South Cambridgeshire District Council

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

Report to:	Joint Development Control Committee	27th October 2021
Lead Officer:	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development	

21/00772/OUT – Fulbourn (Technology Park, Fulbourn Road, Cambridge)

Proposal: A hybrid planning application for a total of 56,473sqm of commercial floorspace for Use Classes E(g) i (offices), ii (research and development), ii (light industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution - limited to data centres) uses. Comprising a) an Outline Application with all matters reserved (except for access) for the development of up to 44,671 sqm of floorspace, with associated access, structural landscaping, car and cycle parking and associated infrastructure works; b) a Full Application for the first Phase comprising the main access, one commercial building, a multi-decked car and cycle park and associated landscaping and infrastructure works; and c) a Full Application for the details of initial enabling works comprising site wide earth works and drainage.

Applicant: Abstract (Cambridge) Limited

Key material considerations:
- Principle of development
- Character and appearance of the area and adjacent Green Belt
- Cultural Heritage
- Carbon Reduction and sustainable designs
- Environmental impacts and residential amenity
- Transport and highways
- Flood risk and drainage

Date of Member site visit: n/a

Is it a Departure Application?: No

Decision due by: 12 November 2021

Application brought to Committee because: Major application - non-residential building or buildings where the floorspace to be created by the development is 1,000square metres or more.

Presenting officer: Fiona Bradley (Interim Team Leader)

Executive Summary

1. The site was removed from the Green Belt and allocated for employment use in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 with a requirement for development proposals to demonstrate how the site can be designed and landscape effectivity to mitigate impact on the Green Belt, noting that this will include excavation to achieve appropriate profiling and landscaped buffers on the southern and eastern boundaries. The site lies immediately to the east of the existing Peterhouse Technology Park (PTP). Accordingly, the principle of development accords with Policy E/3 of the Local Plan.

2. This hybrid application comprises three planning applications: 1. Detailed planning permission for site-wide enabling works; 2. Detailed planning application for comprising 11,802sqm of floorspace comprising 'Building 3' (Use Class E3) and a Multi Storey Car Park (MSCP) including site access from the Yarrow Road roundabout; and 3. Outline planning permission for the development of up to 44,671 sqm of commercial development on the site.

3. Substantial excavation works are required to provide level building platforms across the site as well allowing the buildings to be built into the slope of the land, reducing the height of buildings to minimise harm to the adjacent Green Belt. A comprehensive landscaping scheme has been proposed providing substantial landscape buffers along the southern (rear) and eastern (side boundary adjacent to countryside) boundaries in particular. Additional planting and landscaping is also proposed along the northern (front) and western (side boundary adjacent to PTP) boundaries.

4. The development will make an important contribution to jobs provision in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire both in the construction phase of development and the operational phase. During the construction it is estimate that the equivalent of 118 full time jobs will be provided. When the development is operational, it is anticipated that it will generate approximately 2,700 employees on the site.

5. A package of measures to support public transport use and active travel, and to manage parking demand are proposed. Subject to these measures, the transport impact of the development is considered acceptable.

6. Building 3 adopts a sustainable design with an all-electric approach with air-source heat pumps and a photovoltaic array on the roof and will achieve a BREAAM excellent rating. Conditions will ensure this approach is taken forward in the reserved matters applications.

7. The impact on neighbours and the surrounding area have been considered. As the site is currently arable farmland the presence of buildings on it will undoubtably have a visual impact. However, it is considered that that the size and scale of development is

appropriate on this site and that Building 3 and the MSCP have been designed to ensure a high quality and sustainable development. The Parameter Plans submitted with the outline planning application, together with conditions, will ensure the height and scale of buildings proposed through the reserved matters applications are also appropriate for this site. Impacts on neighbours during construction will be kept to a minimum through conditions restricting hours of construction and adherence to the Construction Environmental Management Plan submitted.

Recommendation

8. The proposed development is **recommended for approval** subject to the conditions and informatives set out at the end of this report and a Section 106 agreement for transport and highways mitigation measures.

Relevant planning history

9. The planning history for this site is limited given the agricultural use of the land. A request for a formal scoping opinion for commercial development at land south of Fulbourn Road, Cambridge reference 20/04886/SCOP was submitted by the applicant and the Formal coping Opinion was issued on 8 January 2021.

Planning policies

EIA Directives and Regulations – EIA Regulations

10. European Union legislation with regard to environmental assessment and the planning regime remains unchanged despite the UK leaving the European Union on 31 January 2020. The Government passed secondary legislation in October 2018 to ensure the continued operation of the EIA regime.

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)

11. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for the LPA is the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended)

12. The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) (the CIL Regulations) generally set out regulations relating to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Part 11 refers specifically to planning obligations (including those in Section 106 Agreements) and is relevant to the consideration of these applications and will influence the final content of Section 106 Agreement, in the event that planning permission is granted.

13. CIL Regulation 122 imposes limitations on the use of planning obligations. It states (where there is no CIL charging regime), a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:
    (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.

Equalities Act 2010

14. The applications have been assessed against the relevant sections of the Equalities Act 2010. It is not considered that the Applications discriminates against people with protected characteristics (age, gender reassignment, being married or in a civil partnership, being pregnant or on maternity leave, disability, race including colour, nationality, ethnic or national origin, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation) specified in this Act.

15. Relevant Development Plan policies.

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER AND HEADING
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018	S/1 Vision S/2 Objectives of the Local Plan S/3 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development S/5 Provision of Jobs and Homes S/6 The Development Strategy to 2031 CC/1 Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change CC/3 Renewable Energy and Low Energy in New Developments CC/4 Water Efficiency CC/6 Construction Methods CC/7 Water Quality CC/8 Sustainable Drainage Systems CC/9 Managing Flood Risk HQ/1 Design Principles HQ/2 Public Art and New Development NH/4 Biodiversity NH/6 Green Infrastructure NH/8 Mitigating the Impact of Development In and Adjoining the Green Belt NH/14 Heritage Assets E/3 Fulbourn Road East (Fulbourn) 6.9 hectares E/9 Promotion of Clusters SC/2 Health Impact Assessment SC/9 Lighting Proposals SC/10 Noise Pollution SC/11 Contaminated Land SC/14 Odour and Other Fugitive Emissions to Air

	TI/2 Planning for Sustainable travel TI/3 Parking Provision TI/6 Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone TI/8 Infrastructure and New Developments TI/10 Broadband

16. Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2021 National Planning Practice Guidance National Design Guide
Supplementary Planning Documents	Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Sustainable Design and Construction (2020) Cambridgeshire Flood and Water (2016) Biodiversity (2009) Health Impact Assessment (2011) Landscape in New Developments (2010) Public Art (2009) District Design Guide (2010)
Previous Supplementary Planning Documents(These documents, prepared to support policies in the 2006 local plan are no longer SPDs, but are still material considerations)	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD

Greater Cambridge Local Plan

17. Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are jointly preparing a new Local Plan, with a Regulation 18 consultation on the 'First Proposals' draft, scheduled to begin in November 2021. Given the early stage of preparation of the Local Plan, it carries little weight in the decision making process.

Publicity

Advertisement: Yes
Site Notice: Yes
Neighbour Notifications: Yes

18. Two rounds of formal consultation have been undertaken for this application. The first was in March 2021 following submission of the application. The second was in July 2021 following the submission of a suite of documents providing amended and additional to address issues raised in the first round of consultation. The responses to the consultation and publicity are set out in the sections below.

Consultation

Cambridgeshire County Council (Transport Assessment Team)

Application as amended – revised mitigation (response dated 20 September 2021)

19. These comments are further to comments dated 13th September 2021 and additional information provided by the applicant.

20. The Transport Assessment Team accept the rationale provided by the applicant concerning the Fulbourn to Cambridge Greenway financial contribution. As such, the financial contribution towards the Greater Cambridge Partnership Fulbourn to Cambridge Greenway scheme has been adjusted accordingly.

21. Conclusion - The Highway Authority does not object to the proposals subject to the following mitigation package:

Conditions

• That the revised site access junction is constructed prior to occupation of the first building in accordance with drawing 20-281-100-003 Rev. E. agreed by Highways Development Management. Works to be undertaken as a S278 agreement with CCC.
• Travel Plan to be agreed prior to occupation of each building. To include up to date monitoring of travel behaviour for buildings occupied beyond the first phase.
• A car park management plan to be agreed prior to occupation of each building. A CPMP to ensure that the amount of parking available for use does not exceed 275 spaces for the first phase of development, the provision for each phase of development, and include the provision of spaces allocated to car sharing and off peak journeys.
• That no additional car parking above the 915 spaces within the MSCP is provided unless this provision is demonstrated not to impact upon the trip cap.
• To detail whether a walking / cycling link is required to the neighbouring Peterhouse Technology Park. This should be detailed at each reserved matters application, with details of the link and when it is to be constructed if it is required.
• To improve the westbound bus stop on Fulbourn Road opposite the site with a pedestrian link to the site, and a larger bus shelter and hard standing area. To install these works under a S278 agreement prior to occupation. The details of the bus shelter to be agreed with CCC and the existing shelter to be passed to Fulbourn Parish Council for reuse.

• To improve the eastbound bus stop on Fulbourn Road opposite the site with an appropriate bus shelter. To install these works under a S278 agreement prior to occupation. The details of the bus shelter to be agreed with CCC.

S106

• A trip cap on vehicle entering and departing the site of 106 arrivals in the AM and 117 departures in the PM peak during Phase 1 development and 522 arrivals in the AM and 573 departures in the PM during the full development, with vehicle flows to be monitored annually for the duration of the development.
• That each reserved matters application is subject to approval of a Transport Assessment. This will review vehicle trips and Travel Plan monitoring to ensure that the peak hour vehicle flows are within the vehicle cap, and that the trips associated with each reserved matters application would not result in the trip cap being exceeded.
• A contribution towards strategic infrastructure. This is to be primarily for the Fulbourn to Cambridge greenway and any measures to enable mode shift from car to non-car in the surrounding area of a total of £1,842,325. Of this a contribution of £375,195.15 in relation to phase 1 with the remaining to be in proportion to the area of each reserved matters.
• A contribution of £20,000 towards the future maintenance of the bus stop shelters to be passed to Fulbourn Parish Council.
• A contribution of £36,000 for the provision and maintenance of a Real Time Passenger Information RTPI display at the two bus stops opposite the site.
• Parking surveys to be undertaken in the surrounding area before and after development every year for a period of 5 years post occupation of the final building. A contribution of £40,000 is requested to cover the costs associated with consultation, scheme design, and implementation of a managed or other parking scheme should the surveys demonstrate a problem and there is support among local residents for this.

Application as amended (response dated 13th September)

National Policy Context

22. Comment 1 Reference is made to the relevant transport policies.

Existing Local Transport Network Walking and Cycling Routes

23. Comment 2 The applicant highlights that there are shared footway and cycleways along Fulbourn Road, leading to the signal junction with Queen Edith's Way, along Cambridge Road to Fulbourn, and Yarrow Road to the railway line crossing. There are pedestrian crossings at the Yarrow Road arm of the Yarrow Road / Fulbourn Road roundabout, and a Toucan crossing located near to Limedale Close to the west of the site.

24. Comment 3 The site is near to the proposed Fulbourn Greenway which links Fulbourn with Cambridge Railway station, and onwards onto the Chisholm Trail for journeys to north Cambridge, or the rest of the Cambridge City cycle network. Local Public Transport Services.

25. Comment 4 This is noted to be the Citi 1 which is a direct service to Cambridge Railway station along Cherry Hinton Road which takes 13 minutes. This has a frequency of a bus every 15 minutes during weekday peak periods. The Cambridge Guided Busway can be reached at Cambridge Railway station.

26. Comment 5 The nearest bus stops are outside the site boundary, with a small shelter for the Cambridge bound stop, and no shelter for the Fulbourn bound stop. Local Roads Existing Traffic Conditions

27. Comment 6 The TA has considered the latest 60 months' accident record together with an analysis of any trends or clusters. This notes that there are two accidents at the Yarrow Road roundabout, with concentrations of accidents at the key junctions along the road network within the City and particularly along Cherry Hinton Road and Hills Road.

28. Comment 7 The applicant has extended the analysis to cover Yarrow Road, Gazelle Way, Airport Way and Newmarket Road to the A14. The number of collisions on the network between the site and Newmarket Road and the A11 are much fewer than the network within the City. Many of these locations are known, and where there have been or are schemes to address safety. The collision record does not raise any significant areas of concern in relation to this application.

    Site Access and Layout

29. Comment 8 Please refer to Highways Development Management comments for the highways access and layout. The applicant proposes a comprehensive network of footway and cycle routes within the site, leading from Fulbourn Road to the buildings and cycle parking.

30. Comment 9 Should this site provide a pedestrian connection to the adjacent Peterhouse Technology Park on its eastern boundary? If there are common tenants between the sites, this would allow for cross movements without the need to cross Fulbourn Road.

    Parking

31. Comment 10 The provision of one car parking space per 40 sqm results in a total proposed provision of 1362 parking spaces. Whilst this may follow the South Cambridgeshire District Council parking standards, this provision is considered to be excessive, taking into account the circumstances of the highly congested surrounding road network. The applicant has proposed a robust mitigation strategy infrastructure provision and a high quality Travel Plan, to significantly shift the mode share away from car borne trips.

32. If the multi storey car park (MSCP) of 915 spaces is built as the sole parking provision, then the ratio of parking would reduce as the site is built out, with a potential ratio of 1 space per 60sqm with 56,000sqm of GFA.

33. Comment 11 The full application for the first building has a provision of 275 spaces to be provided within the MSCP, resulting in a provision of 1 space per 43sqm. Should approval be given a condition is proposed to determine how these spaces will be provided in the MSCP. The applicant proposes that spaces for car sharing and off peak travel will be provided within the car park. It is considered that there is potential for the ratio of parking to be reduced over time as the site builds out by implementing travel plan initiatives and by not building the second car park.

34. Comment 12 The applicant details that with the sole provision of the 915 spaces that this car park would be full. This is taking account of car sharing and off peak journeys outside of the peak hours, and includes the potential for hybrid working.

35. Comment 13 The future provision of parking over and above the MSCP should be controlled by assessments of trip generation and the trip budget for the site, and should only be possible if the trip budget for the site is not exceeded, and to prevent any

overspill parking in the surrounding area. Should approval be given a condition is proposed to ensure this.

36. Comment 14 A total of 1811 cycle parking spaces are provided for the full site, with 366 provided for the full application. This conforms to existing policy of 1 space per 30sqm.

