity is protected.

Sound levels from plant and equipment associated with the application requires assessment to ensure local amenity is protected. It is required that the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background level (L₉₀) at the **boundary of the premises** subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

The plant noise insulation condition and its informative are recommended.

Emergency generator

- 6.5 Emergency generators are common within application sites such as this. The emergency generator condition is

recommended. If a generator is not present then the applicant should notify the planning department to prevent an unnecessary condition.

Internal sound levels

- 6.6 Section H5.24-5.25 of the environmental statement advises that acceptable noise levels can be achieved in the proposed offices when windows are closed. This is reasonable; however alternative ventilation will be required. Section H6.6 advises that air conditioning will be required to achieve acceptable internal noise levels, due to keeping windows closed. This is satisfactory.

Lighting

- 6.7 Hoare Lea have provided an external lighting design note. The design note advises that the lighting design is to be designed in accordance with Cambridgeshire County Council guidance. This will be for the county council to comment on.

It is recommended that full horizontal and vertical Lux contours are provided. A light condition is recommended.

Contaminated Land

- 6.8 An intrusive investigation was undertaken at Peterhouse Technology Park. The results of the investigation are reported in the Ground Contamination Interpretative Report (dated October 2014 and produced by Ramboll UK). The report formed part of the application documents. However, we require that the following documents (referenced in the interpretative report) are also submitted before we can provide detailed comments:

-Geo environmental and Environmental Desk Study (dated May 2014)

-Site Investigation Factual Report (dated October 2014)

In the meantime it is confirmed that all issues on the site can be dealt through the contaminated land condition which should be attached to the above application if planning permission for the development is granted.

Air Quality

- 6.9 This application represents an intensification of use at the site including an additional 538 car parking spaces and up to an additional 73 peak hour vehicle trip movements per day on the local network.

An Air Quality Assessment was completed as part of the EIA for the site. This predicts that if the development is permitted then an increase of up to 0.9 micrograms per cubic meter of nitrogen dioxide and an increase of up to 0.1 micrograms per cubic metre of particulate matter would be observed at selected sensitive receptors around the proposed development as a result of the predicted increase in traffic around the development area.

No increase of nitrogen dioxide or particulate matter is predicted within the AQMA therefore there are no grounds for objection of this planning application. However we would welcome the installation of the sustainable travel infrastructure recommended in the Travel Plan including:

- Additional shuttle bus services
- Additional cycle parking spaces
- Car sharing Bays
- Pool bikes
- Telephone and video conferencing training
- Addition electric charging vehicle points

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.10 Application as originally submitted: This application has been the subject of extensive pre-application discussions with the City Council, commencing in early 2014. Earlier iterations of the proposal were also considered by the Council's Design and Conservation Panel in August, 2014. These discussions considered a wide-ranging number of design issues, including the impact of building forms on the Green Belt, site layout, detailed building elevations, public art, landscape and cycle/car parking, amongst others. We are generally pleased with the outcome of this work as now reflected in the application and have the following comments to make.

- 6.11 We have reviewed the Design and Access Statement (DAS) submitted with the application dated April 2015 and the following comments are based on the information contained in that document.

Principle of development

- 6.12 It is our understanding that the argument of “exceptional circumstances” is required in order to enable the development to proceed as set out in the application. This is because the land will not be released from the Green Belt until such time as the new Local Plan has been adopted by the City Council, and the determination of this application will likely happen before the plan is adopted.

Design Development – building massing

- 6.13 The submitted site and building design accord with discussions the applicant and their agents have had with the City Council over the past several months. The DAS records the various massing options to deliver 25,000 square metres of required floor space for ARM at section 4.1. These options were discussed in detail with the Council. In further developing the building massing it was agreed there was a need to break down very long elevations into smaller buildings better related to those which already exist on the PTP campus. The submitted building massing accords with what we deem to be an acceptable form of development in this location, taking into account the scale and type of buildings already on the campus and ensuring a legible network of entrances, building edges and alignment of existing and proposed building frontages.

Site layout

- 6.14 The site layout has been a response to specific site constraints posed on the designer. More specifically section 3 of the DAS sets out specific constraints including a gas main, a water main, site topography and existing residential properties. All of these have influenced the siting of the two office buildings including the two multi-storey car parks as well as the approach to proposed landscaping, building elevations, materials and critically how the building is experienced from beyond the site (as set out in LVIA photomontages provided as part of the Environmental Statement at Appendix D12, Volume 3).

- 6.15 The entrance location between the proposed buildings ARM A and ARM B, as well as the entrance location and configuration of routes between buildings has evolved from a number of discussions and the assessment of options with the applicant. ARM already work out four buildings on the PTP campus, specifically ARM 1, 2, 3 and 6 and so early on in the development of the site layout a key objective was to ensure a good level of connectivity and “way finding” between buildings for employees and visitors alike. The main office building entrance to the new ARM A and B office buildings will provide for a clear, legible entrance from both the new multi-storey car park opposite and from the wider campus.
- 6.16 The location and design of the two multi-storey car parks, as well as the surface car park west of ARM B, has developed alongside the office buildings and responds well to the positioning of various office buildings (existing and proposed) across the campus. The extension of the main vehicular route and siting of buildings south of this route is directly a function of the need to avoid buildings being positioned above the gas main. Building locations equally respond to the constraint posed by the water main heading underground towards the Cambridge Water building and which runs in a north-south direction approximately bisecting GB3 and BG4 site allocations.

Building and elevation design

- 6.17 The design of buildings may be broken down into the two key building types proposed: the first being the two new office blocks (ARM A and ARM B) and the second the two multi-storey car parks.

ARM A/B

- 6.18 The building design responds to the working arrangements needed by ARM, the future occupier. The brief for the architect, including the required floor plate and workspace arrangements, is explained in sections 4.3 and 4.4 of the DAS. Required circulation zones, “collaboration zones”, meeting rooms and small and large offices are all key parts of the user requirements for ARM and have driven the building massing, height and detailed form.

- 6.19 The main entrance to the two new buildings will be via a highly glazed, open plan two-storey foyer which is situated directly opposite the northern car park. The buildings are designed such that they enjoy an internal “street” connecting ARM A and ARM B and thereby creating a convivial social space where staff can meet and engage with others outside of their more private office spaces. The buildings are situated directly west of ARM 1 which enables ease of contact with staff working in that building and a small outdoor gathering space is located immediately south of the large reception area and facing the open Green Belt immediately south.
- 6.20 The external building design for both ARM A and ARM B is dominated by one key element: a series of perforated vertical “fins” which are fastened at first floor level. The purpose of the fins is twofold: first to reduce solar gain upon the fabric of the external envelope of the building and so provide comfortable working conditions inside, and the second to create a dynamic quality to the external façade of both buildings. The panels will be perforated based on the pattern of the crystalline structure of silicon which itself is a key element of the science which underlines the technology of integrated circuitry (the key product which ARM designs and patents as a company). Under an electron microscope, silicon produces what are known as “Kikuchi bands” and which help make up a crystal lattice-type structure. It is this lattice structure which is proposed to be cut into the fins being applied to the building facades, themselves made of aluminium and cut at different sized triangular-shaped openings. The fins will surround the entirety (save the entrance foyer between the buildings) of ARM A and ARM B and in so doing will strongly define the character of the entire scheme.
- 6.21 There is reference in the DAS to two different thicknesses of fins, one at 50mm and one at 5mm (sections 5.2.5 and 5.2.6). The drawings on these pages are referred to as “options”; therefore clarification is needed on which of the two thicknesses is proposed. We would assume the 50mm fins would represent two sheets of aluminium, both perforated, such that their total thickness including a void in between is 50mm. The 5mm option is simply one perforated panel only. As we understand it, the support “frame” for the panels will be the same in both cases.

- 6.22 The balance of the building elevations will include a highly glazed curtain wall system at ground floor level and a combination of curtain wall glazing, aluminium spandrel panels and brise soleils at second storey level. The second storey level will be recessed from the first floor level and include an open terraced deck. The easterly end of the second storey of ARM A and westerly end of the second storey of ARM B will include plant screened by dark grey metal louvres. Therefore the entire building height (of both ARM A and ARM B) will be approximately 12 metres tall with a screened, roof light section comprising another 1.5 metres in height for a total overall building height of 13.5 metres. All colours of metal cladding are proposed to be in grey thereby creating a uniformity of appearance but also to ensure views of the buildings from outside the site, especially from the Green Belt, are not jarring and show the buildings blending in with their surroundings.
- 6.23 The design of the office buildings is considered to be appropriate for this location. The perforated fins represent a playful dynamic feature of the building elevations and also have a functional purpose (to help mitigate against over-heating). The scale of the buildings is appropriate in this location and the near and distant photomontages of the scheme demonstrate that the buildings sit comfortably in their surroundings. The “top” of the buildings is appropriate and helps provide screening of roof top plant. The design is considered very much appropriate to the nature of a company whose main business involves design and innovation in the technology sector.
- 6.24 We note however one material which may not have been discussed at pre-application stage, being the GRP duct covers at roof level. We question whether this is an appropriate material to help “finish off” the top of the buildings. We are however content for this covering to be conditioned and note that an alternate should be considered. All materials should be conditioned and the applicant should be requested to construct a sample panel including the perforated fins and all metal products.

Multi-storey car parks (including car and cycle parking)

- 6.25 The detailed design of the multi-storey car parks is based on three levels, or decks, of parking in each of the northern and eastern car parks. The buildings are sited to be convenient to

key building entrances, especially to ARM A and ARM B as well as ARM 1. The northern car park is known as Car Park B and the eastern one is known as Car Park A. Car Park A has a total of 261 car parking spaces and Car Park B will have a total of 500 spaces. Both multi-storey car parks will be built as split level decks. It is understood that this quantum of parking has been discussed with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highways Authority and we assume they will be commenting in this regard.

- 6.26 In relation to cycle parking, a total of 176 cycles are to be accommodated in an under-croft arrangement in two-tier stacker systems and 452 cycles are proposed to be accommodated, again in the same arrangement/stacker system. Cycle spaces will be situated in those parts of the car parks which are closest to adjacent building entrances.
- 6.27 The proposed cladding system for both buildings has evolved from discussions with the Council and uses 10mm thick “Petrarch” panels (see <http://www.cep-panels.com/Petrarch/StandardColorsTextures/tabid/926/Default.aspx> for further information on the product and finishes/colours provided). The petrarch product is provided in a series of panels with concealed fixings. Both smooth and riven finishes will be used in a random pattern to help provide a sense of variety to the elevations and from panel to panel. A series of rods and wire trellises will be fastened to the car parks to enable planting to be supported and grow, in time, around and over selected parts of the car parks. Landscape colleagues have provided comments separately on these details.
- 6.28 The car parks are very large in size, however they are a) relatively low in profile and in the case of Car Park A fit comfortably into the higher ground immediately south so won't excessively impact on views from within the Green Belt and b) will be clad in a varied system of panelling and climbers, helping soften their impact and appearance. Residents immediately north and north-west of Car Park B will look directly towards the car park in some cases from their windows and gardens, however the elevations facing these residents will be partly “dug” into the ground levels at this location and these elevations will, in time, be covered in climbers to help them blend in better with existing/retained vegetation and trees in this location. It is our view that the proposed impact on their amenity is

acceptable and we understand the applicant has consulted with residents in this area. Landscape colleagues will also be commenting in greater detail on this aspect of the scheme separately.

Public art

- 6.29 We have reviewed the Public Art Delivery Plan dated April 2015. The main commission will be by one artist whose work will involve a work, or series of works, in collaboration with the design team which can be integrated on the northern car park (Car Park B) and adjoining boulevard.
- 6.30 At section 4.8 of the DAS, there is a more detailed description of what we understand to be the emerging proposal to deliver the public art contribution. This includes the use of solids taken from imagined cut-out perforations from the metal fins on ARM A and ARM B “...being blown across the site – rather like leaves falling from a tree in autumn and being scattered by the wind – some landing on the ground but the majority affixing themselves to the building opposite” (extract from page 122, section 4.81 Artist’s Proposal, in the DAS).
- 6.31 Precisely how the triangular cut-out elements will be fastened to the petraarch panels on Car Park B needs to be agreed, however in our view this is a very creative idea and one which continues the theme of design being informed by technological “motifs” in an interesting way. We will need to be closely involved in the detailed design and selection of fastening of the triangular elements but are very much encouraged by the idea at this stage.

Comments of the Design and Conservation Panel

- 6.32 The panel reviewed and early iteration of the scheme at its meeting of August 13, 2014. The scheme was not fully developed at the time of the presentation and the presentation provided was about the more general principles of building massing and elevation as well as landscape car parking.
- 6.33 Given its early stage of development, the panel awarded the scheme an overall AMBER verdict but concluded that they were “...comfortable in general terms with the conceptual master planning....”. They considered that a more thorough

explanation of the impact of the scheme on its wider setting was needed and that the potential for reducing the building height should be explored.

- 6.34 We are comfortable that the panel's comments have been addressed through further more detailed work since the meeting. Further comments from the Panel following its meeting of July 8th 2015 are outlined later in the report (paras 106-113).

Conclusions:

- 6.35 As noted previously, this application has been the subject of extensive pre-application discussions and the evolution of the site and building design has featured significantly in those discussions. We are pleased with what is now proposed through this application though would note the need to carefully condition materials to ensure the quality of the proposal as set out and aspired to in the DAS is executed fully. In this regard the use of GRP cladding at roof level is questionable, but an alternate material can be considered and secured via condition. Equally clarification is needed as to the thickness of the aluminium fins.
- 6.36 The scheme represents a significant project for a significant employer in Cambridge and has the potential to be a very exciting addition to the city. We consider that the detailed site and building design, together with the creative use of materials and the emerging public art proposal will deliver a scheme which is appropriate for ARM and the city.
- 6.37 On this basis, the application is considered to accord with relevant Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and emerging Local Plan policies (2014 Proposed Submission) 55, 56, and 57.
- 6.38 Following additional information In our comments of June 1, 2015, we raised concern about the use of GRP (glass reinforced plastic) cladding was proposed to conceal ducts at roof level. We note this has now been amended to aluminium for this location in a blue-grey colour and are content with this amendment which will provide a higher quality, more appropriate fit with the other building materials on ARM A and B.

6.39 In addition, we questioned which of the two options for the thickness of the façade “fins” would be used, as two options were shown in the application submissions (5mm or 50mm, the latter being simply two 5mm panels spaced apart to total 50mm). We understand this is now going to be one 5mm thick panel for the fins and note that this helps avoid the effect of two sets of perforations appearing misaligned when seen from below (how they would be seen from any external view of the building).

6.40 Finally, for the car park elevations we questioned how a) the fastenings for the petrarch panels would be concealed and b) how the art “triangles” would be fixed to the petrarch panels. Revised elevation drawings of the car parks note the following:

“Petrarch Panel Fixing Strategy: Slatted Petrarch façade slatted panels nearly riveted to fully finished steel frame using colour matched fixings to match Petrarch panels. All other fixing back to subframe to be concealed”

6.41 With this clarification and the drawings not provided showing further detail on these panels, we are content that the framework to which the car park panels will be attached will be fully concealed and have no further concerns.

6.42 With regards to the public art being fastened to the same panels, we are content that this is conditioned and reviewed together with the approval of the Petrarch panels (sample panel) and accept that the final art installation is subject to further development.

6.43 In conclusion, the amendments and further information as received in July mean that the application, subject to the conditions noted in our earlier comments, is acceptable in design terms.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

Sustainable design and construction

6.44 Policy 3/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 requires applications for major development to be accompanied by the Council’s Sustainable Development Checklist and a

Sustainability Statement. In order to demonstrate how the principles of sustainable design and construction have been integrated into the design of the proposals, the applicant has submitted an Energy and Sustainability Report, with further information contained in the Design and Access Statement and the Landscape Strategy. These documents outline a range of measures, including:

- Targeting a minimum BREEAM score of 'very good' with an aspiration to achieve BREEAM 'excellent'. The Energy and Sustainability Strategy includes a BREEAM pre-assessment, which indicates that as currently designed, the scheme is capable of achieving a score of 71.06%, which is equivalent to a BREEAM 'excellent' rating, albeit with only a small buffer. This approach is supported as it is the Council's opinion that a score of 'excellent' is entirely in keeping with the design aspirations for this site as well as the innovative nature of the work that ARM themselves undertake. It should also be highlighted that the scheme is also targeting a number of BREEAM innovation credits, notably in relation to sustainable procurement and construction waste management), an approach that is supported. If all possible credits are achieved then a score of 83.38% could be achieved, which is close to a BREEAM 'outstanding' rating.
- The integration of passive design measures into the architectural design of the proposals, notably the innovative approach to passive solar design, which is considered further in the renewable energy section below.
- The specification of brown roofs, which will include a mosaic of grassland seed in order to provide an ecologically enhanced habitat with the aim of mirroring the environment/habitats of the nearby Cherry Hinton Pit SSSI. The brown roofs will provide multiple benefits to the scheme, not only in terms of biodiversity enhancement but also surface water attenuation and the reduction of internal cooling loads.
- The integration of SuDS features into the landscaping design, which will maximise the benefits that SuDS pose beyond just surface water attenuation. Features proposed, in addition to the brown roofs, include a runnel in front of the new building, permeable paving, swales, gravel filter drains, Breedon gravel and geo-cellular storage. While I will leave detailed technical comments to the Council's sustainable drainage engineer, the overall approach to SuDS is supported.
- The proposal to utilise rainwater recycling tanks (or similar) to provide water for irrigation is welcomed. It would be helpful if

the applicant can provide further information as to the location of these tanks. If to be located underground, this will need to be considered in light of the landscape strategy to ensure the tanks do not impact on landscape features.

All of these measures are supported.

Renewable Energy Provision

- 6.45 In line with the requirements of Policy 8/16 of the Local Plan 2006, applicants of major developments need to demonstrate that their proposal can meet at least 10% of its energy requirements through the use of on-site renewable energy requirements, measured in terms of carbon reduction. The Council's Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document provides further guidance on this policy, including that passive solar design can count towards meeting this requirement, and a number of schemes in Cambridge have utilised a passive solar design approach to meet the requirements of Policy 8/16.
- 6.46 From early pre-application discussions for this scheme it has been apparent that the applicant was keen to take an architectural approach to the reduction of energy use and associated carbon emissions looking to implement innovative ways in which to reduce energy demand in a building where the predominant energy loads will be related to electricity. It was also apparent that the applicant was keen to focus on sustainability strategies that offered multiple benefits not just to building users, but the wider environment in which the Peterhouse Technology Park sits, for example through integrating SuDS into the landscaping design of the scheme. As a result, discussions around renewable energy moved away from the implementation of technologies to looking at innovative ways in which passive solar design could be integrated into the architecture of the scheme so as to become a specific feature, hence the introduction of the external solar screening. Consideration has been given to renewable energy provision, with a focus on the generation of electricity and the potential role that photovoltaic panels could play. These have been ruled out for a number of reasons including:
- Visual impacts given the sensitive location of the development on the edge of the Cambridge Green Belt. This is coupled with

the priority that has been given to the use of brown roofs, which not only will help to reduce the visual impact of the building when viewed from a distance, but also offer multiple benefits as referenced above;

- The relatively limited impact that photovoltaic panels would have on reducing energy related CO₂ emissions; and
- The desire to pursue a more innovative approach to CO₂ reduction and energy demand reduction through the use of the architecturally integrated solar shading, the primary role of which is to reduce energy loads associated with cooling in the summer as well as reducing energy demand related to heating and lighting.

6.47 Carbon calculations have been submitted for the scheme, which have established the 10% requirement for both regulated and unregulated energy as 82,100 Kg/CO₂/annum. The use of passive solar design measures, i.e. the solar shading, is predicted to lead to reductions of 81,000 Kg/CO₂/annum, which equates to a 9.8% reduction in emissions. Further carbon emission and energy demand reductions are to be achieved through the use of energy efficient plant, low energy lighting and efficient ventilation, which brings overall carbon reduction to 13.5% compared to a Building Regulations 2013 compliant baseline. This approach is supported.

6.48 While the contribution of the passive solar design is slightly below the 10% requirement, I am supportive of the approach being taken as it demonstrates the extent to which an architectural response can reduce the carbon emissions of a building. While the use of photovoltaic panels could have made a contribution to carbon reduction, the amount needed to make a significant contribution to the energy demand of this building would have had a visual impact in what is a sensitive location. In my view the use of the solar shading, the design of which will be bespoke to this building, taking its inspiration from the silicon crystal that lies at the heart of the integrated circuits designed by ARM, demonstrates a level of innovation that justifies a slightly different approach to the application of Policy 8/16. As such, the approach being taken is supported.

Access Officer

6.49 ARM generally has very good provision for disabled access as shown by the comprehensive D&A statement provided. The

Disability Panel made comments but were generally happy with this proposal after a presentation.

- Hearing loops are needed at reception, meeting rooms, etc
- The wheelchair accessible toilets need reconfiguring so that the transfer space is not across the entrance to the door.
- The accessible shower could be reconfigured to be a shower and 'Changing Places' standard toilet.

6.50 No further comments received following revisions.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

6.51 Application as originally submitted: **Objection** – for the following reasons:

- The format of the Arb Implications Assessment (AIA) makes it difficult to compare the impact on trees with the proposed site plans and does not appear to show required removals.
- Notwithstanding the above, the proposal does not appear to consider the importance of trees around the existing field and the planted belt of trees along the west boundary of the existing car park. This is an established and valuable belt of trees the loss of which will have a detrimental impact on amenity. The site is dominated by buildings and hardstanding and therefore needs these tree belts to soften the environment.