37. Comment 15 The cycle parking is proposed to be a mixture of Sheffield stands and double stackers. For the detailed application, changing facilities and showers are provided for cyclists. This is appropriate and will encourage cycling to and from the site.

Forecast Trip Generation and Distribution

38. Comment 16 The trip rate of 1.57 vehicle arrivals in the AM peak, and 1.72 departures in the PM peak is taken from the survey of the adjacent Peterhouse Technology Park and is agreed. This would result in 803 vehicle arrivals in the AM peak and 881 vehicle departures in the PM peak. Following further discussion with applicant this vehicle trip generation is considered robust and is agreed.

39. Comment 17 It is noted that due to the pandemic there is no further local Travel Plan data available locally that could be used. A comparison with the 2018 Travel Plan plus data for Cambridge Science Park is therefore appropriate.

40. Comment 18 Further to the distribution details provided, with 24% towards Fulbourn and 32% to and from Yarrow Road, the applicant has undertaken modelling of the following junctions.

    • Cambridge Road with Shelford Road in Fulbourn;
    • Gazelle Way with Cherry Hinton Road;
    • Cherry Hinton Road with Airport Way;
    • Church Road with Airport Way;
    • A1303 Newmarket Road with Airport Way.

41. Many of these junctions have been modelled and are to be revised as part of the application for Land North of Cherry Hinton. This includes the flows from the Land to the north of Cherry Hinton – 1200 dwellings City S/18/0481/OUT application as well as the committed flows of the Wing development for 1300 dwellings and associated land uses SCDC S/2682/13/OL.

42. Comment 19 The future year scenario of 2023 for the opening year, and 2028 for the Cambridge City junctions modelled is appropriate. A future year of 2031 for the other junctions aligns with that used for the above additional junction modelling and is agreed.

Capacity Assessment

43. Comment 20 It is noted that the junctions of Fulbourn Road with Cherry Hinton Road, and the Hills Road junctions with Cherry Hinton Road and Long Road are at capacity without the additional development traffic in 2023 and 2028. With the development traffic added to the network delays and queues at these junctions are predicted to increase, with the most severe impact at the junction of Fulbourn Road with Cherry Hinton Road in the AM and PM peaks. This junction is closest to the site and has the most traffic. The nearby junction of Limekiln Road with Queen Edith’s Way will also be over capacity in the AM Peak.

44. Comment 21 The applicant has undertaken additional capacity assessments of the junctions requested towards Fulbourn and Newmarket Road. The development traffic will result in the junctions of Airport Way / Cherry Hinton Road and Land North of Cherry Hinton site access being over capacity in the AM peak. The junction of Newmarket Road with Airport Way will also be over capacity in the AM and PM peaks on Newmarket Road.

45. The junction of Cambridge Road with Shelford Road in Fulbourn will also be over capacity in the AM and PM peaks on Cambridge Road.

46. Comment 22 The applicant details that with a reduction in peak hour traffic of 35% to 522 arrivals in the AM peak and 573 departures in the PM peak that the above junctions will operate within capacity thresholds. With this reduction in traffic the junction of Airport Way / Cherry Hinton Road and Land North of Cherry Hinton site access being at the threshold of capacity in the AM peak.

47. The junction of Airport Way with Cherry Hinton Road and Land North of Cherry Hinton site access is slightly over theoretical capacity in the AM Peak, although the impact of the development is not considered to be severe.

48. The junction of Airport Way with Newmarket Road is slightly over the theoretical capacity of the junction, although the impact of the development is not considered to be severe.

49. The junction of Cambridge Road with Shelford Road will be over capacity on Cambridge Road in the AM and PM peaks with the development having an impact at this junction. However, taking into consideration the proportional impact in this location, and the current constraints on the highway network, it is not considered that 'hard' highway mitigation works could be justified in this location.

50. Comment 23 CCC would seek that beyond the first phase that the development proceeds on a monitor and manage basis. This is with each phase only able to continue with an assessment of the trip generation, trip budget, travel plan, mode shares and parking utilisation of the development. Each phase should be subject to a transport assessment and review and only able to proceed subject to agreement of Cambridgeshire County Council. Should approval be given a S106 clause is proposed to ensure this.

    Travel Plan

51. Comment 24 The provision of an enhanced Travel Plan and 10% car sharing bays is welcomed. The assumption of 10% of the workforce working from home and 10% travelling in the off peak is noted. The applicant has provided evidence of other successful initiatives and it is accepted that there is potential for this site to achieve the reduction of 35% of car driver trips as proposed by the applicant.

52. Comment 25 The following mitigation package is considered to be essential to mitigate development and therefore would seek to be agreed with the applicant as follows.

    Conditions

    • That the revised site access junction is constructed prior to occupation of the first building with the plans to be agreed by Highways Development Management. Works to be undertaken as a S278 agreement with CCC.
    • Travel Plan to be agreed prior to occupation of each building. To include up to date monitoring of travel behaviour for buildings occupied beyond the first phase.

• A car park management plan to be agreed prior to occupation of each building. A CPMP to ensure that the amount of parking available for use does not exceed 275 spaces for the first phase of development, the provision for each phase of development, and include the provision of spaces allocated to car sharing and off peak journeys.
• That no additional car parking above the 915 spaces within the MSCP is provided unless this provision is demonstrated not to impact upon the trip cap.
• To detail whether a walking / cycling link is required to the neighbouring Peterhouse Technology Park. This should be detailed at each reserved matters application, with details of the link and when it is to be constructed if it is required.
• To improve the westbound bus stop on Fulbourn Road opposite the site with a pedestrian link to the site, and a larger bus shelter and hard standing area. To install these works under a S278 agreement prior to occupation. The details of the bus shelter to be agreed with CCC and the existing shelter to be passed to Fulbourn Parish Council for reuse.
• To improve the eastbound bus stop on Fulbourn Road opposite the site with an appropriate bus shelter. To install these works under a S278 agreement prior to occupation. The details of the bus shelter to be agreed with CCC.

S106

• A trip cap on vehicle entering and departing the site of 106 arrivals in the AM and 117 departures in the PM peak during Phase 1 development and 522 arrivals in the AM and 573 departures in the PM during the full development, with vehicle flows to be monitored annually for the duration of the development.
• That each reserved matters application is subject to approval of a Transport Assessment. This will review vehicle trips and Travel Plan monitoring to ensure that the peak hour vehicle flows are within the vehicle cap, and that the trips associated with each reserved matters application would not result in the trip cap being exceeded.
• A contribution towards strategic infrastructure. This is to be primarily for the Fulbourn to Cambridge greenway and any measures to enable mode shift from car to non-car in the surrounding area of a total of £2.24M. Of this a contribution of £457,000 in relation to phase 1 with the remaining to be in proportion to the area of each reserved matters.
• A contribution of £20,000 towards the future maintenance of the bus stop shelters to be passed to Fulbourn Parish Council.
• A contribution of £36,000 for the provision and maintenance of a Real Time Passenger Information RTPI display at the two bus stops opposite the site.
• Parking surveys to be undertaken in the surrounding area before and after development every year for a period of 5 years post occupation of the final building. A contribution of £40,000 is requested to cover the costs associated with consultation, scheme design, and implementation

Application as submitted

National Policy Context

53. Comment 1 Reference is made to the relevant transport policies.

Existing Local Transport Network

Walking and Cycling Routes

54. Comment 2 The applicant highlights that there are shared footway and cycleways along Fulbourn Road, leading to the signal junction with Queen Edith's Way, along Cambridge Road to Fulbourn, and Yarrow Road to the railway line crossing. There are pedestrian

crossings at the Yarrow Road arm of the Yarrow Road / Fulbourn Road roundabout, and a Toucan crossing located near to Limedale Close to the west of the site.

55. Comment 3 The site is near to the proposed Fulbourn Greenway which links Fulbourn with Cambridge Railway station, and onwards onto the Chisholm Trail for journeys to north Cambridge, or the rest of the Cambridge City cycle network.

    Local Public Transport Services

56. Comment 4 This is noted to be the Citi 1 which is a direct service to Cambridge Railway station along Cherry Hinton Road which takes 13 minutes. This has a frequency of a bus every 15 minutes during weekday peak periods. The Cambridge Guided Busway can be reached at Cambridge Railway station.

57. Comment 5 The nearest bus stops are outside the site boundary, with a small shelter for the Cambridge bound stop, and no shelter for the Fulbourn bound stop.

    Local Roads

    Existing Traffic Conditions

58. Comment 6 The TA has considered the latest 60 months' accident record together with an analysis of any trends or clusters. This notes that there are two accidents at the Yarrow Road roundabout, with concentrations of accidents at the key junctions along the road network within the City.

59. Comment 7 Due to the forecast distribution of traffic accident data should be sought from Business.intelligence@cambridgeshire.gov.uk for Yarrow Road, Gazelle Way, Airport Way and Newmarket Road to the A14.

60. The accident data should be appended to the Transport Statement and a plot provided showing each accident location. It would also be beneficial to tabulate the accidents to clearly define the number and severity of accident occurring at each location.

61. The County Council will review the accident analysis once the above information has been provided.

    Site Access and Layout

62. Comment 8 Please refer to Highways Development Management comments for the highways access and layout.

63. Comment 9 Should this site provide a pedestrian connection to the adjacent Peterhouse Technology Park on its eastern boundary? If there are common tenants between 3 the sites, this would allow for cross movements without the need to cross Fulbourn Road.

    Parking

64. Comment 10 The provision of one car parking space per 40 sqm results in a total proposed provision of 1362 parking spaces. Whilst this may follow the South Cambridgeshire District Council parking standards, this provision is considered to be excessive, taking into account the circumstances of the highly congested surrounding road network. It is expected that the applicant will develop a robust mitigation strategy including infrastructure provision and a high quality Travel Plan, to significantly shift the

mode share away from car borne trips. In association with this, there will be a need to reduce the need for car parking spaces to further discourage car use.

65. Comment 11 The full application has a provision of 275 spaces, resulting in a provision of 1 space per 43sqm. As above it is considered that this provision can be much reduced initially, or over time as the site builds out. The applicant is requested to detail whether the car park to be built as part of the detailed application will be available for all of the buildings within the park.

66. Comment 12 A total of 1811 cycle parking spaces are provided for the full site, with 366 provided for the full application. This conforms to existing policy of 1 space per 30sqm.

67. Comment 13 The cycle parking is proposed to be a mixture of Sheffield stands and double stackers. For the detailed application, the applicant is asked to detail if there are proposed to be changing facilities for cyclists.

    Forecast Trip Generation and Distribution

68. Comment 14 The trip rate of 1.57 vehicle arrivals in the AM peak, and 1.72 departures in the PM peak is taken from the survey of the adjacent Peterhouse Technology Park and is agreed. This would result in 803 vehicle arrivals in the AM peak and 881 vehicle departures in the PM peak.

69. Comment 15 Whilst the applicant has applied a census mode share from the Peterhouse Technology Park in 2013 and compared this to the Science Park, it is considered that these mode shares do not fully represent the potential for mode shift from the private car in this part of Cambridge. There is potential for the mode shares to change in this part of Cambridge, as a result of the Fulbourn Greenway and other infrastructure being implemented by the Greater Cambridge Partnership and Cambridge and Peterborough Combined Authority. 4 It is not considered that data from the Science Park is a robust basis for validation of the 2013 Technology Park data. Before CCC can accept any data a base line on which to build the Travel Plan, validation surveys will be required at the Technology Park. These will need to be undertaken at a time when the current national restrictions have been eased (To be confirmed by CCC).

70. Comment 16 It is noted that the junctions of Fulbourn Road with Cherry Hinton Road, and the Hills Road junctions with Cherry Hinton Road and Long Road are at capacity without the additional development traffic.

71. Comment 17 Further to the distribution details provided, with 24% towards Fulbourn and 32% to and from Yarrow Road, the applicant is requested to undertake models of the following junctions.

    • Cambridge Road with Shelford Road in Fulbourn; • Gazelle Way with Cherry Hinton Road;
    • Cherry Hinton Road with Airport Way;
    • Church Road with Airport Way;
    • A1303 Newmarket Road with Airport Way.

72. Many of these junctions have been modelled and are to be revised as part of the application for Land North of Cherry Hinton. The applicant should therefore model the future junction layouts and flows in the future year scenarios. This is to determine whether there is capacity at these junctions for the committed development flows, as well as the flows to and from this development. The required details will be provided by CCC.

Committed Development

73. Comment 18 The applicant is asked to detail the traffic flows from each of the committed developments on the road network plans. This is to check that the correct flows have been used. This will particularly include the flows on the road network from Land to the north of Cherry Hinton – 1200 dwellings City S/18/0481/OUT and the Wing development – 1300 dwellings and associated land uses SCDC S/2682/13/OL. CCC is not aware that these developments have been incorporated into TEMPRO and therefore these development flows should be included unless it can be shown that they are included in Tempro. Tempro data is extrapolated from data preceding the current Local Plan period and does not take into consideration specific development sites.

Traffic Flow Scenarios

74. Comment 19 The applicant is asked to outline when the development is expected to be completed. The future years should be 2023 and five years post completion. The Tempro growth factor for 2023 is agreed.

Capacity Assessment

75. Comment 20 Additional capacity assessments should be undertaken for each of the above additional junctions identified in comment 17. This should include the committed improvements and development flows to these junctions in the future year scenarios. This is to evaluate the impact of the development on the road network north and east of the site.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Local Highways Authority)

Application as amended (email received 17 September 2021)

76. The Road Safety Audit Stage 1 has been successfully completed and the provision of this along with the stand-alone plan showing the proposed access arrangements overcomes the Highway Authority's request that the application be refused.

Application as submitted

77. The Highway Authority requests that the application be refused in its present format due to lack of information. While the application is in part in outline with all matters reserved except for access no standalone engineering drawing showing the proposed access has been provided (General Arrangement Sheet 1 of 4, Dwg. No. 2435-LLA-00-GF-PL-L-002 is a landscape drawing and the Access Outline Planning Drawing CITP-SB12-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A Rev 4 shows no significant detail).

78. Given the significant changes to the layout of the existing adopted public highway that drawing number 2435-LLA-00-GF-PL-L-002 shows the proposed works will require a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) and the Highway Authority seeks that all problems identified within the audit must be mitigated before any approval that the Planning Authority is minded to grant is issued. In order to maintain continuity across the County Council the Highway Authority seeks that the RSA Stage 1 be undertaken by its in house team.

79. The above request can be overcome by providing a standalone engineering drawing of the proposed access and by having the same subject to the RSA Stage 1 process.