6.52 Following additional information: query whether the existing tree belt to the west of the existing car park is to be retained and outline that the Arboricultural Implication Assessment plans is not clear.

6.53 Tree Officer has requested conditions be imposed relating to further information and tree protection measures should the proposals be granted planning permission.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.54 Application as originally submitted: Broadly supportive of the scheme which has also been the subject of extensive pre-application advice. Further information was requested to enable the proposals to be fully assessed. Including:

- Groundworks specification/method statement including stripping, stockpiling of soils on site or adjacent and re-spreading.
- Cut and fill details.
- Landscape maintenance and management plan.

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)

6.55 The applicant has submitted a Landscape Strategy and an Environmental Statement which provide information relating to the visual impact of the proposals. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is of particular relevance in assessing the local and wider landscape and visual impacts. The Landscape Officer has advised that the findings are generally supported but offer the following detailed comments in respect of this information as follows:

6.56 Concur with the findings that the site is physically and visually contained in the wider landscape by the rolling chalkland ridge to the south and Limekiln Hill to the west. On the southern boundary of Peterhouse Technology Park mature hedging forms a well-defined soft green edge to the City with the roofscape visible above the vegetation. The northern and equally sensitive boundary is formed by residential development at Tweedale.

6.57 The site and proposed development would not be visible in any strategic views towards Cambridge as identified in the Cambridge Skyline Guidelines but would be visible on the edge of the City when approaching along Fulbourn Road to the east. Views from Mill Hill west of Fulbourn are identified as "setting views" in the Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment. There are distant views towards the City skyline in views from Shelford Road to the southeast.

6.58 With regard to the setting of the city and the application site, the intervening topography and publically accessible viewpoints result in views being limited to those obtained from: a portion of Shelford Road to the southeast, approaching Cambridge along

Fulbourn Road, and those from the residential roads and properties of Limedale Close, Tweedale and Ainsdale to the north and northwest and within Peterhouse Technology Park itself.

- 6.59 The proposed buildings would be largely hidden beyond intervening topography, seen in conjunction with existing built form at Peterhouse Technology Park or set amongst trees and hedgerows on the edge of the City at Limekiln Hill, along Fulbourn Road and at Capital Park. In views towards the City Centre, the development would sit below and not intrude on views of the skyline and historic core, with the composition of views and setting of the City remaining largely unaffected.
- 6.60 Significant adverse residual visual effects identified by the LVIA are limited to those obtained from properties of Limedale Close and Tweedale. The proposals incorporate mitigation measures to minimise effects on the visual amenity but there will be some adverse effects remaining.
- 6.61 Chapter M deals with cumulative effects of extending the Peterhouse Technology park westward. It finds that some negative residual effects remain after mitigation measures have been put in place with regard to specific sensitive receptors in relation to landscape and visual impact, i.e. there would be a negative residual effect on the properties on Ainsdale.
- 6.62 The LVIA did not identify any significant adverse residual landscape effects arising from the proposed development apart from the localised loss of agricultural land adjacent to the built edge and contained within the wider landscape.
- 6.63 The incorporation of a landscape buffer strip to the southern boundary with the agricultural land incorporating native hedgerows and tree planting would provide enhancements to the built edge.
- 6.64 The LVIA has also undertaken a subjective assessment of the potential night time effects associated with the proposed development and found that there are unlikely to be any significant night time effects.

6.65 Following additional information: Still require further information relating to planting species, treatment of the southern boundary and maintenance and management plan.

6.66 Following second additional information: All other amendments have been completed. I would like to condition the following:

- Landscape groundworks specification/method statement including stripping, stockpiling of soils on site or adjacent and re-spreading.
- Revisions to the Landscape maintenance and management plan.

Suggested Landscape Conditions

- Façade sample materials and colours shown on site.
- 5 year replacement of failed planting.
- Conditions relating to Façade sample materials and colours
- Landscape implementation.
- Implementation of Landscape Management Plan.
- Details of topsoil removal.

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

6.67 Application as originally submitted: **Objection** Access to the site: The applicant highlights some of the inadequacies in the cycling and walking routes to the site but does not indicate what measures will be funded through section 106 to mitigate the increased usage on these routes of staff travelling to work. Paragraph 6.13 in the Environmental Statement is poorly written and does not make clear what is proposed.

6.68 Access within the site: There is no information about existing cycle parking locations and whether or not it is adequate for existing usage. Access to the East car park cycle parking is not acceptable as it is too close to the disabled car parking space.

6.69 It is not clear what purpose the blue section of cycle path serves to the east of the North car park – according to the vehicular access plan no motor vehicles travel north along the eastern side of the car park and so it is not clear why a separate cycle path is needed. (Please note that if any cycle path is indicated with coloured surfacing this colour should be red not blue). The path from Limedale Close to the cycle parking entrance should

be 3m for the entire length – the pinch point created by the gravel path should be removed.

6.70 The path to the east of Cambridge Water is very narrow and not suitable for shared use. Cyclists should be encouraged to use either the main access or the Limedale Close access. The section of blue surfacing encourages cycles onto a narrow footway with what appears to be chicanes - this is not acceptable.

6.71 The cycle route plan in the Design and Access Statement (point 4.9.4) does not show the route to the cycle parking in the East car park.

6.72 Following additional information: **Objection.** Access to the East car park cycle parking is not acceptable as it is too close to the disabled car parking space. It is not clear what purpose the section of cycle path serves to the east of the North car park. According to the vehicular access plan no motor vehicles travel north along the eastern side of the car park and so it is not clear why a separate cycle path is needed. The path from Limedale Close to the cycle parking entrance should be 3m for the entire length. The current proposal is not acceptable.

6.73 The cycle route plan in the Design and Access Statement (point 4.9.4) does not show the route to the cycle parking in the East car park.

6.74 Following further clarification from architect:

- With regard to access to the East Car Park - this is improved.
- The width of the segregated cycle route up past the North car park is acceptable
- There are no Sheffield stands in the East and North car parks - there need to be some in each area so that those with non-standard bikes/ child seats/large baskets have an alternative option.
- Further details needed regarding aisle widths for the two tier racks.

Drainage Consultant

6.75 Application as originally submitted: The proposal as it currently stands only just about achieves a single treatments stage (SuDS). I would suggest that this is looked at again as it is this element that prevents the sustainable drainage scheme from being viewed as an exemplar. I would also suggest that a proprietary water quality improving component could be utilised in this location.

Following additional information: Advise that the SuDS is acceptable, although not exemplary.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

6.76 Application as originally submitted: Confirm that the survey methodologies are acceptable. Fully support the proposals and would be happy to assist the applicant in sourcing local seed from City Council owned nature reserves. Also request that conditions are imposed in relation to providing a lighting design strategy for biodiversity, details of bat and bird boxes and the sourcing of native local species for planting.

Planning Policy Manager

6.77 Policy 4/1 in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 states that there is a presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The policy's supporting text sets out the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt, which are to:

- Preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic City with a thriving historic core;
- Maintain and enhance the quality of its setting; and
- Prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the City.

6.78 The NPPF sets out the government's policy on Green Belt. The NPPF attaches great importance to Green Belts and the fundamental aim of Green Belts defined as preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open¹. Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area are advised to establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set

¹ NPPF, paragraph 79

the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan². When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development³.

6.79 The Council started preparation of a new Local Plan in 2011 and submitted the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission document for examination in March 2014. Policy 4 in the draft plan sets out the Council's approach to Green Belt. As part of the review of the Local Plan the Council along with South Cambridgeshire District Council have reviewed the inner Green Belt boundary on the edge of the city as part of the development strategy. This review identified a number of small sites that were capable of release from the Cambridge Green Belt without harming the purposes of the Green Belt. Development here would have limited impacts on Green Belt purposes which are capable of mitigation. Furthermore, the site is in a sustainable location on the urban edge of Cambridge and the release of this land would support the Cambridge high tech economy and ARM.

6.80 Policy 26 in the draft Local Plan proposes allocations GB3 & GB4 at this location for employment development. Whilst the Inspector has held hearing sessions in relation to Green Belt and proposed allocations GB3 & GB4 the Inspector has not given any indication or conclusion on these matters.

6.81 As the draft Local Plan has not been adopted this site should be regarded as the Green Belt and hence the proposed development is technically defined as 'inappropriate development in the Green Belt'. The NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in 'very special circumstances'⁴. It goes on to say that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential

² NPPF, paragraph 83

³ NPPF, paragraph 84

⁴ NPPF, paragraph 87

harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations⁵.

6.82 It is clear therefore, that the test for releasing land from the Green Belt (exceptional circumstances) is different from the test for inappropriate development in the Green Belt (very special circumstances). The applicant is not relying on the release of Green Belt land (sites GB3 and GB4) as proposed in the draft Local Plan and instead are seeking to demonstrate a 'very special circumstances' argument. Without which, the proposals would be unacceptable as a matter of principle and conflict with policy 4/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Very Special Circumstances Case

6.83 The applicant has argued that the case for very special circumstances is met as there are "very special circumstances" that justify the proposed development. These are associated with the considerable local and national significance of the Cambridge Cluster, and of the important social and economic contribution that ARM makes to it. In particular:

(a) the proposed development needs to be located in Cambridge both to ensure the long term economic health of the City, and to achieve ARM's requirements;

(b) the proposed development needs to be within a single, consolidated site;

(c) there is an immediate requirement for the business to grow with new space to be available by Q4 2016;

(d) there is a lack of suitable alternative sites; and

(e) there would be significant consequences for Cambridge and the wider economy if the Proposed Development is not able to proceed.

6.84 All of these factors together are considered to demonstrate that there are very special circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt by way of inappropriate development.

⁵ NPPF, paragraph 88

6.85 In this case, the very special circumstances have been demonstrated as:

1. development at this site will not substantially harm the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt⁶;
2. the Council is proposing this land is released from the Green Belt in the new Local Plan⁷;
3. there are substantial benefits to the local and national economy⁸;
4. ARM have conducted an extensive search for alternative sites in the Cambridge area⁹; and
5. this land is in a sustainable location on the edge of Cambridge.

Employment

6.86 The application is proposing substantial new employment development. ARM A and ARM B are providing 20,677 sqm of new floor space (Gross External Area). The demolition of ARM 2 will result in the loss of 1,231 sqm of floor space (GEA). The Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission proposes that sites GB3 and GB4 (which includes most of the site of this planning application as well as land to the west) will deliver approximately 25,000 sqm of new employment floor space. The site of the planning application covers roughly half of sites GB3 and GB4 as well as extending into land not in GB3 and GB4 and is proposing a large proportion of the floor space envisioned. It appears that the planning application will not prejudice the delivery of the employment floor space envisioned in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission.

6.87 Policy 7/2 in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 requires new employment development proposals to meet one of the four criteria. This is to ensure that the limited supply of employment land in Cambridge is reserved for businesses have an essential need for a Cambridge location. It should be noted that the final sentence of policy 7/2 states that “this policy does not apply to

⁶ As evidenced by the Council’s assessment of this land in the 2012 Green Belt Review and Matter Statement and the applicant’s statement

⁷ Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission Policy 26 and Policies Map

⁸ As evidenced by the applicants planning statement and the Council’s Matter 6 statement

⁹ As evidenced by the applicants planning statement

development by established bodies for their own occupation and use". An established body is defined as a business that has been operating in Cambridge for five years or more. ARM meets the definition of an established body and so is not required to meet the criteria of policy 7/2.

- 6.88 Policy 7/4 in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 promotes development which supports the Cambridge Cluster. The proposed development clearly fosters innovation and helps reinforce the existing high technology and research cluster in Cambridge. The need to be located in this area is set out in the Planning Statement submitted with the application.

Historic England

- 6.89 Historic England do not wish to offer any comments on this occasion and the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of specialist conservation advice.

Sport England

- 6.90 Have no comments to make in respect of the application.

Natural England

- 6.91 No objection. Whilst the proposed development is located, at its closest, within approximately 150m of Cherry Hinton Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), we are satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures have been identified to ensure that development will not have an adverse impact on the special interests for which this site has been notified. The SSSI is primarily notified for the populations of four nationally uncommon plant species which occur on the site. In addition, the site supports areas of herb-rich chalk grassland. Having reviewed the relevant sections of the Environmental Statement, submitted as part of this application, we are satisfied that adverse effects on the natural environment through potential pathways, including emissions to air, are unlikely subject to the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.

Natural England would expect mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Statement, including drainage/pollution control measures, measures to minimise dust generation and to

secure biodiversity protection and enhancement, to be implemented through appropriately worded planning conditions.

Environment Agency

- 6.92 Application as originally submitted: The agency has no objection in principle to the proposed development subject to conditions relating to contaminated land, and piling being imposed should planning permission be granted.
- 6.93 Following additional information: confirm that there are no additional comments to be made.

Lead Local Flood Authority (Cambridgeshire County Council)

- 6.94 Application as originally submitted: advise that they are unable to comment as insufficient information has been provided.
- 6.95 Following additional information: confirm that no further information has been provided in respect of flooding issues.

Anglian Water

- 6.96 Application as originally submitted: (duplicate comments)

Wastewater Treatment – the foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Cambridge Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.

Foul Sewerage Network: The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows.

Surface Water Disposal: The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is acceptable.

A condition relating to the construction of hard standing areas has been requested.

Following additional information: No further comments.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.97 Application as originally submitted: The application has been viewed from a crime reduction and/or community safety perspective. Recommend electronic access control for cycle stores. Overall, no objection to the proposals.
- 6.98 Following additional information: No further comments.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.99 Our records indicate that the site is located in an area of high archaeological potential. Three ring ditch remains of Bronze Age burial mounds were known from aerial photographs and were investigated ahead of the construction of the adjacent technology park in 1997 (HER ECB357). The Iron Age earthwork enclosure War Ditches is located a short distance to the south west (HER 04963), which was also the site of subsequent Roman occupation (HER 04963a). The site has been subject to an archaeological evaluation, the results of which indicate that significant evidence for prehistoric activity survives in the area. These archaeological remains would be severely damaged or destroyed by the proposed development.
- 6.100 We would therefore recommend that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation, to excavate and record the archaeological evidence ahead of construction. The programme should include provision for archiving and publication of the results of the investigation and should be commissioned and undertaken at the expense of the developer. This programme of work could be secured by condition.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service

- 6.101 Request that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants, which may be by way of a Section 106 agreement or a planning condition. The applicants should also note that Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service have non standardised Fire appliance.

Highways England

- 6.102 Offer no objection.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting(s) of 13 August 2014

6.103 The panel reviewed an early iteration of the scheme at its meeting of August 13, 2014. The scheme was not fully developed at the time of the presentation and the presentation provided was about the more general principles of building massing and elevation as well as landscape car parking.

6.104 Given its early stage of development, the panel awarded the scheme an overall AMBER verdict but concluded that they were "...comfortable in general terms with the conceptual master planning....". They considered that a more thorough explanation of the impact of the scheme on its wider setting was needed and that the potential for reducing the building height should be explored.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting(s) of 8 July 2015)

The minutes of the Panel meeting are below:

6.105 The detailed planning application consisting of: the demolition of ARM2; the construction of new buildings for B1 use; two multi-storey car parking structures; additional temporary car parking spaces; new cycle parking spaces; hard and soft landscaping works; new internal roads, foot and cycle paths; ancillary and associated facilities and site infrastructure. This follows the pre-application presentation in August 2014 (noted above).

Presentation by Ed Hayden of Scott Brownrigg Architects.

The Panel's comments were as follows:

Southern landscape boundary treatment and views.

6.106 As a key concern raised at the last presentation; the Panel felt strongly that with such a long, uninterrupted southern façade, a robust boundary treatment was needed to relieve its stark impact on views from the fields and Gog Magog hills. A native species hedge running the full length of the southern boundary and allowed to grow to a significant height together with a series

of taller trees was therefore regarded as more appropriate than the low hedge proposed.

Phasing.

6.107 The Panel welcomed the intention for early landscape procurement to secure its delivery as a single entity. As ARM are not the exclusive users of the Technology Park, the need for flexible floorspace is also understood.

Vertical perforated fins (main building).

6.108 The Panel were not comfortable with the proposed detailing for the vertical fins for solar control and for minimising light pollution, as they appear dated. Also, the need to deter pigeons would result in the unfortunate inclusion of spikes along the horizontal elements of the fins. Further work on the detailing is recommended.

Parking.

6.109 The Panel understands that the Highways Authority is currently examining the justification for the proposed parking ratio and will look forward to learning the outcome of this work.

Petrarch panels (cladding).

6.110 Some concern was expressed regarding the use of this cladding along such a huge expanse and whether sufficient studies had been carried out as to its impact on the landscape. It is recommended that officers have the opportunity to review large samples of the cladding on site before the final colour and texture is agreed.

Public routes through to the Gog Magog Hills.

6.111 The Panel would like to see future consideration given to the re-opening of historic public access through to the Gog Magog hills. (The designers are reminded that under current policy, the lack of public access to land to the south is not a consideration when evaluating the impact on views.)

Conclusion.

6.112 The Panel appreciated the opportunity to re-visit this scheme at the more developed, submission stage. The eastern boundary has now been continued to the SSSI which is welcomed. Some concerns remain however. These principally focus on the southern boundary as this will become the new long-term Green Belt boundary of the city. The importance of the southern boundary treatment cannot be underestimated, and every measure should be taken to mitigate the impact of the scheme's expansive southern façade as far as possible. As the neighbouring fields are also owned by Peterhouse College, the Panel would encourage any scope for off-site planting to be explored, so as to provide a more robust boundary treatment.

VERDICT – AMBER (5), GREEN (4) based on the treatment of the southern boundary (see conclusion above) and concerns relating to the detailing of the solar control fins and cladding material for the car parks.

Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 26 May 2015)

6.113 The Design team are praised for their comprehensive Access Statement. Further information on how a disabled person would navigate the site would have been helpful however, particularly as the scale of the plans was smaller than the recommended 1:100 and made distances difficult to judge.

Ministry of Defence

6.114 Application as originally submitted: The MOD has no safeguarding objections to the proposals.

6.115 Following additional information: The MOD has no safeguarding objections to the proposals.

National Grid

6.116 Application as originally submitted: Comments dated 29.07.15

Objection: for the following reasons:

- The building at NG4, on drawing A-01-DR-414-100 is within 3 meters of the high pressure gas pipeline. National Grid Policy

and the guidance given in document IGEM/TD/1 (which is used by HSE and the Gas industry as standard to operate pipelines under) indicates that there should be no building erected within 3 meters of the pipeline.

- The proposed building footprint is within our easement area, this would restrict access to the pipeline should any works to the pipeline be required.
- The building at NG1, on drawing A-01-DR-414-100, appears to show structure or changes to ground over pipeline. This is not acceptable in terms of policy and access as any building on top of the pipeline is not allowed.
- It appears that the ground coverage over the Pipeline may be reduced as part of the Applicant's proposals. National Grid Gas has considerable concerns about this from a health and safety perspective.
- The structures shown at NG3, on drawing A-01-DR-414-100 need agreeing with National Grid as they can endanger the integrity of the pipeline.

6.117 Following additional information: Remove objection

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 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

Medical Research 120 Peterhouse Technology Park
5 Limesdale Close (2 letters)
34 The Orchards
1 Limesdale Close

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Traffic and Parking

- Concern relating to the impact on traffic on Fulbourn Road.
- Workers may park in Limedale Close which would inconvenience residents, there is also a covenant which prevents residents from parking on the street but this could not be applied to workers for the ARM site.
- Concern relating to safety of access through Limedale Close for cyclists turning onto Fulbourn Road.
- We feel that the proposed extension to the park and the associated enhanced landscaping would be a positive improvement. However we have concerns relating to access to the park and the number of proposed parking spaces.
- The transport survey was conducted in June 2014 and as neighbours on the PTP we were surprised not to be informed of this or consulted.
- The seasonal nature of staff travel has not been addressed in the travel plan and if collated in winter, the level of staff journeys to work is likely to be lower than the 24% given as the June figure.
- From experience parking at Peterhouse Technology Park is far less of an issue during pleasant months (such as June) when employees are more likely to walk or cycle
- The proposed parking level (538) is unrealistic for the 1,000 staff increase and will result in parking issues.
- The results of the transport survey led to the conclusion that no alteration to the access from Fulbourn Road is needed. It is our belief that an extra 1,000 staff will create congestion in peak periods as well as increase pollution. The transport survey does not appear to consider the increase in car traffic both to the site and into Cambridge.
- Changes are needed to the existing access to allow traffic to flow more easily.
- The current access to the site is not safe for cyclists and this may deter employees from cycling into work.
- ARM employees may use the MRC designated spaces and park on the access roads which reduces visibility and affects manoeuvring space for delivery and emergency vehicles.
- Limedale Close is too narrow and the pavement is regularly crossed by private driveways there are major concerns for people leaving their driveways with the number of pedestrians and cyclists present as visibility is poor.