80. Given the size and nature of the proposed development Transport Assessment Team within the County Council should be consulted on this application. If they have not been consulted please do so via: David.Allatt@Cambridgeshire.gov.uk this will assess the suitability of the access design against the predicted traffic (all modes) that the site will generate. Once the access has been agreed in principle further comments may be made on the details of the design.

81. Please add a condition to any permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue in regard to this proposal requiring that no demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed in writing with the Planning Authority (guidance has been provided within the response for the applicant to use as a framework). The Highway Authority requests that the TMP be a stand-alone document separate from any Environment Construction Management Plan or the like, as the risks and hazards associated with construction traffic using the adopted public highway are quite different from those associated with the internal site arrangements. The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:

    i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted public highway).
    ii. Contractor parking; provide details and quantum of the proposed car parking and methods of preventing on street car parking.
    iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted public highway).
    iv. Control of dust, mud and debris, in relationship to the operation of the adopted public highway.

GCSP Sustainability

Application as amended

82. The proposed amendments do not materially alter the sustainable design and construction commitments of the proposals. It is noted that the roof plan for building 3 has been revised, although this still shows the indicative layout of the proposed photovoltaic panels, brown roof and wider plant areas (drawing number CITP-SBR-B3-R1-DR-A-8303 Rev P4). As such, the original comments dated the 7 April 2021 in support of the proposals stand.

Application as submitted

83. Support: The overall approach to sustainable design and construction in welcomed. The Design and Access Statement commits to all occupied buildings being designed to achieve a BREEAM rating of 'excellent', targeting an Energy Performance Certification of A. The London Energy Transformation Initiative (LETI) Climate Emergency Design Guidance strategies, which sets out a pathway to net zero carbon buildings, have also been reviewed in the development of the building passive design principles. Condition wording is recommended below related to evidence of BREEAM performance as part of future reserved matters applications for later phases of the proposals, as well as the submission of BREEAM certification for Building 3, the pre-assessment for which shows a current score of 75.8%, which is supported.

84. With regards to Phase 1, the LETI recommendations around energy consumption in particular have informed the design of the façade of Building 3. In order to achieve an energy consumption figure of 55 kWh/m^2/yr, which is significantly lower than most

Building Regulations compliant buildings, this has required a high performing envelope, a window to wall ratio of 39%, passive thermal design and crucially, the use of external shading to reduce the heating and cooling load of the building by 19% compared to an unshaded building. The orientation of the shading varies depending on the orientation of the façade, with horizontal brise soleil on the southern façade and vertical fins on the east, west and north facades. This approach is supported.

85. With regards to energy, and meeting the requirements of policy CC/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, the building will utilise an all electric approach, with air source heat pumps and a 97.2 m^2 photovoltaic panel array. These systems are shown on the roof plan (drawing number CITP-SBR-B3-R1-DR-A-8303 Rev 3). Carbon calculations indicate a 10.6% reduction in carbon emissions, which is likely to reduce further over time as the grid decarbonises. This approach is supported. Condition wording is recommended below for future reserved matters applications.

86. Wider approaches to sustainable design include targeting 3 BREEAM credits for water efficiency, which represents a 40% reduction in water use, exceeding the requirements of policy CC/4. A brown roof is also proposed for Building 3 beneath the photovoltaic panels, as shown on drawing number CITP-SBR-B3-R1-DR-A-8303 Rev 3, an approach that is supported. Measures have also been incorporated into the design of the car park, including provision for electric vehicle charging, an energy management system that will allow the ev charge point provision of 5% rapid charge points to be spread over a greater number of spaces as demand increases, and allowance for additional battery storage provision should this be needed to increase charge point capacity further. These approaches are all welcomed.

87. Taking the above into account, the proposed scheme is supported in sustainable construction terms.

GCSP Urban Design

Application as amended

88. Further to the last consultation (comments issued on 30 April 2021), the applicant has revised the design to address urban design concerns, i.e. Building 1's visual impact. The amendments include setting back the main roof and the second floor element of Building 1 by 10.5m compared with the previous design to minimise visual impact. The 65m separation distance between the 2-storey element of the office building and the residential dwelling on the other side of the Fulbourn is considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

89. To conclude, both the proposed outline element and the full application for the single commercial building and the multi-storey car park are considered acceptable in urban design terms, and would broadly meet the objectives set out in Policies E/3 and HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018). Conditions in relation to materials, sample panels, cycle storage and public art are recommended.

Application as submitted

90. Summary: Both the proposed outline element and the full application for the single commercial building and the multi-storey car park are considered acceptable in urban design terms, and would broadly meet the objectives set out in Policies E/3 and HQ/1 of the 'South Cambridgeshire Local Plan' (2018). The applicant is asked to provide further

clarification on certain areas detailed below. Conditions in relation to materials, sample panels, cycle storage and public art are recommended.

91. General comments: Officers welcome the changes introduced to the scheme following pre-application engagement. The comments below focus on the design aspect of the proposals. Please consult the Council's landscape architect regarding the proposals impact on the green belt and compliance with Policy NH/8: Mitigating the Impact of Development In and Adjoining the Green Belt of the 'South Cambridgeshire Local Plan' (2018).

    Detailed comments:

    Layout

92. The applicant's Design and Access Statement (DAS) contains a detailed analysis of the site context. It demonstrates that the applicant has explored various layout options during the initial stage of the design development (P. 74 to 75 of the DAS) taking into account the site constraints. and concluded that the current proposals (option 4b) would present the most appropriate layout option. The proposals aim to create five 3-storey buildings, with associated car and cycle parking in the form of a multi-storey car park serving Buildings 1, 2 and 3; Buildings 4 and 5 with a single deck car park each. The layout of these blocks are appropriate, it considers the site constraints, e.g. the green belt context, the gas main along the northern edge of the site requiring a 10m easement from the centre of the main and the location of the existing Yarrow Road roundabout which would provide connection to the site. The proposed layout would establish a new building frontage similar to the neighbouring Peterhouse Technology Park, by adopting a boulevard approach with buildings set back from the spine road creating good opportunities for a high quality public realm and usable amenity spaces for users, and a landscaped edge along Fulbourn Road and Cambridge Road.

93. The proposed layout relates well to the surrounding green belt: the proposed green buffer would be located on the south and east boundary to provide a good degree of screening. These planted zones would help to set an organic transition from office space to the rural surroundings. The buffer would also provide amenity spaces such as seating areas and a trim trail, encouraging outside working and meetings. This is particularly welcome as it would support the concept of outdoor working in the post-Covid era, taking into account the well-being of staff and local resident.

94. It is important that the amenity spaces and public art provided within the site would benefit the staff, visitors as well as local residents. The applicant should provide clarification on how this can be achieved as the neighbouring Peterhouse Technology Park does not appear to allow the general public to enjoy its amenity spaces.

    Scale and massing

95. The general approach to the scale and massing of the proposed buildings across the site is acceptable. The proposed 3-storey height would reflect the height of the buildings in the Peterhouse Technology Park. P. 34 of the applicants DAS shows that the proposals have taken into account the existing site levels: the levels at the rear south west corner of the application site has the highest ground level in comparison to the rest of the neighbouring context, and so the buildings on this site will need to be dug into the ground in order to maintain a similar relationship to the existing buildings.

96. The proposed site sections show that the distance between Blocks B and D and the existing dwellings would be 65m and 43.5m respectively, together with the planting in

between, this separation distance is considered acceptable and would not result in unacceptable visual or amenity impact on the existing properties.

97. Regarding the detailed application for the erection of Building 3 and the adjacent multi-storey car park, their height and massing is considered acceptable. Building 3 would be 3-storey 13.5m in height and the multi-storey car park would be 5- storey 13.5m in height, similar to the general building height in the neighbouring Peterhouse Technology Park.

Architecture and materials

98. The contemporary architectural style proposed to Building 3 and the multi-storey car park is supported, and would relate well to the recently completed office buildings ARMS A & B in the neighbouring Peterhouse Technology Park, while respecting the surrounding natural landscape. The concept of incorporating solar shading features on Building 3's facades is supported: the horizontal brise soleil on the southern facade would help reduce excess sunlight and help create a comfortable working environment. The vertical fins on the East, West, and North Facades would help create visual interest and reduce incident sunlight in the building.

Public art

99. The indicative design and location of the public art (golden bird sculpture) in the DAS is supported, as it would help enhance the quality of the public realm of the space between Building 3 and the multi-storey car park. However, Officers consider it important to have another piece of public art placed at the proposed new roundabout to create a better sense of arrival and to help enhance the identity of this international technology park. In addition, high quality furniture should be incorporated along the main spine road to encourage the use of the outdoor space in the park and this can also form part of the public art strategy which is currently missing from the outline and detailed applications but can be conditioned.

100. Conditions covering materials, sample panels, cycle parking and public art are recommended.

GCSP Landscape

<u>Application as amended – final comments (received 13 September)</u>

101. Access – acceptable

102. Landscaping – Existing vegetation – A revised tree implications plan with tree protection plan has been submitted. Acceptable subject to replacement following completion of enabling works. To be conditioned.

Outline Application

103. Landscape Open Space Strategy – A revised line of trim trail has been submitted. Drawing acceptable.

104. Parameter Plan 4 – Open Space and Landscape Outline Planning This drawing needs to be amended to clearly indicate the woodland buffer within Landscape Framework Zone C. The drawing implies that there will be a 7m wide woodland buffer at

its narrowest point. However, with a maintenance strip running along the decked car park there is only 2.5m.

105. Applicant also needs to revisit both swales which run along the eastern boundary of the decked car park. Unconvinced that there is sufficient space to accommodate a significant landscape buffer.

106. Parameter Plan 2 - Building Heights Outline Planning LVIA response to CITP officer comments 31 August 2021. Flue heights – agree with the applicant that 8m high flues upon buildings 1, 2 and 4 fronting onto Fulbourn Road / Cambridge Road would not result in any change in the overall assessment of the significance of effects. Buildings would be set back and result in any potential flues being a minimum of 85m from residential properties similar to Arm 3 located on the adjacent site. Set back of flues to be conditioned. Applicant has included structural planting to the Site's southern and eastern boundaries to help provide screening of the new buildings. This is acceptable (subject to confirmation of eastern planting) however, there are concerns that building 5 with 8m high flues, which will not be set into the landscape as per the MSCP, will have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt. 8m high flues to be exclude from development upon the southern boundary and to be conditioned. Elevation of Building 3 with privacy enclosure – previous comments outstanding.

107. Parameter Plan 2 - Building Heights Outline Planning and Proposed Site Levels Plan - Enabling Works. Levels to be confirmed as per previous comments.

108. The following details are to be conditioned:
- Soft and hard landscaping
- Street furniture
- External lighting and CCTV
- Cycle storage
- Refuse and recycling store
- Drainage – Swales along the eastern boundary to be confirmed. See previous comments.

Full application for the first phase

109. Soft landscaping

Topsoil storage and previous planting concerns to be conditioned

110. Hard landscaping

- Detailed Phase 1 Hard Landscape Proposals Sheet 5 of 10 – previous comments apply
- Details of retaining wall to the rear of Building 3 details to be conditioned Central road access details – details to be conditioned
- Lighting and CCTV- location and details to be conditioned
- Building 3 - North and East Elevations Detail Planning 8401 P4. Previous comments apply
- Refuse to the rear of Building 3 – Location to be revised and details conditioned
- Drainage Previous comments to be conditioned.

Full application for the enabling works comprising

111. The following details are to be conditioned:

- Drainage Pond and swale
- Permanent site access and roundabout including cut associated with the highway

- Soil management plan – previous comments apply and to be conditioned.
- Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character & Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining The Green Belt - To prevent any harm to the landscape character, views and the green belt applicant to include all boundary planting within the enabling works. All existing planting, inclusive of new planting undertaken within the enabling works, to be protected within both the detailed and outline applications.

Application as amended – interim comments (16 August 2021)

112. Access – acceptable.

113. Landscaping – Existing vegetation – A tree survey and line of tree protection has been included within the Construction Environmental Management Plan. A new temporary entrance has been indicated (page 26) through the line of existing boundary hedgerow. Applicant to resubmit a tree survey and method statement, as evidence, indicating a temporary access which does not have an adverse impact to any existing trees. As per arboriculturist recommendations a detailed arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan is required. To be conditioned.

Outline application

114. Landscape Open Space Strategy – In principle this is acceptable. However, there are concerns that there is insufficient space available to accommodate proposed trials around the new infiltration pond. Applicant to revisit line of trim trail.

115. Parameter Plan 4 - Open Space and Landscape Outline Planning – Landscape framework Zone C - this area has been indicated as a woodland buffer and retreat corridor forming boundary Landscape Buffer Zone. At its narrowest point the eastern boundary is approx.. 7.4m wide which is acceptable. However, the drainage drawings indicate 6m inclusive of permeable paving and a swale with no space for a landscape buffer. Drainage drawings to be revisited to reflect landscape framework zone C and a 7.4m wide landscape buffer to be included which excludes swale and permeable paving.

116. Parameter Plan 2 - Building Heights Outline Planning - Applicant has indicated that 'Any roof top plant and related screening to be set back from the building edges by no less than 10m and to be no greater than 0.5 above parapet levels, excluding flues that can be 8m above roof level'. However, Building 3 has a privacy enclosure which is 1.5m high upon the roof and contradicts this statement. Applicant to revisit height of privacy enclosure upon Building 3. Concerns with the height of flues at 8m high. This has not been addressed within the LVIA assessment. LVIA to be revisited to confirm that flues upon Buildings 1, 2, 4 & 5 will not have a significant adverse impact upon the landscape character, views and visual amenity and purposes of the Green Belt. Enabling Works conflict particularly proposed decked car park – Applicant to confirm levels with section details.

117. The following details should be conditioned:

- Soft and hard landscaping - No soft and hard details have been provided for the outline application
- Street furniture
- External lighting and CCTV
- Cycle storage
- Refuse and recycling store – Layout and specification inclusive of living roof to comply with RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.

118. Drainage- Swale running along the eastern boundary adjacent to decked car park – Although in principle this is acceptable there is insufficient space to accommodate a significant landscape buffer, maintenance strip, trim trail and a swale within tight constraints. Applicant to reconsider footprint of proposed decked car park and coordinate with landscape architect to provide a landscape buffer as per parameter plan.