Neighbour Amenity

- During building work we would like assurance that work on Saturdays will be kept to a minimum and no work will occur on Sundays.
- Concern that security lighting on the site may cause light pollution/disturbance.
- Concern relating to noise from air conditioning and noise from cars using the site.
- Objections to the idea of having access to the site through Limedale Close.
- Concerns relating to construction phase of development, the plans refer to temporary access and parking but does not specify numbers and again depending on the time of year this could exacerbate parking issues at the site.
- Object to the access via Limedale Close as there is already a tendency for people to be dropped off at the top of the close and cars arriving to collect people and parking on the pavement and then turning on private driveways.
- The area immediately behind Limedale close is artificially raised we request that this earth be removed and the level put down to the level of our garden and the street.

7.3 Cambridge Past Present and Future have also made a representation in respect of the application as submitted and advise as follows:

‘Cambridge Past, Present and Future’s planning committee have reviewed and discussed the application. If the Council is satisfied with ARM’s explanation, and are reassured that approval would not create a precedent for other less deserving applications, then Cambridge PPF would support the application ‘ although the support is heavily caveated.

7.4 The main concerns raised by Cambridge PPF relate to:

- The timing of this application in the context of the approval process of the 2014 Local Plan. Because the expansion of PTP necessitates the release of the two sites GB3 and GB4 from the Green Belt at a time when the local plan is still in draft form, our main concerns are those of the timing of the application and of the potential precedent this approval could provide.
- Lack of detail to explain the urgency of ARM’s requirements for new space.

- From our reading of the NPPF, land cannot be released from the Green Belt solely because of the weight of the exceptional circumstances, which appears to be the thrust of the applicant's argument, as any release must be through the re-drawing of the boundary in the Local Plan.
- The application does provide a strong justification as to how the exceptional circumstances are satisfied. However it does rely heavily on the 2012 Inner Green Belt Review, which has itself now come under criticism from the Inspectors in their preliminary report.
- The visual impact of the development in such a sensitive area on the Green Belt boundary could be minimised by reducing the mass of the buildings.
- We would urge that the site is levelled between the gas main and the Southern boundary, and that the landscaping of the bank along the site boundary to the South is strengthened with more tree planting.
- Cambridge PPF also has concerns about the adequacy of the proposals to mitigate the traffic congestion generated by the increased number of employees along the already heavily congested Fulbourn Road. The Travel Plan seems to comprise the usual measures such as car sharing and cycle spaces which will have only marginal effect. As always with these developments, the transport and traffic implications are viewed piecemeal on a site-by-site basis when what is needed is a more comprehensive integrated assessment of traffic flows across the whole South-East Cambridge area.
- The landscape assessment for the Local Plan Review and release of the greenbelt is not relevant to the determination of the application and the applicant's should not rely on this assessment, which has been called into question by the Local Plan Inspector.

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

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. Very special circumstances case
3. Employment
4. Visual Impact
5. Context of the site design and external spaces
6. Residential amenity
7. Public Art
8. Energy and sustainability
9. Disabled access
10. Refuse arrangements
11. Highway safety
12. Car and cycle parking
13. Trees
14. Biodiversity
15. Third party representations
16. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

- 8.2 The site is currently allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan as greenbelt land. Therefore, development of this scale is unacceptable as a matter of principle unless 'very special circumstances' can be demonstrated. It is this argument that the applicants are relying on, and the application is not made on the basis of the proposed allocation of GB3 and GB4 as employment land in the review of the Cambridge Local Plan. In this case, the application is not premature in the sense that it will be assessed against the current designation of the site as greenbelt under Policy 4/1 and government guidance in the NPPF.
- 8.3 Concerns have been raised by third parties concerning the status of the Local Plan Review. The fact that the applicants have submitted the application under 'very special circumstances' also means that the current application would not result in any 'pre-judgment' of the outcome of the Local Plan Review and would not set any precedent for other development in the greenbelt. Should any other proposals come forward, a justification under the 'very special circumstances' argument would be needed and each case would be judged on its own merits and on the basis of the relevant Local Plan Policies in force at that time.

Very Special Circumstances Case

- 8.4 Having reviewed the information submitted as the 'very special circumstances' case put forward, I am of the opinion that the expansion of the ARM facilities at the Peterhouse Technology Park does meet the criteria as set out in the NPPF in line with the comments received from the Planning Policy Manager. I am also of the opinion that the retention of the global headquarters of ARM in Cambridge for the foreseeable future would have clear economic and employment benefits for Cambridge. Given that ARM have very specific recruitment requirements, working practices and products I am minded that the exception being made relates specifically to ARM as a company and it would be reasonable therefore, given this is permanent development to recognise the special circumstances put forward by ARM to restrict the first occupation of the new buildings to ARM. Government guidance is clear that personal permissions should be avoided wherever possible and so to secure ARM's occupation for the mid-term (3 years) will be sought via a clause in the S106 legal agreement. This time period is considered appropriate as it is long enough to show a commitment from ARM but will also cover the period of the Local Plan Review where the site is proposed for release from the Greenbelt. It is not considered that it would be reasonable or appropriate to control occupation for a longer period than this, nor would that meet the guidance on proper use of planning conditions. I note the request from the Highway Authority in their latest consultation response that the occupation of the building is restricted to ARM in perpetuity. The justification set out above have been put to the Highway Authority who have accepted this stance (e-mail dated 03.08.15).
- 8.5 Given the arguments set out above and having considered the advice of the Planning Policy Manager I conclude that very special circumstances have been demonstrated in respect of the requirement for this development as a matter of principle, the impact of the proposals will be assessed separately under the relevant sections of the report below. In the light of this conclusion, should the committee be minded to support the recommendation be for approval, the application will need to be referred to the Secretary of State as a 'departure' from adopted policy 4/1 (Greenbelt). The application has been advertised as a departure from the Local Plan.

Visual Impact (on wider landscape)

- 8.6 I have reviewed the information contained in the LVIA and having visited the site and assessed the wider visibility of the site from public vantage points and looked at the immediate surrounding context, I consider that the topography of the site, the location and form of the buildings, the landscaping (particularly to the southern boundary of the site) and the colour and materials proposed for the building all serve to integrate the proposed buildings as fully as possible within the immediate context and to allow the buildings to 'sit' within the wider landscape. It is the office building which in my view has the greatest impact on the wider landscape due to its position in relation to the southern boundary of the site and the fact that this end of the site is more exposed to wider views than the eastern end of the site, which sits within a deep recess and is largely screened from wider views. Whilst a buildings in this location, and of this scale will have some impacts, I am satisfied that the proposals are acceptable. Overall, I concur with the conclusions of the Landscape Officer with regard to the impacts in the wider landscape and conclude that these are acceptable.
- 8.7 Third party comments have raised concerns about reference to the work undertaken in respect of the LVIA to support the release of GB3 and GB4 in the review of the Local Plan. It is the case that the applicant's submission does reference this work and does point to this in part as justification for the location of the buildings. However, the applicant's assessment of the visual and landscape impact is not restricted to this work and I am satisfied that sufficient evidence has been produced in respect of the visual impact of the proposed building with the current greenbelt designation, the supporting evidence does not rely on the site being released from the greenbelt for the visual impacts to be acceptable.
- 8.8 Third party comments have also stated that the area to the west of the northern car park is artificially raised and should be levelled to the reflect the levels in Limekiln Close. The proposals seek to retain some mature trees to the west of the northern car park and whilst the level is artificially raised, levelling of it would be likely to impact on the retention of the mature trees. I am also of the opinion that the change in ground levels serve to screen the building and help it to 'sit' within the site. To remove the raised

ground would serve to expose the building further in views from the west which I do not consider would be favourable. Finally, the site levels have been designed to reflect the constraints of the site and there is a high pressure gas main immediately to the south of the proposed northern carpark and National Grid have commented that there would be safety concerns with excavations in the vicinity of the gas main as this would reduce the depth of the pipe in relation to the ground level which is undesirable for safety reasons/

- 8.9 I also note that there are visual impacts identified which affect the residential streets immediately adjacent to the site this issue will be addressed in detail in the residential amenity section to the report. I am satisfied though, that the proposals would comply with Policies 3/2, 3/3, 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) in relation to long distances views from outside of the site and impacts of the development in the wider landscape context.

Context of site, design and external spaces

Scale and massing

- 8.10 The scale and massing of the buildings has been subject to detailed analysis in the Design and Access Statement (section 4.1) and various options have been explored. The proposals incorporate two multi storey car parks of 3 deck height and two large office buildings ARM A & B which are 3 storey blocks with a recessed upper floor. The scale and massing of the buildings has been reviewed and in detail by the Council's Urban Design and Conservation Manager who has concluded that the overall scale, massing and architectural approach of the buildings is acceptable. I agree with this view.

Materials

- 8.11 The northern carpark is a three storey (deck) car park and is sited immediately to the south of the existing Cambridge Water company building which fronts onto Fulbourn Road. The southern elevation of the building, which fronts onto the service road within the Peterhouse Technology Park is clad in a mixture of buff colour Petrarch panels and horizontal panels both of which are to be interspersed with planting to create a 'living wall' effect along the bottom of the building and extending up in vertical panels breaking up the mass of the southern elevation.

- 8.12 The eastern carpark utilises the same materials as the Northern carpark and will also have a living wall system to the southern elevation.
- 8.13 The entire building height of both ARM A and ARM B will be approximately 12 metres with a screened, roof light section comprising another 1.5 metres in height for a total overall building height of 13.5 metres. The office buildings will have a recessed, glazed communal entrance which will serve to 'break up' the mass of the building when viewed at close quarters. The vertical 'fins' will also add detail and relief to the elevations as well as providing a practical purpose of screening from direct sunlight.
- 8.14 The access road within the site extends the existing road within the site to the west and will create a 'boulevard' feel to the technology park. There is also a 'plaza' area to the front of the office buildings and the public art extends through the site. There is a comprehensive landscaping scheme which will ensure that the planting to the buildings is secured and effectively maintained and I am satisfied that this can be controlled via suitably worded conditions. I am satisfied that the buildings create a distinctive character that is appropriate for the context and are well detailed in terms of materials.
- 8.15 With regard to the context of the site, design and external spaces I consider that overall, the buildings and car parks have been well detailed in terms of their visual appearance and specified materials. I note the comments of the Design and Conservation Panel in relation to the use of Petrarch, however the Urban Design Manager has commented in detail on the proposed materials and also on the views of the panel. The application has also been the subject of extensive pre-application discussions. I am satisfied that the current proposals will result in a high quality development and that the detailing of the materials can be controlled via suitably worded conditions.
- 8.16 Amenity space for ARM A and B will be provided to the south of the buildings, as three courtyards, and as roof terraces that wrap around 'brown roofs' on part of ARM A, B and fully across the reception building.

8.17 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

Residential Amenity

8.18 The residents most affected by the proposals are those on Limedale Close and Tweedale to the north-west of the application site. The closest building proposed in relation to these properties is the northern car park.

8.19 The car park has been re-sited to overcome the objection from National Grid in relation to its easement requirements for maintenance to the high pressure gas main and the car park is now sited 1200mm further to the north than originally proposed. I have assessed the proposals on the basis of the revised information.

Visual impact and dominance

8.20 The northern car park is a large building, and does lie within reasonably close proximity to the residential properties on Limedale Close in particular.

8.21 The rear elevation of the northern car park is sited approximately 13m from the closest affected property on Limedale Close. Properties in Tweedale are sited in excess of 30m from the westernmost point of the building. There is already a building in the vicinity of the proposed new car park (ARM 2 which has a smaller footprint and is two storeys in height.) There is some existing mature tree screening which is proposed to be retained to the west of the carpark. The maximum height of the carpark would be approximately 14m metres and the western elevation, fronting towards the residential properties (approx. 13m to the properties on Limedale Close and 30m to the properties on Tweedale), would be clad in horizontal Petrarch panels and planting. I consider that the scale of the building, coupled with the landscaping to the west of the site (which is set at a higher ground level than the car park itself) would significantly soften the visual impact of the building and screen the impacts of the use of the building (such as car headlights, lighting and maneuvering noise). I am also of the opinion that the footprint of the building and the height has been designed as far as possible to mitigate the impacts on the residential properties. In addition to this, I am

mindful of the fact that the site is already occupied by the technology park and that ARM has large scale operational buildings at this site, including an office building with surface car parking in the location of the proposed northern car park (the existing ARM 2 building). The existing ARM2 building is sited immediately to the south of the Cambridge Water Company building and at its closest point is approximately 20m from the closest residential property. I also accept that the building would project further to the west than the existing built form however, this building line is staggered and the closest point of the northern carpark building maintains a separation distance of approximately 20m to the closest property on Limedale Close and in excess of 30m to the closest property on Tweedale.

8.22 The ARM B building would also extend further to the west than the existing office buildings on site but a separation distance of at least 40m is maintained from the closest residential property on Tweedale. I consider that this would not give rise to an overbearing or oppressive form of development. I accept that compared to the existing ARM2 building, which is a 2 storey office building, the northern carpark would represent both an increase in scale and proximity to the affected residential properties. I also accept that the ARM B building would be more visible to the residential properties than the existing buildings on site. The issue though, is whether it would result in an unacceptable degree of visual domination or enclosure. Given the separation distances of ARM B and the northern carpark and the design of the buildings I am of the opinion that the development would be acceptable. I am also of the opinion that the ARM A building and the eastern carpark could not have any detrimental impacts on residential amenity.

8.23 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Noise and disturbance

8.24 The key aspect of the proposals in terms of noise and disturbance relates to the northern carpark and the western end of the proposed ARM B building which are closest to the residential properties. The proposed access from Limedale

Close is also an aspect which could have impacts for the residents.

- 8.25 The northern carpark replaces an existing office building with surface car parking at the site. As previously outlined, the closest point of the northern carpark to the residential properties would be approximately 13m. I consider that the impacts of the use of the car park would be compatible with the adjacent residential properties and given the nature of ARMS operating practices as a global headquarters, I consider that parking is preferable in close proximity to residential properties rather than office use. The Council's Environmental Health team have been consulted in respect of the proposals and have recommended conditions relating to plant noise, which I consider reasonable. No concerns have been raised in respect of the proposed car park and the noise that this would generate. The design of the building has been carefully considered, and I am satisfied that the 'living wall' once established would provide screening against light pollution from cars accessing the car park at night and in the winter months. A condition relating to the lighting scheme at the site has been recommended and I consider that this is acceptable.
- 8.26 The western end of the ARM B building would also be in closer proximity to residential buildings than is currently the case. However, this building would be sited approximately 40m from the closest property on Tweedale. I consider that any light or noise and disturbance impacts at this distance would be minimal.
- 8.27 With regard to the proposed access to the site via Limedale Close, third parties have raised concerns about noise and disturbance arising. The proposals indicate that Limedale Close will be extended to the south and will provide alternative pedestrian and cycle access to the site. I note the third party objections to this route and acknowledge that Limekiln Close is currently a cul-de-sac with no through access for cars, pedestrians or cyclists. However, I consider that the use of this pathway by pedestrians and cyclists would not give rise to an undue level of noise or disturbance to occupants of the properties on Limedale Close so as to unacceptably harm their amenity.

8.28 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Public Art

8.29 The applicants have submitted a Public Art Delivery Plan dated April 2015. Its aspiration is the delivery of public art throughout the site. The Council's Urban Design Team have commented that the concept is developed fully enough to be supported. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010. Acceptable implementation of public art can be secured by condition.

Renewable energy and sustainability

8.30 The Council's Sustainability Officer is satisfied with the approach proposed to both sustainable development and renewable energy has provided the following detailed comments in respect of the proposals in relation to renewable energy provision.

'While the contribution of the passive solar design is slightly below the 10% requirement (at 9.8%), I am supportive of the approach being taken as it demonstrates the extent to which an architectural response can reduce the carbon emissions of a building. While the use of photovoltaic panels could have made a contribution to carbon reduction, the amount needed to make a significant contribution to the energy demand of this building would have had a visual impact in what is a sensitive location. In my view the use of the solar shading, the design of which will be bespoke to this building, taking its inspiration from the silicon crystal that lies at the heart of the integrated circuits designed by ARM, demonstrates a level of innovation that justifies a slightly different approach to the application of Policy 8/16. As such, the approach being taken is supported.'

8.31 In my opinion, subject to the conditions recommended to secure the details and implementation of the renewable technologies and its maintenance, the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan Policy 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Sustainable Design & Construction

8.32 The Council's Senior Sustainability Officer has advised that the suite of measures put forward by the applicant's is acceptable and these measure include:

- Targeting a minimum BREEAM score of 'very good' with an aspiration to achieve BREEAM 'excellent'.
- The integration of passive design measures into the architectural design of the proposals.
- The specification of brown roofs, which will include a mosaic of grassland seed in order to provide an ecologically enhanced habitat with the aim of mirroring the environment/habitats of the nearby Cherry Hinton Pit SSSI. The brown roofs will provide multiple benefits to the scheme, not only in terms of biodiversity enhancement but also surface water attenuation and the reduction of internal cooling loads.
- The integration of SuDS features into the landscaping design, which will maximise the benefits that SuDS pose beyond just surface water attenuation.
- The proposal to utilise rainwater recycling tanks (or similar) to provide water for irrigation

8.33 As these measures are supported by the Council's Sustainability officer and given the specific constraints of the site, I am of the opinion that the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of Sustainable Design and Construction in accordance with Policy 3/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Disabled access

8.34 The Access Officer has not raised any objections to the proposals and the Disability Consultative Panel were also supportive of the proposals. There are a comprehensive suite of measures contained in the Design and Access Statement including disabled car parking, level access to the building, disabled accessible lifts, accessible toilet and shower facilities on all levels, sufficient colour contrast for visually impaired people to orientate themselves together with management and staff training procedures. I am satisfied that the additional comments from the Access Officer can be added by way of a suitably worded informative to the planning permission. In my opinion the proposal is compliant in respect of inclusive access, with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.35 The Councils Waste Manager has commented that the proposals are acceptable subject to the submission of further information in relation to the location and capacity of the bin stores. Indicative details of bin storage facilities have been provided and I consider these to be acceptable. I am satisfied that adequate bin storage has been specified in respect of the proposals and that the further information would relate to the detail of appropriately designed store. I am also satisfied that this can be accommodated within the site, and as such that this can be reasonably controlled by condition.
- 8.36 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.37 Following the submission of additional highways data and a revised travel plan, the highway authority has removed its holding objection and have confirmed that the proposals will have an impact on the highway network. As such it is essential that the applicant contributes to schemes to improve the access to the site and to also encourage access to the site by other transport modes and to also ensure that the aspirations of the Travel Plan can be realized. These measures can be secured through a Section 106 agreement and the detailed requirements of the Highway Authority are set out in the S106 section to this report. The highway authority have raised no other concerns regarding highway safety.
- 8.38 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.39 The highway authority have not objected to the level of car parking provided within the scheme. Although it is noted that the parking ratio is higher than would usually be expected for this type of development at 1: 31 sqm the existing parking ratio at the site is actually 1:26sqm. Although the parking ratio is relatively high I am satisfied that it would result in an overall

reduction in overall parking ratios currently provided at the site. ARM have also made a very special case as set out in their Planning Statement in relation to transport modes of their employees and also that an under provision of parking could lead to parking conflict in the surrounding residential streets – particularly Limedale Close and Tweedale. The comments from the Highway Authority have suggested a clause in the S106 agreement to include a parking survey and money set aside to address any problems in the surrounding streets should any issues be identified. I consider that this is also reasonable.

- 8.40 With regard to cycle parking, the Council's Walking and Cycling Officer has objected to the proposals on the basis of the access to cycle stores and concerns over the width of the access from Limedale Close. The level of parking provision and the type of provision is not questioned and I am therefore satisfied that the detail of the access to the bike stores and the width of the access can be addressed by suitably worded conditions and the concerns do not relate to broad principles of level or type of provision.
- 8.41 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Trees

- 8.42 I note that the Council's Tree Officer has raised an objection to the proposals based on lack of clear information submitted in order for her to assess the proposals. However, the scheme has been subject to extensive negotiation with the Council's Landscape Officer and Urban Design Team who have focused particularly, on securing suitable boundary treatments for this sensitive site, which will include new tree planting to the Southern Boundary. As there are no protected trees on or adjacent to, the site and given that the Tree Officer in her representation has requested conditions should planning permission be granted I am satisfied that conditions relating to further information would be appropriate.
- 8.43 In my opinion the proposals are compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policy 4/4

Biodiversity

- 8.44 The site does lie within an environmentally sensitive area and the LNR designation and adjacent SSSI are relevant considerations in determining this application. Based on the information provided in the Environmental Statement which includes mitigation, measures and based on the comments received from the Environment Agency, Natural England and the Councils Biodiversity Officer I am satisfied that subject to suitably worded condition to secure measures to encourage/sustain biodiversity that the proposals would be acceptable in this regard. In addition to this, the planting within the site, at the boundary and the greening of the car-park buildings themselves together with the selection of local species for the swales via the landscaping scheme will also bolster the success of physical measures suggested in the mitigation strategy (eg bat boxes) and provide suitable foraging areas and movement corridors for species.
- 8.45 In my opinion the proposals are compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policies 4/3, 4/5, 4/6 and 4/7.

Third Party Representations

- 8.46 I have addressed the issues raised in representations listed below in the paragraphs indicated.