Full application for first phase

119. Soft landscaping

- Planting specification – applicant to provide details where topsoil will be stored upon the site after stripping
- ArborRaft system – applicant to provide a plan indicating extent of crate system within paving. To be conditioned.
- Fagus sylvatica is not typical of the local landscape character. Suggest replace with Carpinus betulus. Due to dry conditions within South Cambs Betula & Sorbus species are to be avoided. Applicant to include alternative species.
- New hedgerow upon the southern boundary to be a simple native hedgerow with large long lived trees that integrate with the existing infrastructure. Hedgerow species to include: Hawthorn, hazel, blackthorn, field maple, dog rose, and, occasional, wild privet and wayfaring tree.
- The soft landscape details submitted indicate works along the entirety of the southern boundary. This is welcomed and will reduce any adverse effects to the landscape and views, however, applicant to confirm if the red line boundary will be adjusted to suit.

120. Hard landscaping
- Detailed Phase 1 Hard Landscape Proposals Sheet 5 of 10. Permeable paving to be provided to the west and south of MSCP as per drainage drawings.
- Street furniture – acceptable Cycle storage – Internal cycle storage to MSCP acceptable
Building 3 - North and East Elevations Detail Planning 8401 P4. Elevations to include 1.5m high plant enclosure and riser
The following details are required to be conditioned:

- Details of retaining wall to the rear of Building 3 to be provided or conditioned
- Central road access details - Bryan G Hall Access Road - Details to be provided
- Lighting and CCTV details to be provided or conditioned
- Refuse to the rear of Building 3 – As per 5.14 RECAP-Waste-Management-Design-Guide collection crews should not have to move large containers (4 wheels) a distance greater than 10m. Applicant to relocate external storage building nearer to vehicle turning head. Specific construction requirements are addressed in Appendix D RECAP e.g. drainage water wash down and ventilation, hard impervious floor material. Applicant to provide details inclusive of living roof or to be conditioned.
- Brown roofs - Operation and maintenance programme to be confirmed in 'Drainage strategy and SUDS report'. Applicant to also provide section details and specification of brown roofs.
- Main access road and roundabout – drainage details to be provided.
- Details of Raingarden to the east of MSCP
- Recessed manhole covers to be provided within hard paving

Full application for enabling works

121. Drainage - Pond and swale – Details to be provided inclusive of headwall, gabions, liner, planting schedule and specification, weir etc. To be conditioned.

122. Permanent site access and roundabout including cut associated with the highway - Bryan G Hall Access Road Details to be provided

123. Soil management plan acceptable subject to the following
- Prior to topsoil stripping existing surface vegetation to be removed no less than 2 weeks before stripping
- Topsoil heaps to be treated with an approved herbicide or long term heaps to be treated with clover seed mix or equivalent
- No areas of topsoil to be stripped with the RPA of existing trees and hedgerows.

124. Applicant has indicated that the site will be stabilised with a compacted layer of quicklime / cement with subsoil and a capping layer of stone and cement. In principle this is acceptable, however it is not clear how subsoil / topsoil beneficial to plant growth will be spread for proposed landscape works as per parameter plans and landscape details. Applicant to provide details within soil management plan.

125. Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character & Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining The Green Belt- Applicant has included within detailed drawings a landscape buffer to the south of the site. This is welcomed and will reduce the adverse impact of the new development and enabling works. However, it is not clear if these works will be within the Full Application for the first phase or enabling works. Applicant to confirm within red line boundary.

<u>Application as submitted</u>

Outline application

126. An Outline Application with all matters reserved (except for access) for the development of up to 44,671 sqm of floorspace, with associated access, structural landscaping, car and cycle parking and associated infrastructure works

127. Access – Acceptable

128. Layout – Decked Car Park (DAS page 108), Applicant has indicated that the decked car park will be offset from the eastern boundary to reduce the impact of the development on the surrounding Green Belt. This was welcomed in the pre app meetings however, this has not been reflected within Parameter Plan 1 – Land Use. Applicant to revisit and amend Potential future access between the application site and the adjacent ARM site – within the DAS the applicant has lightly touched the potential connection with the adjacent site. However, no further sketch details have been provided or investigated. A present, I am not convinced that this is feasible. Applicant to confirm.

129. Landscaping – Existing vegetation - A tree survey has been included within the ES. However, the following details are to be conditioned - Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan for vegetation both within and adjacent to the site. Hard & soft landscaping and street furniture – No details have been provided and to be conditioned within reserved matters application Parameter Plan 1 – Land Use & Parameter Plan 4 – Open Space and Landscape, applicant to include a description of Landscape Framework Zones e.g Long lived native trees with understorey planting, preservation of existing boundary hedgerow, trim trails etc. upon the drawing All Parameter Plans conflict with ES (page 11.104) and DAS. Applicant to revisit and amend.

130. Scale - Parameter Plan 2 - Building Heights. Applicant to confirm upon a drawing existing ground and proposed levels both within and adjacent to the site and how the new

development will sit into the landscape. Section details are required both within and upon boundaries of the site.

131. Artwork – Locations of artwork to be confirmed upon a parameter plan.

Full application for first phase

132. A Full Application for the first Phase comprising the main access, one commercial building, a multideck car and cycle park and associated landscaping and infrastructure works.

133. Access – New access into the site is acceptable. There is an existing cycle path to the south of the Yarrow roundabout which diverts cyclists safely around the junction. This has not been indicated upon the General Arrangement drawings and it is not clear if the lane will be removed or integrated within the new junction/ footpath. Applicant to confirm What landscape improvements are proposed within the new central Yarrow roundabout? Applicant to confirm.

134. Landscaping. Existing vegetation – A tree survey has been included within the ES. However, the following details are to be conditioned - Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan for vegetation both within and adjacent to the site. Existing boundary trees and hedgerows to be protected, retained and enhanced other than access requirements. Any gaps within hedgerows to be infilled with native species reflecting existing landscape characteristics.

135. Green Buffer to the south and west of the site – No details have been provided other than the General Arrangement drawings, the Parameter Plans, the DAS and the ES. All drawings and documents conflict which is unacceptable. Applicant to revisit.

136. The main access leading into the site – applicant has included tree planting at 10m centres within grass which is welcomed. However, as discussed in previous pre app meetings this is insufficient to mitigate development until other phases are brought forward. Suggest applicant includes a single specie hedgerow behind new trees and edge of future plots (as indicated in DAS page 113 and ES). Applicant to revisit General Arrangement drawings.

137. Main axis from existing Yarrow roundabout to the south of the site – As per discussion within previous meetings, a gap to be created within the southern site boundary to encourage long distant views out of the site – Applicant to amend General Arrangement drawing.

138. Soft landscape works – No details have been provided and to be conditioned inclusive of landscape specification.

139. Tree pit details - New trees fail due to lack of soil and water. Applicant to provide sufficient root space for all trees. Trees planted in areas with a high ratio of hardstanding above their rooting area deserve structural soils or 3D cellular confinement systems to ensure they have the best rooting environment in this harsh location. https://www.greenblue.com/gb/resources/soil-calculator/. Applicant to provide section details of trees surrounded by hard surfacing.

140. Hard works – Other than the General Arrangement drawings, no details have been provided and to be conditioned. Blister paving or tactile surface paving to be included at pedestrian crossing points DAS indicates retaining walls adjacent to the southern

boundary. However, no details have been provided. Applicant to confirm location on General Arrangement drawings and confirm with sections / details Street furniture & Artwork (plinth) – details have not been provided and to be conditioned. Artwork to be provided within central roundabout? Applicant to confirm.

141. Boundary treatments – No details have been provided and to be conditioned.

142. Lighting and CCTV – No details have been provided and to be conditioned.

143. Refuse and recycling store / UKPN – acceptable subject to details of brown roof specification.

144. Building 3
Roof – Brown roof details required and to be conditioned
Height – 14m high with FFL @25.950AOD inclusive of plant which conflicts with Parameter Plan 2 – Building Heights. Applicant to confirm upon a drawing existing ground and proposed levels both within and adjacent to the site and how the new development will sit into the landscape. Detailed sections are required indicating how the development relates with the existing landform.
Entrance to Building 3 – Could the entrance to the new build be located centrally within the paving layout?

145. MSCP
Cycle parking – allocation within MSCP is acceptable with visitor parking externally. Details to be provided and to be conditioned
Height – 13.6m high with FFL @25.950AOD. Applicant to confirm upon a drawing existing ground and proposed levels both within and adjacent to the site (agricultural field and ARM) and how the new development will sit into the landscape. Detailed sections are required indicating how the development relates with the existing landform.
Long Section Through Building 3 and Carpark Detail Planning – indicates a small retaining wall adjacent to the external stairs of MSCP which is not been reflected in General Arrangement plans – applicant to amend.
Drainage – Applicant to confirm if a swale or ditch is to be provided upon the southern boundary to intercept surface runoff from agricultural field (as undertaken in adjacent site).
A number of documents refer to rain gardens within the site. Applicant to confirm location within detailed design.

Full application for enabling works

146. A Full Application for the details of initial enabling works comprising site wide earth works and drainage.

Landscaping

147. Existing vegetation - A tree survey has been included within the ES. However, the following details are to be conditioned - Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan for vegetation both within and adjacent to the site.

148. Drainage Details Sheet 3 5232 P02 – Due to the rural location applicant to replace the precast concrete headwall with an alternative approach which reflects the local landscape characteristics. Infiltration pond - Section details of pond are required and to be conditioned DAS (page 65) indicates attenuation tanks and areas in yellow to be completed in the enabling works. This is not clear and applicant to clarify.

149. Cut and Fill – A drawing to be provided indicating cut and fill with existing and proposed ground levels. Applicant to also submit a detailed Soil Management Plan outlining the methodology of soil stripping, handling, haul routes temporary material storage areas inclusive of topsoil and gravel, finished depths and location of topsoil, subsoil and gravel throughout the site, formation level decompaction measures, soil re-spreading, decompaction as well as soil disposal (if necessary) and protection of finished ground.

150. Detailed sections required through the site to show the proposed make-up of the cut and fill, the levels and contours to be formed and showing the relationship of proposed earth works to existing vegetation and surrounding landform.
Cement stabilisation and capping layer to be confirmed. Location and sections to be provided. At present it is not clear what and where the finished formation levels will be and where (if any) topsoil / subsoil will be respread across the site. It is also not clear how the site sits within the landscape and its relationship with adjacent landform (Arm site, Fulbourn Road and agricultural field). At present there is insufficient information supplied by the applicant. I'm particularly concerned that the site other than access, Building 3 and the MSCP will be finished with a cement stabilisation and a capping layer for a considerable period until future phases of development are progressed, which is unacceptable. No landscape mitigation works are proposed which is unacceptable.

151. Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character - At present there are major concerns that the proposed landscape mitigation works both in the outline and detailed applications are insufficient and unacceptable. Further information is required to address my concerns and drawings to be revisited due to conflict of information. Until these concerns have been addressed the proposed development does not respect, retain or enhance the local landscape character and would have an adverse effect upon the landscape and local views. The proposal would be contrary to Policy NH/2: Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character & Policy HQ/1: Design Principles.

152. Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining The Green Belt - Any development proposals within and adjoining the Green Belt must be located and designed so that they do not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt. Again, there are major concerns that the proposed landscape mitigation works both within the outline and detailed applications are insufficient and unacceptable. Until these concerns have been addressed the development would have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt particularly upon the eastern and southern boundaries. The proposal would be contrary to Policy NH/8: Mitigating the Impact of Development in and Adjoining the Green Belt.

153. Revisions during application process - Applicant to include revision clouds upon drawings to track changes made to the drawings and indicate an area of change. Design changes to be accompanied by an addendum or bulletin in the form of a narrative explaining changes.

GCSP Ecology

Application as amended

154. The applicant has submitted a Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Ramboll, June 2021) which is welcomed. The report is showing that the application site will achieve a 16% net increase in reginal biodiversity units, and 740% net gain in linear biodiversity units. This is

acceptable in principle. Conditions are recommended to be included within any decision notice issued; should the Planning Officer recommend permission is granted.

Application as submitted

155. The site consists of an arable field with wooded boundaries, and grass margins. The site sits within the Impact Risk Zone of the nearby Cherry Hinton Pit SSSI; however it does not meet the criteria that would require a consultation with Natural England, the site is also approximately 600 m from Limekiln Close (and West Pit) LNR/CWS. Direct effects are unlikely; however analysis of potential impacts should be investigated. Species records show great crested newts, barn owls and other breeding birds, flowering plants, invertebrates, reptiles, bats, brown hare, water vole, harvest mouse, and hedgehog have all been recorded locally.

156. The application is supported by an Ecological Impact Assessment (Ramboll, November 2020) which is welcomed. The report finds that the site is of relatively low ecological value, and that any risks of harm to protected species can be removed through non-licensable avoidance and mitigation strategies. Key ecological features identified included the species rich defunct hedge along the northern boundary, and the offsite wooded area to the west. There is general agreement with this analysis.

157. The report mentions that the site will provide a net gain in biodiversity. This is welcomed; however there is no submission of biodiversity net gain calculations. This will need to be addressed prior to determination to support the principle stated within the report. Considering that low value land makes up a majority of the site, this is definitely an achievable goal.

158. Action required: Submission of biodiversity net gain calculations, preferably using the DEFRA Metric 2.0. All underlying assumptions should be included within the submission (habitat condition assessments for example). If using a different metric all assumptions and variations must be justified. Once submitted, conditions can be suggested.

GCSP Trees

Application as submitted

159. Trees on or adjacent site have: No statutory protection.

160. Hedgerows on or adjacent site: From a quick desk study it is possible they may qualify as important hedgerows under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 and would therefore have statutory protection, and/or have no statutory protection.

161. Documents or information required with application(s): Due to the type of proposal and where the red line boundary sits, it should be relatively straightforward to submit a detailed Tree Protection Plan with Method Statement with the following or reserved matters application. This would avoid a pre-commencement condition.

162. As much detailed information as possible should be submitted upfront to fully outline the proposal. Any application should at a minimum should include:
Detailed tree establishment and maintenance plan
Detailed tree planting plans (including street lighting/CCTV columns)
Detailed tree protection plan and method statement
Tree planting specification

163. Other: All documents should comply with (or state why they do not):
BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction Recommendations;
BS 3998:2010 Tree work Recommendations;
The Hedgerow Regulations 1997;
BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape recommendations; and
BS 4428:1989 Code of practice for general landscape operations (excluding hard surfaces).

GCSP Conservation

164. The site is within 40m of the edge of Fulbourn Hospital conservation area.

165. The ES does cover heritage issues and does correctly identify a small number of non-designated heritage assets and one designated heritage asset (the Fulbourn Hospital conservation area) as having the potential to be affected by the development.

166. The conclusion of Appendix 8 of the applicants' environmental statement, that the impact of the proposal on the non-designated heritage assets (Victoria House, Hereward House, and the former hospital gatehouse) would be nil or neutral, is agreed.