Issue	Paragraph
The seasonal nature of staff travel has not been addressed in the travel plan and if collated in winter, the level of staff journeys to work is likely to be lower than the 24% given as the June figure.	8.20
Objections to the idea of having access to the site through Limedale Close.	8.
Concern relating to noise from air conditioning and noise from cars using the site.	Plant noise controlled by condition.
Concerns relating to access to the parking and the number of proposed parking spaces.	8.22

<p>Workers may park in Limedale Close which would inconvenience residents, there is also a covenant which prevents residents from parking on the street but this could not be applied to workers for the ARM site.</p>	<p>S106</p>
<p>Concern relating to the impact on traffic on Fulbourn Road.</p>	<p>S106</p>
<p>Concern relating to safety of access through Limedale Close for cyclists turning onto Fulbourn Road.</p>	<p>S106</p>
<p>The area immediately behind Limedale close is artificially raised we request that this earth be removed and the level put down to the level of our garden and the street.</p>	<p>8.8</p>
<p>Limedale Close is too narrow and the pavement is regularly crossed by private driveways there are major concerns for people leaving their driveways with the number of pedestrians and cyclists present as visibility is poor.</p>	<p>S106</p>
<p>Object to the access via Limedale Close as there is already a tendency for people to be dropped off at the top of the close and cars arriving to collect people and parking on the pavement and then turning on private driveways.</p>	<p>S106</p>
<p>ARM employees may use the MRC designated spaces and park on the access roads which reduces visibility and affects manoeuvring space for delivery and emergency vehicles.</p>	<p>S106</p>

Concerns relating to construction phase of development, the plans refer to temporary access and parking but does not specify numbers and again depending on the time of year this could exacerbate parking issues at the site.	Condition relating to DCEMP recommended
The current access to the site is not safe for cyclists and this may deter employees from cycling into work.	8.22
Changes are needed to the existing access to allow traffic to flow more easily.	S106
The results of the transport survey led to the conclusion that no alteration to the access from Fulbourn Road is needed. It is our belief that an extra 1,000 staff will create congestion in peak periods as well as increase pollution. The transport survey does not appear to consider the increase in car traffic both to the site and into Cambridge.	8.22
The proposed parking level (538) is unrealistic for the 1,000 staff increase and will result in parking issues.	8.22
From experience parking at Peterhouse Technology Park is far less of an issue during pleasant months (such as June) when employees are more likely to walk or cycle	8.22
The transport survey was conducted in June 2014 and as neighbours on the PTP we were surprised not to be informed of this or consulted.	There is no formal requirement for neighbours to be consulted when preparing a travel plan
Concern that security lighting on the site may cause light pollution/disturbance.	8.15, 8.16

During building work we would like assurance that work on Saturdays will be kept to a minimum and no work will occur on Sundays.	Condition controlling construction times recommended.
The timing of the application in relation to the Draft Local Plan	8.1, 8.2
The NPPF makes it clear that the Local Plan is the highest authoritative determinant in spatial planning so approval would undermine the Local Plan process.	8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4.
How urgent is ARM's situation, and what would be the effect of delay for another eighteen months? If a version of the Local Plan is eventually approved, including the release of GB3 and GB4, then it can be assumed that the Council would be inclined to grant planning permission. So what would be the consequences of prejudging the Local Plan approval, and granting planning permission in advance? Our concern is the possibility that other developers will then use this case as a lever for other inappropriate schemes in the Green Belt around the city fringe.	8.1
Green Belt land cannot be solely because of the weight of the exceptional circumstances, it must be through the re-drawing of the Local Plan boundaries.	8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4
The application does provide a strong justification as to how the exceptional circumstances are satisfied. However it does rely heavily on the 2012 Inner Green Belt Review, which has itself now come under criticism from the Inspectors in their preliminary report.	8.1
The visual impact of the development in such a sensitive area on the Green Belt boundary could be minimised by reducing the mass of the buildings.	8.7
We would urge that the site is levelled between the gas main and the Southern boundary, and that the landscaping of the bank along the site boundary to the South is strengthened with more tree planting.	8.8

Cambridge PPF has concerns about the adequacy of the proposals to mitigate the traffic congestion generated by the increased number of employees along the already heavily congested Fulbourn Road. The Travel Plan seems to comprise the usual measures such as car sharing and cycle spaces which will have only marginal effect. The transport and traffic implications are viewed piecemeal on a site-by-site basis when what is needed is a more comprehensive integrated assessment of traffic flows across the whole South-East Cambridge area.	S106
Proposals are premature	8.1
Safety for cyclists using existing access	S106
Proposals rely on LVIA undertaken for release of greenbelt through Local Plan review and should not be relied on for this application	8.7

Planning Obligation Strategy

Planning Obligations

8.47 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 my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements. The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. The Public Art

Supplementary Planning Document 2010 addresses requirements in relation to public art. The applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

Transport

8.48 The following schemes are requested to be funded directly by this development, with a proportionate contribution sought from the development for other works which would assist with mitigating the impact:

Scheme	Requested S106 Contribution
cycling scheme between Robin Hood junction of Fulbourn Road with Cherry Hinton Road to Peterhouse Technology Park	£600,000 (full cost of scheme)
Upgrade and improvements to the Robin Hood junction of Fulbourn Road with Cherry Hinton Road to include additional capacity and improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.	£320,000 (partial contribution – total cost of scheme £900,000)
Installation of Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation and associated works at Long Road / Hills Road junction.	£100,000 (full cost)
Improvements to bus stop infrastructure at the two closest bus stops in the vicinity of PTP.	£25,000 (full cost)
Improvements to cycle provision on Cherry Hinton High Street between Fulbourn Road and Desmond Avenue	£80,000 (partial contribution – total cost of scheme £250,000)
Segregated cycle lanes on both sides of Cherry Hinton Road between Robin Hood junction and Walpole Road.	£200,000 (partial contribution - total cost of scheme £1.3m)

Contribution in reserve for the consultation and implementation of parking controls in surrounding residential streets if required.	£50,000
	Total £1,375,000

Justification for financial contributions

The Highway Authority have set out the following justifications for each of the financial contribution requests:

- 8.49 Cycling scheme between Robin Hood junction of Fulbourn Road with Cherry Hinton Road to Peterhouse Technology Park. This scheme is identified in the emerging City Deal programme specifically to allow for future expansion at PTP. This could potentially also include upgrade of the pelican crossing west of PTP to a Toucan crossing, and the widening of the footway and cycleway between PTP and Yarrow Road. Cost: £600,000. This is the full cost of this scheme as its purpose is to enable safer and improved access to employees of PTP.
- 8.50 Upgrade and improvements to the Robin Hood junction of Fulbourn Road with Cherry Hinton Road. This will include additional capacity and improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. Proportionate contribution of: £320,000 is requested. This is a proportional cost of the scheme based on the development related traffic flow (total cost of scheme =£900,000). Employees at PTP will significantly benefit from these improvements, but this scheme will also have benefits for the wider trips on the network, therefore a proportionate cost is sought.
- 8.51 Installation of MOVA and associated works at Long Road / Hills Road junction. The TA shows that the PTP development will have a clear impact at this location; improving operation of the signals will directly contribute to mitigating this impact. This is the full cost of £100,000 is requested as for these works as increased ARM related traffic levels at this junction increase queues and delays and the contribution is required to mitigate this.
- 8.52 The improvements to bus stop infrastructure at the two closest bus stops in the vicinity of PTP. Contribution of £25,000 requested. This is the full cost of these works and would pay for

real time bus information at each bus stop. Increased bus patronage is essential if ARM is to reach their mode share targets and hence reduce off site highway impacts.

8.53 Improvements to cycle provision on Cherry Hinton High Street between Fulbourn Road and Desmond Avenue. Contribution of £80,000 requested. This is a part payment of an overall scheme cost of £250,000 to recognise that this route will be used by ARM employees but will also be of benefits to the wider area.

8.54 Segregated cycle lanes on both sides of Cherry Hinton Road between Robin Hood junction and Walpole Road. Contribution of: £200,000 requested. This is a part payment of an overall scheme cost of £1.3m for segregated cycle lanes that connect Robin Hood junction to the wider quiet road cycle network via Walpole Road. The proportion would make a reasonable contribution towards this scheme and would allow ARM employees to connect to the wider cycle network and hence contribute to achieving the mode split targets necessary to reduce the off- site highway impacts. These provisions are directly related to PTP and are on key desire lines for the increased traffic and increased levels of cycling that will be needed for the mode split targets to be met.

8.55 Contribution in reserve for the consultation and implementation of parking controls in surrounding residential streets if required. £50,000. This could be required if the travel plan does not achieve its targets, and / or there is a demonstrable impact from ARM.

Other S106 Requirements

8.56 Parking surveys should be completed in surrounding streets every year for a period of 5 years.

8.57 The first occupation of the buildings shall be restricted to ARM for a period of 3 years.

8.58 The provision of fire hydrants in consultation with Cambridgeshire Fire Service

Monitoring

8.59 The County Council also requires a monitoring charge to be paid for County obligations in accordance with current County policy

8.60 At their meeting on 25 November 2014 the County Council's Economy and Environment Committee agreed that fees for the monitoring of all financial and non-financial planning obligations required by the County Council will be payable on the following basis:

£100 where the total value of the contributions payable to the County Council is less than £10,000; or

1% of the total value of the contributions payable to the County Council where the total value of those contributions is £10,000 or more up to £2 million; or

where the total value of those contributions exceeds £2 million, 1% of the total value of the contributions for the first £2 million and 0.5% thereafter subject to a cap of £60,000; and

£100 for any non-financial contribution.

8.61 The financial contributions have not been finalised at the time of the committee report being drafted. There will be a contribution required to cover the costs of monitoring of the County Council obligations although the exact figure is yet to be determined.

8.62 Travel Plan monitoring by Travel for Cambridgeshire for five years post completion £12,500. This is required to monitor the travel plan and work with ARM to meet their travel plan targets.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.63 It is my view that the planning obligations requested are necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

8.64 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure financial contributions towards transport schemes, I am

satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/3 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

8.65 The applicants have accepted the principle of financial contributions towards transport mitigation but have not formally accepted the figures requested by the Highway Authority. Delegated authority is therefore requested to allow officers to negotiate and agree with the County Council Highways Team in respect of the financial contributions in respect of highways/transport matters is requested.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In the light of the preceding discussion it is concluded overall that a case for 'very special circumstances' has been justified in this instance and that the very clear economic, employment and social benefits of the proposed development on this greenbelt site would outweigh the harm of a departure from the current adopted Local Plan Policy. I am satisfied that the proposals would comply with the provisions of the relevant Development Plan Policies. After looking at the very special circumstances case and assessing the impacts of the development it is considered to be acceptable subject to the imposition of suitably worded conditions, a S106 legal agreement to secure relevant highways contributions and to restrict the occupancy of the buildings to ARM for a period of 3 years and referral to the Secretary of State for review as a Departure from the Local Plan. As such the application is recommended for approval.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

Minded to APPROVE subject to referral to the Secretary of State as a 'Departure' from the Local Plan, the completion of the S106 Agreement by 31 December 2015 and the imposition of conditions.