167. The rural setting of the former asylum site which makes up the conservation area makes a small contribution to its significance. The proposal would erode this rural setting to a limited extent, but that erosion would be mitigated by the nature of the vegetation on the southern boundary of the conservation area and the eastern side of the application site, the presence of the Cambridge Road between the site and the conservation area, and the proposed layout of the development. The proposal would have a very low level of visibility from within the conservation area. Additional photographic evidence would have helped to clarify this, but the conclusion of Appendix 8: that any harm caused to the significance of the conservation area would be at the extreme lower limit of the 'less-than-substantial' range, is correct.

168. Increased biodiversity is the only wider public benefit specifically identified in the conclusion to Appendix 8, but there appear to be a number of others, including scientific/technological advance, and employment. It is for the decision-maker to weigh these benefits against the very low level of 'less-than-substantial' harm which would be caused to the conservation area, but the latter is so slight that it would almost certainly be outweighed by the wider public benefits.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

Application as submitted

169. The site has been recently been subject to an archaeological evaluation (HER ECB6486). The Historic Environment Team is yet to receive the report on this evaluation, but we are aware from our site monitoring visits that the evaluation confirmed the absence of significant archaeology. It is therefore confirmed that no objection is raised to this proposal and that a condition of planning permission requiring archaeological investigation is not required in connection with this application.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Crime Prevention Design Team)

Application as amended

170. This office has reviewed all amendments as detailed – there are no objections, recommendations or further comments. The team would like to continue to be consulted to ensure community safety measures and vulnerability to crime is considered and are supportive in that regard.

Application as submitted

171. This office has reviewed the above hybrid planning application. Noted that all matters reserved (except for access) – this office is very happy to be consulted to ensure that community safety and reducing vulnerability is addressed and to comply with HEA: 06 of the Breeam requirements. Supportive of the application and no further comments at this time.

172. This office has now reviewed the Full Application for first Phase comprising main access, commercial building and the multi decked car and cycle park plus associated landscaping. The team is supportive of the community safety measures to be applied including the design of the decked parking to consider Park Mark Safer Parking Scheme. The use of CCTV and lighting as suggested is welcomed plus landscaping proposals designed to support CCTV and to be regularly maintained. All measures contribute to reducing the vulnerability to crime. This office is happy to offer any specific consultation in regard to security proposals as this scheme progresses.

173. One observation in regard to the cycle parking area is that any use of Sheffield hoops, the hoops should be concreted into ground as thefts are occurring where bolts are being ripped out to remove the cycle.

South Cambridgeshire Environmental Health (Air Quality)

Application as submitted

174. The findings of the Air Quality Assessment are acceptable. The energy strategy for the proposed development is based on an Air Source Heat Pump System with no on-site combustion plant. The submitted Low Emission Strategy is acceptable to promote a sustainable transport for the development. No objection is raised to the proposal subject to a recommendation requiring the submission of a Low Emission Strategy requiring the provision of 68 rapid Electric Vehicle Charge Points.

South Cambridgeshire Environmental Health (Contaminated Land)

Application as submitted

175. The site's previous use is as an agricultural field and as such has a relatively low risk in terms of potential contamination. The proposed use is also not particularly sensitive to the presence of contamination. Assessment has been carried out and detailed in the Interpretative Report, which confirms that the site poses low risk in terms of contamination. No further investigation or remedial measures are required. Therefore it is recommended that a precautionary condition be imposed to set out the procedure should and any unexpected contamination be discovered.

South Cambridgeshire Environmental Health (Noise and Vibration, Lighting)

Application as amended

176. The revised information submitted has been considered and this is satisfactory to now be part of the submitted CEMP. As such, the previous comments made on 9th April in relation to recommending conditions requiring information on airborne dust and phasing on construction activities are no longer required.

Application as submitted

Noise and Vibration

177. The Cambridge International Technology Park, Construction and Environmental Management Plan dated 26th January 2021, prepared by Bowmer and Kirkland is submitted in support of this application as contained in the ES Appendix 4.6 CEMP – Cambridge ITP Rev B has been reviewed and there is broad agreement with its content.

178. Whist it may not be necessary to undertake continuous noise and vibration monitoring agreement should be reached on when it will be undertaken. For example spot noise checks could be undertaken on a regular basis at site boundary locations closest to residential properties.

179. Longer Term Continuous Monitoring of noise and vibration should be undertaken when :
- Agreed target levels are likely to be exceeded by prediction
- Upon receipt of substantiated complaints
- At the request of the Local Planning Authority / Environmental Health following any justified complaints

180. Whist existing nearby residential premises will be exposed to construction noise that will be transitory in nature the impact should be considered and controlled. In order to minimise pre-commencement conditions a condition requiring adherence to the CEMP submitted could be attached.

181. In addition to the CEMP condition, additional conditions covering hours of operation, dust control measures and a comprehensive construction programme are recommended.

182. The Chapter 13 – Noise and Vibration Technical Appendices, which present the Noise Measurement Time Histories and the 2D view of SoundPLAN® model created for the assessment of road traffic noise levels provides no information as to any noise impacts that may occur as a result of the development apart from vehicle movements connected to on site car parks. However, Chapter 13 of the ES provides further detail.

183. Chapter 13 also refers to fixed plant and equipment serving the buildings and states “The dwellings most exposed to fixed external plant noise will depend on the proposed location of plant serving the five buildings which will be decided at a later design stage.”

184. Section 13.25 of the ES refers to having limited plant noise levels to control plant noise to a level of 5dB below the existing background noise level. This is acceptable and the SCDC recommendation for plant and equipment noise is that it should not exceed background levels by more than 3dB at the boundary of the development to prevent creeping background.

185. Section 13.26 of the ES states “A detailed plant noise impact assessment will be done at a later design stage, once the specification of fixed external plant is known.” To this end a condition requiring a noise assessment and a scheme for insulation or other attenuation measures be submitted and a condition relating to collection and delivery hours.

186. The effect of increased vehicle movements on local roads has been assessed and based on predictions the impacts are considered negligible. Whist significant adverse impact was not envisaged, commentary and screening assessment has been provided on potential off-site traffic noise generation.

187. It is stated that these technologies may be considered in isolation but may also be considered as part of a mix of technologies used on-site.

188. No objection is raised to these technologies but if air source heat pumps and or micro-wind turbines are considered then further noise impact assessment and or a noise insulation scheme may be required. In terms of ASHPs the assessment of noise impact can be a grey area. Under The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 201 they may be considered permitted development subject to very specific requirements / conditions. In the absence of any detailed information a condition could be considered to retain the control of any noise associated with renewable energies that may be installed at a future date.

Artificial lighting

189. The Abstract Cambridge, Lighting Pollution Statement (Reference 6775 REV S2A, dated 13th November 2020) provides very general information on the proposed lighting scheme. However, 5 Chapter 12 of the ES provides further detail and confirms a detailed lighting impact assessment will be carried out at the design stage.

190. A lighting impact assessment / scheme should be provided and should cover such matters as, light spillage, hours of illumination, light levels, column heights, the levels of impact on nearby dwellings including horizontal and vertical isolux contours and methods of mitigating any adverse effects. Whilst it would be preferable to consider as early as possible, as this is often a detailed design issue a condition is recommended to cover this.

South Cambridgeshire Sustainable Drainage

Application as amended

191. The proposals have demonstrated that a suitable surface water drainage strategy for the site can be delivered. The amended Drainage Strategy and SuDS Report alongside the technical note have addressed the main issues raised by the Cambridge City Council sustainable drainage engineer. Conditions are recommended.

Application as submitted

192. The microdrainage calculations show that flooding is occurring for the 1in100 year + 40% climate change event and that there is not enough on site attenuation provided.

193. The microdrainage calculations have only utilised a factor of safety of 2 this must be increased to between 5-10 for infiltration devices depending on consequence of failure.

194. No detailed design information has been provided on the various attenuation features including basins, rain gardens and swales thus it is difficult to determine the design suitability of the proposed SuDS infrastructure. Please note all SuDS features must be designed in accordance with CIRIA guidance including appropriate water depths and side slopes.

195. Whilst it is understood that this application includes delivery of the drainage infrastructure when reviewed against the enabling works plan this does not appear to be the case therefore there are concerned that not all the site wide drainage infrastructure (including that within the outline boundary) is coming forward with this submission. If this is not the case and there are drainage works to be delivered at a later date then detailed drainage phasing plans will need to be provided. Additionally as the system has currently been modelled as a whole it will need to be demonstrated through additional modelling that the infrastructure installed as part of each phase can cater for the critical flood events including climate change and that it is clear what the trigger is for each phase as it comes forward.

196. Foul Water strategy - Please demonstrate that the availability and capacity of connecting to the public foul system is being explored in consultation with Anglian Water for the detailed application boundary.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority)

Application as amended (response dated 6 August 2021)

197. We have reviewed the following documents:

- Drainage Strategy and SuDS Report, Ramboll, Ref: CITP-RMB-XX-XX-RP-C-0001 Rev P04, Dated: 29 June 2021
- Technical Note, Ramboll, Version P02, Dated: 23 July 2021

198. Based on these, as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) we can remove our objection to the proposed development. The above documents demonstrate that surface water from the proposed development can be managed through the use of brown roofs on new buildings. Rain gardens are proposed around the scheme and permeable paving is proposed on the footpaths and some parking areas around the site. Swales are proposed around the scheme for treating elements of highway runoff. Filter trenches are proposed around the edges of the scheme to capture surface water overland flows and promote the infiltration back into the ground. All surface water is directed to an infiltration basin in the northeast of the scheme. The surface water scheme will be managed and maintained by a private management company for the lifetime of the development.

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

200. Conditions and informatives are recommended.

Application as amended (response dated 15 July 2021)

201. At present we object to the grant of planning permission for the following reasons:

Infiltration issues

202. The development site lies over a principle aquifer and is within source protection zone 3. Infiltration through made ground should be avoided – we would normally expect any made ground to be removed from beneath any infiltration SuDS to prevent pollution of controlled waters. Infiltration through made ground is only acceptable if site investigations demonstrate the absence of significant contamination. Furthermore, samples of made ground should be tested for potential contaminants of concern and the risks to controlled waters should be appropriately assessed.

203. Whilst the surface water pro-forma indicates that there is 5m of clearance to groundwater no evidence has been submitted to support this. As outlined in paragraph 6.3.21 of the SPD there must be a minimum clearance of 1.2 m between the base of any infiltration feature and peak seasonal groundwater levels.

204. In addition, the trial pit locations should be marked on a site plan so we can check the infiltration rates for each feature are comparable to the rates achievable in each part of the site.

Detailed phasing plan required

205. The drainage layout plan indicates the works adjacent to the access road are subject to a S278 works designed by others. The applicant has designed swales, and surface water sewers within this area which is outside of the red-line boundary for this application. The LLFA require confirmation that the buildings and hardstanding proposed will not drain to the proposed swales designed outside of the red-line boundary, and that these swales have been included as future inflows to the site.

206. Detailed information on all proposed phasing from the start of construction through to completion is required to demonstrate that the site can be adequately drained during all stages of construction.

Surface water calculations

207. Permeable paving 18 and Swale 3 are both surcharged during the 100% AEP. The drainage system should be designed under full pipe conditions to accept a 1-year design storm without surcharging above the pipe soffit on sites with average ground slopes of greater than 1%.

208. As the drainable area is larger than 100m2 and there will be damage if the system were to fail, the current safety factor of 2 is not appropriate. Guidance for the minimum factors of safety is available both in the CIRIA SuDS manual C753 and in the Surface Water Planning Guidance (section 5.15.5) which is available on our website.

209. Additionally, the detention basin seems to be modelled as a pump although in the rest of the strategy it is an infiltration basin. Please provide clarity on why this is the case as the LLFA do not support surface water pumping.

Source Control

210. The two branches of surface water network upstream of SWMH23, to both SWMH 17 and SWMH49, have no source control.

211. Section 6.3.7 of the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD states that source control methods must be implemented across sites to provide effective pre-treatment of surface water. The applicant has not demonstrated that source control methods will be used here, nor have they provided evidence of why they would be inappropriate.

212. As outlined in Section 6 of the Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document the variety of source control techniques available means that virtually any development should be able to include a scheme based around these principles. The presence of low permeability soils, some forms of contamination and flat topography will not be accepted as reasons not to include source control.

Flow Control Diameters

213. For open features such as swales, ponds and basins, the minimum for flow control diameter is 75mm. For below ground features the minimum diameter is 20mm. The submitted calculations indicate there are 36 flow controls within the system. 31 of these have a diameter that is too small, with the majority being below 20mm even for swales.

Application as submitted (7 April 2021)

214. At present the LLFA objects to the grant of planning permission for the following reasons:

Additional information required on infiltration basin

215. The surface water strategy must demonstrate that the infiltration rate and storage volume required to attenuate surface water run-off from the critical 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) critical storm event, including an appropriate allowance for climate change, can be provided on site. At present, this information has not been provided.

216. The submitted Foul and Surface Water below ground drainage layout sheet 3 indicates the infiltration basin will have a depth of 2m. However, the Micro Drainage calculations show the infiltration basin to be 2.9m deep. The maximum depth of water in the basin should not exceed 2m in the most extreme design event. For open attenuation structures, 300mm of freeboard storage is required above the maximum depth for the design event (1% AEP (1 in 100 year) + 40% climate change). The present submission has not demonstrated that freeboard is available.

217. Please note, in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual, a safety factor of 5 should be used in the design of the infiltration basin.

218. The submitted drainage details sheet 3 (prepared by Ramboll, dated October 2020, reference CITP-RMB-ZZ-00-DR-C-5232) shows a trash screen is proposed on the inlet to the infiltration basin. It is unclear why a screen is necessary at this location as surface water arising from a below ground piped network should not contain debris.

“Variable” levels, side slopes and dimensions of swale and infiltration basin

219. The submitted drainage details sheets 1-3 (prepared by Ramboll, dated October 2020, reference CITP-RMB-ZZ-00-DR-C-5230 to 5232 respectively) indicate the dimensions of the swale, invert levels of the incoming pipes to the infiltration basin and side slopes of the basin, as “variable” which is not acceptable as the site wide earthworks and drainage are at the full application stage. The plans should be amended to confirm the levels, side slopes and all other dimensions of the SuDS features, including water levels for the 100% (1 in 1 year), 3.3% (1 in 30 year) and 1% (1 in 100 year) annual exceedance probabilities, along with the 1% + 40% climate change scenario. The dimensions of the SuDS features should be in accordance with the design recommendations in the CIRIA SuDS manual C753.

Not in accordance with Cambridge City Local Plan

220. The proposals are not in accordance with Policy 31 of the adopted Cambridge City Council Local Plan. Policy 31 requires: f) any flat roof is a green or brown roof, providing that it is acceptable in terms of its context in the historic environment of Cambridge (see Policy 61: Conservation and Enhancement of Cambridge's Historic Environment) and the structural capacity of the roof if it is a refurbishment. Green or brown roofs should be widely used in large-scale new communities; The present submission does not comply as all 5 proposed buildings appear to have a flat roof, but only one building (Building 3) is proposed to have an area of brown roof. There is no evidence as to why the other buildings could not also have brown/green roofs.

Surcharging on the 1:1 year

221. According to the Drainage System Modelling, surcharging will occur during a 1 in 1 year rainfall event. The drainage system should be designed under full pipe conditions to accept a 1-year design storm without surcharging above the pipe soffit on sites with average ground slopes of greater than 1%.

Clarity on proposed rain garden south of Building 1 and 2

222. There is no information about this proposed rain garden in the drainage strategy, other than its inclusion on the submitted Foul and Surface Water below ground Drainage layout Sheets 2 and 8 (prepared by Ramboll, dated October 2020, reference CITP-RMB-ZZ-00-DR-C-5203 and CITP-RMB-ZZ-00-DR-C-5209 respectively). Clarity is required on this proposal to ensure Chief Executive Gillian Beasley www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk it is sized appropriately to attenuate any required flows for the design event (1% AEP plus 40% climate change) and constructed in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753.

Environment Agency

Application as amended

223. The CEMP demonstrates consideration has been given to water quality risks from dewatering and surface run-off and indicates that they plan to manage dewatering on site without the need for a surface water discharge. As such, the Agency's previous concerns about these matters has been resolved and our recommended conditions 1 and 2 satisfied. Anglian Water written approval will be required in respect of proposed foul water drainage/trade effluent discharge.

224. Notwithstanding the above the Agency's original response, dated 19 April 2021, remains pertinent.

Application as submitted

225. Planning permission could be granted to the proposed development as submitted if the recommended planning conditions are included. The conditions cover:

Disposal of foul drainage
Treatment and removal of suspended solids

(Please refer to full response online for all recommended conditions.)

South Cambridgeshire Environmental Health (Health Impact Assessment)

Application as submitted

226. Policy SC/2 of the 2018 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan states that developments >5000m^2 are subject to a full Health Impact Assessment.

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

228. The report has comprehensively reviewed the potential health impacts both negative and positive on the local population. Vulnerable groups have been clearly identified and the potential effects and the distribution of those effects have been explored. Additional comments are included below.

Access to Social Infrastructure

229. There is potential to include the planting of fruit trees and wild flowers to improve the biodiversity, encourage access to healthy, seasonable food and encourage a pleasant social environment. Together this would help promote integration of employees across the site with visitors from the local area and PTP. To be covered at Reserved Matters.

230. Support the suggestion to create a pedestrian link (chapter 7.21) integrating the two sites. S106 monies should be sought to make this happen. This will help improve safe pedestrian access encouraging movement away from a busy road and has potential to link to East Pit LNR and Cherry Hinton SSSI. This would provide a safe, pleasant accessible route for employees to explore outside of work areas and improve the local pedestrian infrastructure for residents.

Access to Open Space

231. Support the idea of opening the landscaped areas to the wider neighbourhood (7.22). The use of social infrastructure could be part of ongoing local community engagement which supports the "people outcomes" of helping people to have a say in what happens.

232. The range of uses for landscaped areas could include a trim trail/green gym to encourage outdoor physical activity and could be available for use by all visitors to the site. This would enhance opportunities for local people to improve their health and provide opportunities for social interaction with nature and people from a diverse range of backgrounds.

233. This could be sought from S106 funding.

Access to Healthy Food

234. Whilst individuals can choose what and where they eat, humans are influenced by ease and accessibility. Therefore, opportunities should be sought to make the healthy option the easy option. A condition could be imposed on new occupiers to use suppliers of fresh, local, healthy food in food retail areas, thus also encouraging social value and supporting the local economy.

Air Quality, Noise and Neighbourhood Amenity

235. Satisfied that a CEMP will be conditioned to minimise the impact of construction close to residential properties.

236. Noise: Satisfied that the impacts identified would have a negligible impact on residents during construction due to the distances between the site and residential areas. Any movement of HGVs to the site would be of a temporary nuisance and that planning conditions will be covered in the Noise ES chapter to mitigate any negative impacts.

Accessibility to Active Travel

237. Satisfied with the proposed pedestrian and footpath infrastructure as listed in point 7.60. Opportunities to charge electric bikes and scooters should also be imposed as a condition to encourage the uptake of more active forms of travel together with incentives. S106 should be sought to subsidise electric bike/scooter hire for all new employees within a 5 mile radius upon employment to influence early adoption and positive behaviour change.

Crime Reduction

238. No additional comments

Social Cohesion

239. Whilst the People Outcomes identified in 7.83 is agreed, employees should be given opportunities to work with Site Management to shape the type of social and networking events that take place.

Minimising Use of Resources

240. No additional comments

Climate Change

241. S106 should be sought to ensure abundant mature tree planting. This will help negate the impacts of climate change, providing shade for people and buildings and providing protection from direct sun exposure, reducing overheating and excessive heating through windows.

242. The rest of the comments on the HIA are contained in the HIA Review checklist attached the comments (can be viewed online).

Summary

243. To help mitigate some of the negative impacts and create a work environment which promotes the health and wellbeing of employees and local residents the following additional measures are suggested:

- Planting of fruit trees and wildflowers to be agreed at RM
- S106 funding to create pedestrian link to the PTP site
- S106 funding to create Trim trail/green gym on site
- Health food licences to be conditioned
- EV charge points for scooters and bikes
- S106 funding for short term lease hire of electric bikes to encourage uptake of modal forms of transport
- S106 funding for abundant planting of mature trees for shading

Anglian Water

Application as amended

Assets Affected

244. There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. Anglian Water would ask that the following text be included within your Notice should permission be granted.

245. Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.

Wastewater Treatment

246. The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Cambridge Water Recycling Centre which currently does not have capacity to treat the flows the development site. Anglian Water are obligated to accept the foul flows from the development with the benefit of planning consent and would therefore take the necessary steps to ensure that there is sufficient treatment capacity should the Planning Authority grant planning permission.

Used Water Network

247. This response has been based on the following submitted documents: CITP-RMB-XX-XX-RP-C-0001 "Drainage Strategy and SuDS Report" dated 29th June 2021. Development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. Anglian Water will need to plan effectively for the proposed development, if permission is granted. We will need to work with the applicant to ensure any infrastructure improvements are delivered in line with the development. A condition requiring phasing plan and on-site drainage strategy plus informatives is requested.

Surface Water Disposal

248. The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option. Building Regulations (part H) on Drainage and Waste Disposal for England includes a surface water drainage hierarchy, with infiltration on site as the preferred disposal option, followed by discharge to watercourse and then connection to a sewer. The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system with connection to the sewer seen as the last option. The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is unacceptable. We would therefore recommend that the applicant consults with Anglian Water and the Environment Agency. We request a condition be applied to the decision notice if permission is granted. The purpose of the planning system is to achieve sustainable development. This includes the most sustainable approach to surface water disposal in accordance with the surface water hierarchy. It is important to explain that the volume arising from surface water flows can be many times greater than the foul flows from the same development. As a result

they have the potential to draw substantially on the public sewerage network capacity and capacity at the receiving Water Recycling Centre. If developers can avoid new surface water flows entering the public sewerage, the impact of developments on wastewater infrastructure and the risk and impact of sewer flooding can be managed effectively, in accordance with paragraph 163 of the NPPF, minimise the risk of flooding. It is appreciated that surface water disposal can be dealt with, in part, via Part H of the Building Regulations, it is felt that it is too late at this stage to manage any potential adverse effect. Drainage systems are an early activity in the construction process and it is in the interest of all that this is dealt with early on in the development process. As our powers under the Water Industry Act are limited it is important to ensure appropriate control over the surface water drainage approach is dealt with via a planning condition, ensuring that evidence is provided that the hierarchy has been followed and any adverse impacts and mitigation required can be planned for effectively. From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water. As such, we are unable to provide comments on the suitability of the surface water management. The applicant and the Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Internal Drainage Board if applicable. The Environment Agency should be also consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a Main River. Condition recommended.

Application as submitted

Assets Affected

249. There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. Anglian Water would ask that the following text be included within your Notice should permission be granted.

250. Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.

Wastewater Treatment

251. The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Cambridge Water Recycling Centre which currently does not have capacity to treat the flows the development site. Anglian Water are obligated to accept the foul flows from the development with the benefit of planning consent and would therefore take the necessary steps to ensure that there is sufficient treatment capacity should the Planning Authority grant planning permission.

Used Water Network

252. This response has been based on the following submitted documents: Cambridge International Technology Park Drainage Strategy and SuDS report dated 25th January 2021 Development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. Anglian Water will need to plan effectively for the proposed development, if permission is granted. We will need to work with the applicant to ensure any infrastructure improvements are

delivered in line with the development. A condition requiring phasing plan and on-site drainage strategy plus informatives is requested.

Surface Water Disposal

253. The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option. Building Regulations (part H) on Drainage and Waste Disposal for England includes a surface water drainage hierarchy, with infiltration on site as the preferred disposal option, followed by discharge to watercourse and then connection to a sewer. From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such, we are unable to provide comments in the suitability of the surface water management.

254. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board.

255. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse.

256. Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.

257. The applicant has indicated on their application form that their method of surface water drainage is via SuDS. If the developer wishes Anglian Water to be the adopting body for all or part of the proposed SuDS scheme the Design and Construction Guidance must be followed. We would recommend the applicant contact us at the earliest opportunity to discuss their SuDS design via a Pre-Planning Strategic Enquiry. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) are a statutory consultee for all major development and should be consulted as early as possible to ensure the proposed drainage system meets with minimum operational standards and is beneficial for all concerned organisations and individuals. We promote the use of SuDS as a sustainable and natural way of controlling surface water run-off.

258. No objection is raised subject to conditions covering the submission of a phasing plan and a scheme for on-site foul water drainage works.

Fire Authority

Application as submitted

259. With regard to the application, should the Planning Authority be minded to grant approval, the Fire Authority would ask that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants, which may be by way of Section 106 agreement or a planning condition. The position of fire hydrants are generally agreed upon when the Water Authority submits plans to the Water & Planning Manager Community Fire Safety Group Hinchingbrooke Cottage Brampton Road Huntingdon Cambs PE29 2NA.

260. Where a Section 106 agreement or a planning condition has been secured, the cost of Fire Hydrants will be recovered from the developer.

261. The number and location of Fire Hydrants will be determined following Risk Assessment and with reference to guidance contained within the “National Guidance

Document on the Provision of Water for Fire Fighting" 3rd Edition, published January 2007.

262. Access and facilities for the Fire Service should also be provided in accordance with the Building Regulations Approved Document B5 Vehicle Access. Dwellings Section 13 and/or Vol 2. Buildings other than dwellings Section 15 Vehicle Access.

263. If there are any buildings on the development that are over 11 metres in height (excluding blocks of flats) not fitted with fire mains, then aerial (high reach) appliance access is required, the details of which can be found in the attached document.

Cambridge International Airport

Application as submitted

264. The proposed development has been examined from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective with Cambridge Airport having No Objection to point a). Points b) and c) could conflict with safeguarding criteria unless any planning permission granted is subject to requiring a Bird Hazard management Plan to be submitted and the removal of PD rights for cranes and construction equipment.

Health and Safety Executive

Application as submitted

265. The HSE advised it had no comments to make on the application.

Greater Cambridge Shared Waste

Application as amended

266. The submitted Operational Waste Management Plan lacks detail and further information is required regarding who the onus is on to present containers for collection e.g. waste contractor or off-site / on-site facilities management staff. Diagrams should be provided into the wider context of development / neighbouring access and egress routes.

Access Officer / Disability Panel

Application as amended

267. The Disability Panel considered the detailed application for Building 3 and the MSCP and was satisfied the scheme was well thought out and included a variety of access features and made the following comments:

- In response to a query about the location of the blue badge spaces, it was confirmed that, although some are external, they are generally internal, and at a level entry as close as possible to the entrance.
- It was confirmed that there are drop sections both sides of the Reception desk, which incorporate a hearing loop and there are wireless app based systems as well.
- Bearing in mind that sometimes it can be difficult for wheelchairs to negotiate mats, the presenters reassured the Panel that the entrance mat is level, is made of solid

bars and has a thick, resilient carpet like finish to take water off pedestrians' feet, etc. It is also angled towards the Reception desk.

- It was agreed that it would be beneficial to have another look at the drawings and either put a Changing Places bench in the shower room, or put a shower in the Changing Places toilet.
- In response to a query about alarm calls made by anyone in the Changing Places or lifts, it was noted that the calls would be received at the Reception desk in the first instance, which is manned 24 hours a day, and by the maintenance company if necessary.
- The presenters commented that, because the building is 3 storeys' tall, no fire fighting lifts are required and each of the stairs have allocated refuge core points. It had been considered that evacuation chairs, which require maintenance (and staff training) would be not be needed. It is not known who the tenants will be, but it is expected that they will have an evacuation plan for staff, especially for the mobility impaired.

Cadent Gas

Application as amended

268. A holding response initially issued which was triggered by the presence of the gas main at the front of the site. This was followed by a response advising that there was no objection to the application subject to an informative being attached alerting the applicant to Cadent Gas as the gas infrastructure owner and operator in the area and requirements for development.

Design Enabling Panel

269. The application was considered by the Design Enabling Panel on 26th November 2020. The main points from the Panel's report are set out below however the Panel's full report is provided in Appendix 2.

270. General design principles - Initial designs of the public realm were presented, these will be worked up further for the application. Options for the buildings are also in early development. The Panel is pleased to hear that BREEAM excellent is being promoted and that engineers Atelier 10 are informing the environmental design using the London Energy Transformation Initiative (LETI) for guidance.

Planning and sequencing

271. The Panel noted that the proposed hybrid application Phase 1 assumes a single building with a disproportionate amount of car parking. This issue has been discussed within the closed session. This is not normally a subject for the DEP, but it seems that a number of decisions taken at the start of the phased programme are driving the outcome.

272. The decision to locate the large multi-storey car park on the highest steepest part of the site has led to the extensive cut and fill in the first stage. The location on the extreme western edge of the site means that the connection to the adjoining technology park (to the west of the site) can be delivered early though at a high cost. The isolated single building on the southern edge of the site might not present the best image for the emerging site.