- 10.1 Delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development
1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

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

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

3. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) or investigations required to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

(a) Desk study to include:

- Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)
- General environmental setting.
- Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.

(b) A report setting set out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

4. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 3, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

(a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors

(b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

5. Implementation of remediation.

Prior to the first occupation of the development or (or each phase of the development where phased) the remediation strategy approved under clause (b) to condition 4 shall be fully implemented on site following the agreed schedule of works.

Reason: To ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

6. Completion report:

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to, and approved by the local planning authority.

(a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 4 and implemented under condition 5 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.

(b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13

7. Material Management Plan:

Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:

- a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
- b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
- c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
- d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development
- e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

All works will be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13.

8. Unexpected Contamination:

If unexpected contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development which has not previously been identified, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and/or the additional contamination has been fully assessed and remediation approved following steps (a) and (b) of condition 4 above. The approved remediation shall then be fully implemented under condition 5

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

9. Before the development/use hereby permitted is occupied, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Reason: to ensure that the noise levels from the plant are acceptable in accordance with Policy 4/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

10. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

11. There should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

12. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), the applicant shall submit a report in writing, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, for approval by the local authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

13. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy4/13

14. Before the development/use hereby permitted is occupied, a scheme for the insulation of the emergency generator in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said generator shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such. The scheme shall include the following:

(i) Generator - Use

The generator shall only be used in the event of mains power failure or in accordance with (ii) below. It shall not be used as an alternative supply in the event of disconnection from the mains supply following for example non-payment.

(ii) Generator - Hours of Running for Maintenance

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 8am - 6pm Monday to Friday, 9am -1pm Saturday and no time Sunday or Public Holidays.

To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

15. Details of any proposed floodlighting or external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the use hereby permitted commences. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/11 and 4/15)

16. Prior to the commencement of development, a site wide Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The DCEMP shall include the consideration of the following aspects of demolition and construction:

- a) Demolition, construction and phasing programme.
- b) Contractors' access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel including the location of construction traffic routes to, from and within the site, details of their signing, monitoring and enforcement measures.
- c) Construction/Demolition hours which shall be carried out between 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless in accordance with agreed emergency procedures for deviation. Prior notice and agreement procedures for works outside agreed limits and hours.
- d) Delivery times for construction/demolition purposes shall be carried out between 0730 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, bank or public holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority in advance.
- e) Soil Management Strategy.

- f) Noise method, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1: 2009.
- g) Maximum noise mitigation levels for construction equipment, plant and vehicles.
- h) Vibration method, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-2: 2009.
- i) Maximum vibration levels.
- j) Dust management and wheel washing measures in accordance with the provisions of Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance 2014
- k) Prohibition of the burning of waste on site during demolition/construction.
- l) Site lighting.
- m) Drainage control measures including the use of settling tanks, oil interceptors and bunds.
- n) Screening and hoarding details.
- o) Access and protection arrangements around the site for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.
- p) Procedures for interference with public highways, including permanent and temporary realignment, diversions and road closures.
- q) External safety and information signing and notices.
- r) Consideration of sensitive receptors.
- s) Prior notice and agreement procedures for works outside agreed limits.
- t) Complaints procedures, including complaints response procedures.
- u) Membership of the Considerate Contractors Scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties.
Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13

17. No development shall take place until a scheme of public Art on site has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme as agreed shall be fully implemented within three months of the first occupation of the site.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision of public art on site (Cambridge Local Plan Policy 3/7).

18. The first occupation of the buildings hereby approved shall be by ARM.

Reason: A 'very special circumstances' case has been made for the development in the green belt specifically relating to the business needs of ARM and first occupation by another user would undermine this assessment contrary to Policy 4/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

19. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a parking management plan shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the measures in the parking management plan shall thereafter be fully implemented.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety (Policy 3/3 and 8/10 Cambridge Local PL an 2006)

20. The Construction Management Plan should be submitted and agreed prior to commencement of development and should include, travel plan measures for construction workers.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety and neighbour amenity (Cambridge Local Plan Policies 3/4, 3/7, 8/3)

21. All non-residential buildings shall be constructed to meet the applicable approved BREEAM rating as a minimum (BREEAM 'very good' or above). Prior to the occupation of any non-residential building, or as soon as practicable following occupation, a certificate following a post-construction review, shall be issued by an approved BREEAM Assessor to the Local Planning Authority, indicating that the relevant BREEAM rating has been met. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To secure sustainable construction commitments in accordance with the approved design and in the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

22. The landscaping scheme as indicated on the following drawing numbers shall be fully implemented prior to the first occupation or commencement of the use of the buildings hereby approved:

1633 A2 15C Landscape Planting Details
1633 A2 12F Detailed Planting Proposals 3 of 5,
1633 A2 13G Detailed Planting Proposals 4 of 5.

Reason: to ensure that the development has a satisfactory visual appearance (Cambridge Local Plan Policies 3/7, 4/2)

23. Prior to the commencement of ARM A_B, the Northern car park and the Eastern car park samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details for each block. This detail shall include the fixing details of all panels.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan Policies 3/4 _ 3/12).

24. Before the commencement of works to ARM A _ B a full size Petrarch panel and vertical fin shall be erected at the site for inspection and written approval by the Local Planning Authority. Works shall be carried out in accordance with the details as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan Policies 3/4 _ 3/12).

25. Prior to the first occupation of the site details of the provision of bat and bird boxes to be provided within the site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved provision and shall be provided within 3 months of the first occupation of the site.

Reason: to ensure that adequate provision is made at the site to protect biodiversity (Cambridge Local Plan Policy 4/7)

26. No development shall take place until details of earthworks have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include the proposed grading and mounding of land areas including the levels and contours to be formed, showing the relationship of proposed mounding to existing vegetation and surrounding landform. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the details of the earthworks are acceptable. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

27. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendation of the appropriate British Standard or other recognised code of good practice. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed by the local planning authority in writing. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscaping in accordance with the approved design. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

28. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the building(s) is/are occupied and retained thereafter unless any variation is agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

29. A landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, other than small privately owned, domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing prior to occupation of the development or any phase of the development whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The landscape plan shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

30. In this condition retained tree means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of two years from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.

(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (Tree Work).

(b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

(c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with British Standard 5837 and the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the retention of trees on site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4)

31. Prior to the commencement of development and with reference to BS 5837 2012, details of the specification and position of all protection measures and techniques to be adopted for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval in the form of an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP).

The approved AMS and TPP will be implemented throughout the development and the agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard and ensure the protection of those existing trees which are to be retained on or adjacent to the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/4)

32. Prior to commencement, a site visit will be arranged with the retained arboriculturalist, developer and LPA Tree Officer to agree tree works and the location and specification of tree protection barriers and temporary ground protection.

Works shall then be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To safeguard and ensure the protection of those existing trees which are to be retained on or adjacent to the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/4)

33. The building shall not be occupied until the area identified on the approved plans for car parking has been drained and surfaced in accordance with details submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing and that area shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose than the parking of vehicles.

Reason: To avoid obstruction of the surrounding streets and in the interests of highway safety and convenience. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 8/2 and 8/10)

34. No development shall take place within the site until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate archaeological investigation of the site has been implemented before development commences. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/9)

35. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of the on-site storage facilities for commercial waste, including waste for recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheeled bins, or any other means of storage will be stationed and the specific arrangements to enable collection from within 10m of the kerbside of the adopted highway/ refuse collection vehicle access point and the arrangements for the disposal of waste shall be provided and shall include provision for a minimum of 50% recycling/organic capacity. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason - To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/13

36. No development shall commence until full details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The agreed facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

INFORMATIVE: To satisfy the plant noise insulation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background level (L90) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

Tonal/impulsive noise frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. This is to prevent unreasonable noise disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits a noise prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142: 2014 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" or similar, concerning the effects on amenity rather than likelihood for complaints. Noise levels shall be predicted at the boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into a noise assessment as described within this informative.

Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring premises; noise sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of noise sources; details of proposed noise sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power levels, noise frequency spectrums, noise directionality of plant, noise levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of noise mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full noise calculation procedures; noise levels at a representative sample of noise sensitive locations and hours of operation.

Any report shall include raw measurement data so that conclusions may be thoroughly evaluated and calculations checked.

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

-Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

-Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance

https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Dust%20and%20Emissions%20SPG%208%20July%202014_0.pdf

INFORMATIVE: Demolition/Construction noise/vibration report

The noise and vibration report should include:

a) An assessment of the significance of the noise impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Annex E - Significance of noise effects. It is recommended that the ABC method detailed in E.3.2 be used unless works are likely to continue longer than a month then the 2-5 dB (A) change method should be used.

b) An assessment of the significance of the vibration impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 2 Annex B - Significance of vibration effects.

If piling is to be undertaken then full details of the proposed method to be used is required and this should be included in the noise and vibration reports detailed above.

Following the production of the above reports a monitoring protocol should be proposed for agreement with the Local Planning Authority. It will be expected that as a minimum spot checks to be undertaken on a regular basis at site boundaries nearest noise sensitive premises and longer term monitoring to be undertaken when:-

- Agreed target levels are likely to exceeded
- Upon the receipt of substantiated complaints
- At the request of the Local Planning Authority / Environmental Health following any justified complaints.

Guidance on noise monitoring is given in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Section 8.4 - Noise Control Targets and in Annex G - noise monitoring.

A procedure for seeking approval from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in circumstances when demolition/construction works need to be carried out at time outside the permitted hours. This should incorporate a minimum notice period of 10 working days to the Local Planning Authority and 5 working days to neighbours to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider the application as necessary. For emergencies the Local Planning Authority should be notified but where this is not possible the Council's Out of Hours Noise service should be notified on 0300 303 3839.

Contact details for monitoring personnel, site manager including out of hours emergency telephone number should be provided.

INFORMATIVE: The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling should be carried out by a suitably qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured sampling, analysis methodology and relevant guidance. The Council has produced a guidance document to provide information to developers on how to deal with contaminated land. The document, 'Contaminated Land in Cambridge- Developers Guide' can be downloaded from the City Council website on <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/land-pollution>. Hard copies can also be provided upon request

INFORMATIVE: Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance.

INFORMATIVE: Any material imported into the site shall be tested for a full suite of contaminants including metals and petroleum hydrocarbons prior to importation. Material imported for landscaping should be tested at a frequency of 1 sample every 20m³ or one per lorry load, whichever is greater. Material imported for other purposes can be tested at a lower frequency (justification and prior approval for the adopted rate is required by the Local Authority). If the material originates from a clean source the developer should contact the Environmental Quality Growth Team for further advice.

INFORMATIVE: New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor Project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).

INFORMATIVE: This planning permission should be read in conjunction with the associated deed of planning obligation prepared under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The applicant is reminded that under the terms of the s106 Agreement you are required to notify the City Council of the date of commencement of development.