Location of uses

273. The Panel wondered whether the two-level car parking structures on the east boundary were making the best use of the edge of the site. Of all the edge conditions, this would probably benefit from the best aspect looking to the north, east and south mainly over open countryside. Buildings behind the hedge boundary could provide better views out and might also present a better edge condition as the proposed buildings 4 and 5 would be visible above the proposed parking anyway. This might be a cleaner solution. Visual Impact studies have not been done yet and so the opportunity to test options should be taken now. The Visual Impact studies would help demonstrate how the site can be designed and landscaped to effectively mitigate impact on the wider Cambridge Green Belt.

Future flexibility

274. There are extensive car parking areas proposed and the Panel wondered whether, given the sustainable location, the quantum and design should be reconsidered. Options for converting the car park structures was discussed but the flexibility might be hampered by the proposed sloping floors of the car parking structures.

Public access and quality of public realm

275. The design at this stage gives a starting point for the discussion of the extent and quality of the public realm. This issue will connect to the questions above of sequencing and location of different uses. The heart of the campus, the space between Buildings 1, 2 and 3 as has been illustrated, is based on the current arrangement. Providing the quality of place sought requires further development. Changes in level, accessibility, ease of movement and conflicts between different users all need to be addressed.

Fulbourn Parish Council

Application as amended

276. Following a recent presentation by the agents, the PC acknowledges that revisions have been made to address many of the concerns raised by the PC and local parishioners but still has reservations that some of the major issues such as increased road traffic in the area and the drainage/flooding issues have not been sufficiently mitigated at this stage.

Application as submitted

277. Fulbourn Parish Council recommends refusal on the following grounds:

- Height of multi-storey car park
- Height of buildings
- Flooding/drainage
- Traffic and access Impact on the wider landscape
- Layout and density
- More information is required on the design and materials
- Compliance with local plan

Councillor Response

Application as submitted

278. Councillor John Williams objected to the application for the following reasons.

279. There is no attempt being made to comply with paragraph 2 of Policy E/3. The design of the buildings and decked car parking and the layout of the development fails to give appropriate profiling and setting against the Cambridge Green Belt and nor is there adequate landscaped buffeting to the south and east as required by policy E/3. By its mass it is not in keeping with the existing buildings on the Peterhouse Technology Park.

280. The proposed re-profiling of the Yarrow Road, Cambridge Road, Fulbourn Road roundabout removes the cycle lane on the south side and the changes that were made overall to reduce capacity to make it safer for cyclists and pedestrians in connection with the Fulbourn Road cycle route improvements. It also makes no provision for the existing bus stop on the south side of Fulbourn Road which serves the Beechwoods Estate. In this respect it fails to meet policy TI/2 in that it will deter sustainable travel by cycle and bus.

The Wildlife Trust

Application as amended

281. The applicant has revised the BNG assessment to take account of some of the previous comments made and to accord with other changes to the scheme. However, in two areas they have not done so and these are highlighted below.

282. Condition scores for some habitats remain incorrect. The incorrect condition scores include those for introduced shrub and urban rain garden, which should be changed to poor in line with Natural England guidance. This also reduces the predicted number of biodiversity units from 17.18 BU to 16.73 BU and the net gain is now 13.3% as opposed to the 16% claimed by the applicant.

283. However, as the application can now clearly demonstrate a greater than 10% biodiversity net gain, and also taking into account the proposed qualitative enhancements to biodiversity, the proposals accord with current adopted biodiversity policies and there would be no grounds for refusal on this issue.

Application as submitted

284. While the Wildlife Trust has no in principle objections to the proposed development, we object to the biodiversity net gain assessment included within the submitted biodiversity report. This contains a number of errors in application and has not followed Natural England guidance, which in turn has over-stated the potential for biodiversity net gain with this application. These are set out in detail below and included in the revised Biodiversity Metric spreadsheet attached:

1. The areas of the baseline and habitat creation do not add up correctly. Looking through the report, this is because the Urban Street Trees category was not put into cell C23 on the A2. Site Habitat Creation Sheet. This significantly reduces the predicted number of biodiversity units.
2. Natural England advises that the connectivity tool should not be used, so the connectivity value should be changed to low throughout.
3. The elevated strategic significance score for the new woodland (Cells L20 & L21) is a little hard to justify, but could be justified by the area being adjacent to the Gog Magog Hills priority area identified in the recently prepared Cambridge Nature Network.

However, the potential plans through the Greater Cambridge Call for Sites to develop a significant urban extension south of the site would undermine the claim of being ecologically well located. For now the elevated strategic significant score remains.
4. Condition scores for some habitats are incorrect. The incorrect condition scores include those for introduced shrub and urban rain garden, which is changed to poor in line with Natural England guidance. This also reduces the predicted number of biodiversity units.
5. Condition scores for other habitats have not been justified in the BNG report or landscaping plans. In particular the predicted good condition for reedbeds, and urban bioswale seem hard to justify in the highly urban context of the development. What evidence is supplied to justify good condition? If there isn't any, then a precautionary approach should be taken at this initial assessment stage. It is suggested moderate for the reedbed, urban bioswale. and urban ground based green wall. Whether the urban brown roof would achieve a good condition will depend on detailed design, so a good condition with evidence supplied of how this will be designed. At this stage a moderate condition be used.
6. All of the above changes result in a net loss of 0.67 Habitat BU or 4.59%. However, with a good condition brown roof, this could change to a net gain of 0.88 Habitat BU or 6.04% net gain. This falls short of the desired 10% and well short of the Natural Cambridgeshire doubling nature aspirations of securing 20% biodiversity net gain from new development.

285. However, comments within the BNG report are accepted, in section 5.2 on qualitative biodiversity change are justified, as the development is clearly a change from intensive arable cropland to an urban business park, with potential to design in habitats to support a range of species from flora to invertebrates and vertebrates and be nature friendly. The urban design and greening elements have certainly attempted to do this, though detailed landscaping proposals will be required to demonstrate this and to back up assumptions in the BNG assessment, such as the brown roof predicted to be of a good condition. However, the biodiversity report should not claim to achieve a significant biodiversity net gain (using the Defra Biodiversity Metric). Any biodiversity net gain through this scheme will be minor and should be presented as such. Whether this accords with planning policy will be for the council to determine, however, for the public record, the biodiversity report should be amended to include an accurate biodiversity net gain assessment, and remove the errors where Natural England guidance has not been followed.

The revised Biodiversity Metric provided by The Wildlife Trust can be viewed online (dated 25 May 2021).

Cambridge Past, Present & Future (CambridgePPF)

Application as amended

286. The revisions and additional documents have been considered; they do not make any material difference to the response made on 09/06/2021 (in particular, the impact of this scheme when viewed from the Gog Magog Hills/Green Belt). Therefore, the objection to this application is maintained.

Application as submitted

287. CambridgePPF understands that this site is an allocation in the Local Plan and therefore we do not object to the principle of development in this location however we do object to this application because it does not comply with the following 2018 Local Plan Policies:

- Policy NH/2: Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
- Policy HQ/1: Design Principles
- Policy NH/8: Mitigating the Impact of Development in and Adjoining the Green Belt
- Policy E/3: "Development proposals will need to demonstrate how the site can be designed and landscaped to effectively mitigate impact on the wider Cambridge Green Belt. This will include excavation to achieve appropriate profile and setting against the Cambridge Green Belt and agricultural land, and the creation of landscaped buffers on the southern and eastern sides."

288. The ground level on which the buildings fronting the main road would sit, Buildings 1, 2 and 3, is 2.3m above the level of Fulbourn Road. This significantly elevates the 3-storey buildings (around 14m high), already one storey taller than the existing buildings on the adjacent Peterhouse Technology Park. This does not satisfy the clear aim of Policy E/3 to reduce the impact of the new buildings on the wider, surrounding Green Belt.

289. The landscape mitigation proposals are clearly insufficient to prevent an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt, particularly in respect of the southern and eastern boundaries. The applicant's photomontage landscape views (clarified as an 'unverified' artist's impression) show a tall, hard edge to the Green Belt when approaching along Cambridge Road from Fulbourn, with the new buildings 1, 2 and 4 visible either through or above both the existing and proposed landscape features, depending on the location of the viewpoint. The landscape strip around the edge of the site on the east and south boundaries is quite narrow which limits the size of trees that could be planted to achieve a degree of screening. It also has to be understood that such trees would likely take 30-40 years to grow to a height where they would provide such screening, meaning that there would be decades of adverse harm.

290. The impact of the existing Peterhouse Technology Park from the Fulbourn Road is mitigated by the tree belt being raised on a landscape embankment, bringing the tree tops above the building height (also the buildings are not much above the level of the main road, rather than the 2.3m raised level for the proposed new buildings). It is difficult to see why this device has not been carried through into the International Technology Park proposals, as it would soften the impact and help maintain a rural feel along the Fulbourn Road as it merges into the Green Belt.

291. We do not consider that due consideration has been given to the impact of the development when viewed from the high ground of Shelford Road, Fulbourn. The original existing Peterhouse Technology Park buildings with their metal roofs and services protuberances are clearly visible and impossible to screen. This new Technology Park, 3-storeys high, has flat roofs which, if light coloured to reflect the sun, may well stand out, exacerbating the hard edge of urban development. No amount of tree screening will lessen the impact. A very small area of 'brown roof' is indicated for Building 3, but at such a small size will be inconsequential. In addition, there appears to be banks of solar panels on the roof of Building 3 and the multi-storey car park. This will have a negative landscape impact when viewed from the higher ground, due to reflection off the glass surfaces. We support renewable energy infrastructure, but would ask that, in this instance, more care is taken in their siting – for example could they be used on the surface car park instead? We would also ask for confirmation that no plant/air conditioning equipment will be mounted on the roofs that would further harm the landscape and views.

292. CambridgePPF support with the comments of the Council's Landscape Officer:

"At present I have major concerns that the proposed landscape mitigation works both in the outline and detailed applications are insufficient and unacceptable. Further information is required to address my concerns and drawings to be revisited due to conflict of information. Until my concerns have been addressed the proposed development does not respect, retain or enhance the local landscape character and would have an adverse effect upon the landscape and local views. The proposal would be contrary to Policy NH/2: Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character & Policy HQ/1: Design Principles."

"Any development proposals within and adjoining the Green Belt must be located and designed so that they do not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt. Again, I have major concerns that the proposed landscape mitigation works both within the outline and detailed applications are insufficient and unacceptable. Until my concerns have been addressed the development would have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt particularly upon the eastern and southern boundaries. The proposal would be contrary to Policy NH/8: Mitigating the Impact of Development in and Adjoining the Green Belt."

293. Instead of the scheme submitted, CambridgePPF would welcome a 2-storey scheme, like the adjoining buildings at Peterhouse Technology Park, especially if the design was less urban and better use was made of design and materials to integrate the building into the surrounding rural area, particularly along the eastern and southern boundaries. It is clear from the design and access statement that the focus has been to design a building that reflects Technology R&D and the other buildings in the vicinity, rather than one that reflects its setting in the landscape, this is unfortunate.

294. CambridgePPF would like to see this application withdrawn and the applicant come back with a scheme which better respects its setting in the landscape, at the foot of the Gog Magog Hills.

295. Finally, it is clear that the applicant has been engaged in pre-app discussions with the Council, but CambridgePPF could not see any evidence that they have carried out any meaningful engagement with the local community and other stakeholders, which might have helped to inform the development of their plans (apologies if they have and it is hidden away in the documents somewhere). If that is correct, then this is not good practice and gives the impression that the developer (and the Council) is not concerned about the impact of this scheme on the wider community. CambridgePPF note the following from the NPPF para 40:

..[local planning authorities] should also, where they think this would be beneficial, encourage any applicants who are not already required to do so by law to engage with the local community and, where relevant, with statutory and non-statutory consultees, before submitting their applications.

Fulbourn Forum

<u>Application as amended</u>

296. Further to our earlier letter of response to the above planning application, dated 1 June 2021, the amended drawings and documents now submitted have not mitigated many of our concerns. This includes the height of buildings, flooding and drainage issues, traffic access, the wider Green Belt landscape, design and materials, ecology issues, and the lack of full compliance with Local Plan Policy E/3.

297. Buildings 1, 2, and 4, fronting Fulbourn Road, are still raised 2.3m or more above the level of the main road, significantly elevating the 3-storey buildings, already one storey higher than the existing buildings on the adjacent Peterhouse Technology Park. The amended submission now proposes to set back the top floor of the above buildings by 10.5m (on the north side only) which only partly reduces their visual impact. The 'Short Section' through Building 2, shown on page 94 of the Design and Access Statement, illustrates the change in perception of the buildings by a person standing on the north side of Fulbourn Road (approx. 30m away), but the reduced view of the top floor is shown to be reliant on 2m high planting (of indeterminate nature) growing along the roof edge of the first floor. The long-term effectiveness and maintenance of this device is questionable and results in a rather strange appearance to the roof edge. No allowance appears to have been made to the parapet detail to accommodate the root structure of the planting, which, when properly detailed, may well result in an increase in the height of the building. Also, it should be noted that the view of the top floor will be more noticeable from locations in excess of 30m, and particularly from other viewpoints such as the approach from Fulbourn.

298. Subsequently, the amended design still does not satisfy the aim of Local Plan Policy E/3 to reduce the impact of new buildings on the wider, surrounding Green Belt.

299. The amended drawings show no change to the landscape mitigation proposals on the eastern and southern boundaries, so our concerns, expressed in our letter of 1 June, that they are insufficient to prevent an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt, remain. Our concerns over the urban use of design and materials, outlined in our 1 June response, also remain.

300. The attenuation basin located in the north east corner of the site appears to have been changed to an infiltration basin - although it is still referred to as an attenuation basin in para. 7.48 of the Design and Access Statement. We note that the LLFA currently objects to the surface water/flood prevention scheme on a number of grounds, including the lack of evidence to determine the peak seasonal groundwater levels. We would point out that the 15 June 2021 response of the LLFA refers to the applicant's surface water pro-forma indicating (without evidence) that there is 5m clearance to groundwater, while on page 21 of the Design and Access Statement it says that the water table is at "10m or deeper", which seems highly unlikely for this location. Two other recent major planning applications in Fulbourn have resulted in considerable concerns relating to surface water and flooding, and it is essential that this development includes a scheme that is fit for purpose, taking full account of the increase in severe weather events as a result of worsening climate change.

301. Trial pits to establish peak seasonal groundwater levels must take account of the variability over a period of time. For example, after the wet winter of 2020/2021, the water table in Fulbourn has already significantly reduced. The potential for flooding from the infiltration basin across the road to the existing homes on the other side must be given top priority to ensure that this can be prevented in all worst-case scenarios. Recent flash floods world-wide, including locally and elsewhere in the UK, must be of great concern.

302. Our concerns about traffic generation and its effect on Fulbourn were outlined in our letter of 1 June 2021 – please refer back to this for our full comments. No proposals are brought forward in the amended documents to prevent Fulbourn Parish from experiencing a significant increase in through traffic (the applicant quotes figures of between 10% and 30%), and/or its use as a parking space with employees transferring to cycles or scheduled buses. The County Council already assesses the surrounding road network (to the development) as being 'highly congested', and the junctions as being 'at capacity'.

303. The Environmental Statement Addendum: Non-Technical Summary predicts that the development will generate “some” 875 vehicle trips during the morning peak hour, and “some” 955 vehicle trips during the evening peak hour. This should be viewed in the light of the proposed 1,349 car parking spaces, and the possible total number of employees being between 4,500 and 6,750 (based upon the ‘rule-of-thumb’ of 8-12 sqm of gross internal floor area per employee). We contend that the predicted vehicle trips are under-estimated with a potentially serious impact on Fulbourn’s road system and ability to absorb non-resident parking. It is also noted that should the planned 1,796 cycle spaces not prove adequate, there is no provision for an increase in spaces.

304. As some out-of-town science parks and research centres already do, we suggest that the applicant brings forward proposals to provide their own transport to the new Technology Park from a location away from Fulbourn, and place restrictions on employees who may consider parking in Fulbourn, not only in the central area, but also along the future cycle Greenway which will be within walking distance of the development. It should be noted that there is no public transport coming from the east of Fulbourn that serves the proposed development.

305. Lastly, we would draw your attention to the need to provide nest boxes for the large contingent of swifts that are an important feature of the Fulbourn area. The present design of the buildings 3 seems incompatible with this necessary provision, as required for all new developments. We suggest that the applicant contacts the Action for Swifts organisation (actionforswifts@gmail.com) where they can advise on the best way to incorporate suitable nest boxes or bricks into the facades. Practical advice can also be found on their website www.actionforswifts.blogspot.com

<u>Application as submitted</u>

306. Although the date for responses to the above hybrid planning application (part Outline/part Full), has passed, we trust that you will be able to take account of our comments as they affect the village and parish of Fulbourn. The Parish Council has already raised objections in respect of a number of issues including height of multi-storey parking, height of buildings, flooding and drainage issues, traffic access, the wider landscape (Green Belt), layout and density, design and materials, and lack of compliance with Local Plan Policy E/3. We would like to expand on some of these concerns.

307. The 2018 Local Plan Policy E/3 states that “Development proposals will need to demonstrate how the site can be designed and landscaped to effectively (my highlighting) mitigate impact on the wider Cambridge Green Belt. This will include excavation to achieve appropriate profile and setting against the Cambridge Green Belt and agricultural land, and the creation of landscaped buffers on the southern and eastern sides.” The first thing to note is that the ground level on which the buildings fronting the main road sit, Buildings 1, 2 and 3, is 2.3m above the level of Fulbourn Road. This significantly elevates the 3-storey buildings (around 14m high), already one storey taller than the existing buildings on the adjacent Peterhouse Technology Park. This does not satisfy the clear aim of Policy E/3 to reduce the impact of the new buildings on the wider, surrounding Green Belt.

308. The landscape mitigation proposals are clearly insufficient to prevent an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt, particularly in respect of the southern and eastern boundaries. The applicant’s own photomontage landscape views (clarified as an ‘unverified’ artist’s impression) show a tall, hard edge to the Green Belt when approaching along Cambridge Road from Fulbourn, with the new buildings 1, 2 and 4 visible either through or above both the existing and proposed landscape features,

depending on the location of the viewpoint. The landscape strip around the edge of the site on the east and south boundaries is quite narrow which limits the size of trees that could be planted to achieve a degree of screening, and greatly reduces the potential for significant biodiversity gain to emerge and a healthy ecosystem to become established, which would provide an effective transition to the agricultural Green Belt. A 2-storey scheme like the adjoining Peterhouse Technology Park would be a big step forward, and a less urban use of design and materials, perhaps using some contemporary brickwork detailing, particularly along the eastern and southern boundaries, would integrate better into a rural setting. The proposed buildings look uncomfortable with their blockish, uninspiring, rather joyless, regimented aesthetic, perhaps better suited to an out-of-town commercial/industrial area.

309. The impact of the existing Peterhouse Technology Park from the Fulbourn Road is mitigated by the tree belt being raised on a landscape embankment, bringing the tree tops above the building height (also the buildings are not much above the level of the main road, rather than the 2.3m raised level for the proposed new buildings). It is difficult to see why this device has not been carried through into the International Technology Park proposals, as it would soften the impact and help maintain a rural feel along the Fulbourn Road as it merges into the Green Belt.

310. We cannot see that any consideration has been given to the impact of the development when viewed from the high ground of Shelford Road, Fulbourn. The original existing Peterhouse Technology Park buildings with their metal roofs and services protuberances are clearly visible and impossible to screen. This new Technology Park, 3-storeys high, has flat roofs which, if light coloured to reflect the sun, may well stand out, exacerbating the hard edge of urban development. No amount of tree screening will lessen the impact. A very small area of 'brown roof' is indicated for Building 3, but at such a small size will be inconsequential. In addition, there appears to be banks of solar panels on the roof of Building 3 and the multi-storey car park. Again, this may well impact on the Green Belt when viewed from the higher ground, due to reflection off the glass surfaces. We support renewable energy infrastructure, but would ask that, in this instance, care is taken in their siting, but that if their impact cannot be adequately contained, then alternative renewable energy systems are considered, or perhaps an off-site installation undertaken, suitably located. We would also ask for confirmation that no air conditioning equipment will be mounted on the roofs, and no safety rails or harness connectors mounted around the edge, visible from the street.

311. Another point of concern is that of traffic generation, particularly as it affects Fulbourn. The County Council has asserted that the on-site car parking provision should be reduced and more encouragement given to alternative modes of travel, such as cycle, foot, and public transport. This is partly because the surrounding road network is "highly congested" and existing junctions in the vicinity are "at capacity". In Fulbourn, we are already very aware of such problems in our village, particularly during the morning and afternoon/evening rush hour periods. The inevitable increase in traffic through Fulbourn has been given no consideration by the applicant. This traffic will particularly impact on the Balsham Road/Dogget Lane/Cambridge Road route (traffic from the A11 and beyond) and, from Wilbraham and beyond, the traffic will seek alternative routes through the village such as Station Road, Church Lane, the High Street, School Lane, Pierce Lane, Cow Lane, Haggis Gap, and Hinton Road. None of these roads are suitable for an increase in traffic movements (many are in the Conservation Area), and all are through residential areas and routes to the village primary school.

312. Virtually all of this increase in traffic will come from well in excess of 7 miles, along fast, busy roads which are not suitable for cycle use. Subsequently, any reduction in car parking on the development site will benefit Cambridge, but not Fulbourn. There is no

public transport coming from the east of Fulbourn which serves the proposed development. There is, however, the danger that Fulbourn might be used as a daily parking spot with travellers then transferring to either a local bus, or their own cycle. This has already been seen in a few locations, particularly before the pandemic resulted in more people temporarily working from home. We would ask that the applicant's Travel Plan addresses these concerns, perhaps by providing their own transport from a location away from Fulbourn, and placing restrictions on employees who may consider parking in Fulbourn, not only in the central area, but also along the future cycle Greenway behind Capital Park which will be within walking distance of the new Technology Park.

Representations from members of the public

Application as amended

313. The owners/occupiers of the following address have made representations:

10 Coltsfoot Close
11 Coltsfoot Close
15 Coltsfoot Close
21 Coltsfoot Close

314. The representations set out below are a summary of the comments that have been received.

Transport/highways

- The Travel Plan still refers to the Cambridge Science Park which is not representative of this site.
- Accident records do not include fatality of July 2020.
- Traffic flows through Fulbourn to the site from the A11 have not been adequately addressed.
- There will now be no improvements to remove the 'line of sight' impacts at the Yarrow Road/Fulbourn Road/Cambridge Road roundabout. A serious omission to address road safety.
- It is unclear is buses will be re-routed through the site, if they do it disadvantages residents in neighbouring roads.
- The increased volume of traffic generated will put extra pressure on surrounding roads, especially with new housing developments coming forward.
- Moving the bus stop on Fulbourn road will result in elderly residents walking further to access public transport.
- A new traffic survey should be carried out in September.

Design/layout

- Buildings are still 3 storeys high, even with the set back, and are overbearing.
- The set back of the frontage buildings has not addressed the overall height issues.
- Open views towards Gog Magog will be restricted.
- Planting is higher and used to 'hide' the buildings but will reduce light and cast a cold shadow over the road.
- Houses on Coltsfoot Close are closer to the development than the houses on Fulbourn Road are to the PTP which the developer compares and the buildings on PTP are 2 storeys.
- Visual impact of PTP is reduced due to the hill behind, the same will not be the case here.

Impact on neighbours

- The proposal address parking during construction phase but not for when the buildings are occupied, too few spaces for the likely demand, this will push parking onto neighbouring residential streets.

Environmental impacts

- Issues regarding flooding once the development is complete have not been addressed.
- Air pollution will be caused by cars and lorries waiting to go around the roundabout.
- The data storage building will consume huge amounts of electricity, generate white noise and vibrations impacting on the environment, including impact on local bat population.
- Loss if sunlight to residential properties.

Consultation, communication, access to site

- The Good Neighbour Plan is standard practice in the industry.
- The developer has not consulted residents fully, a public meeting would now be possible

Application as submitted

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

10 Coltsfoot Close
11 Coltsfoot Close
15 Coltsfoot Close
17 Coltsfoot Close
21 Coltsfoot Close
47 Lucerne Close
4 Teasel Way
8 Harebell Close
41 Harebell Close
6 Comfrey Court

316. The representations set out below are a summary of the comments that have been received.

Transport/highways

- The suggested improvements to the Cambridge Road/Fulbourn Road/Yarrow Road roundabout, are welcome improvements over the earlier information, although still insufficient
- Request new crossing with lights on Fulbourn Road to allow pedestrians to access bus stop.
- The suggested accident data is missing many unreported events (no personal injury). There were only few injuries as they happened during low traffic flows (less likely to be the case after this development). Fulbourn Road and the roundabout with Yarrow Road are an existing accident zone, due to the long straight sightline, especially at night, towards Fulbourn/to Cambridge. There has been one recent fatality (on 31 July 2020)

- Take this opportunity to allow public access and connect a public right of way from Fulbourn Road to connect with the Roman Road PROW at Shelford Road.
- Realigning the roundabout and access roads south of the existing line would allow the line of sight to be removed (by sympathetic planting) and improve road safety (see example illustration).
- Improvement to traffic flows and impacts on other residents in Fulbourn and Teversham do not seem to have been considered, which is surely vital to resolve prior to any approval being granted. Morning traffic through Fulbourn, from A11, causes many delays already for local residents. In addition, exiting onto Yarrow Road from Teasel Way is also very difficult already – this needs to be addressed for residents.
- Traffic surveys don't mention Teasel Way/Yarrow Road junction.
- Congestion is already bad, Yarrow Road roundabout is backed up considerably at peak times. This development will worsen it causing an inconvenience to those that live here.
- The travel plans include comparison with the Cambridge Science Park. This is a very different location, with proximity to the guided busway and new Cambridge North station.
- Parking provision is inadequate. With car parking on site reduced to 1 space for 40sqm it is likely people will park on surrounding residential streets.
- Employees will still drive to work.
- Likely to result in additional traffic through Fulbourn Village due to the site's close proximity of A11/M11.
- There are already a number of developments proposed or being constructed on the Fulbourn Hospital site which will have an impact on Fulbourn Road/Cambridge Road/Yarrow Road.
- Why has access from the existing PTP site not been considered?

Visual and landscape impacts

- Loss of 'outside the city' aesthetic, loss of open farmland and long distance views.
- The plans are vague about phase 2 of the development, which is the one that will have greatest impact on the local neighbourhood. The outlines indicate a three storey building along the northern end of the site. This does NOT match the existing buildings, which are two storey only and are also further from residential property.
- Buildings should be lower in the landscape, no more than two storeys.
- Landscape buffer is welcomed.
- How high will the new trees be?
- A wide angle lens has been used to show the view from Yarrow Road, this exaggerates the gap that would be between the two buildings.

Need

- Reduced need for offices now, due to Covid-19, needs analysis is required based on current and future working patterns.

Sustainability, wildlife

- The land is important for food production and is an excellent example of diverse cropping, essential for wildlife species.
- Impact on fauna and flora the site is an important habitat for deer, skylarks, bee orchids, swifts, bats.
- Impact on the chalk aquifer basin and chalk rivers and streams which are already in a poor state.

- 'Building with nature' standards, which aim for a net gain for wildlife should be used. These standards require a net gain in biodiversity of local specialised species, rather than biodiversity per se.
- Impact on nearby SSSI sites – Cherry Hinton Pits.
- Concern the detention pond will not be large enough or very effective.
- Large glazed buildings are an issue for birds which can't see the glazing.

Pollution, residential amenity

- Impact of light pollution from he buildings
- The neighbouring ARM/Peterhouse site already creates noise and is illuminated all night.
- It is suggested as currently planned that on the winter solstice sun will only reach upstairs floors of local properties
- It is very important, and the developers should be encouraged to provide guarantees to residents to avoid flooding to their properties.
- Noise from vehicles on Fulbourn Road, in particular from tyres on road surface is an issue, this will increase. The road could be re-surfaced or noise barriers be erected.
- Potential noise and vibration from Data Storage building.
- Concern the new buildings will create a tunnel effect, which together with increased traffic, will raise noise levels considerably.
- Impact on privacy due to height of the buildings.
- Loss of sunlight from residential gardens in winter months.

Construction impacts

- Dust and noise are likely to be High impacts based on experience from farming operations (which are of short duration), particularly on residents of Coltsfoot Close that back onto the site and Yarrow Road.
- Construction hours being limited to 07:30-18:00 Mon-Fri with reduced hours on Saturday and none on Sunday will still cause considerable local disruption, noise, dust and traffic for local residents but are welcome.
- Traffic management (page 11) looks inadequate and will result in local roads being used for parking. Recent construction on the ARM/Peterhouse site resulted in many construction and fitting workers vehicles parked on local residential roads. The plans need to include more on-site parking (who will park 15 minutes away if you can use a residential road that is closer?). Enforcement is required to ensure this is does not happen during construction and on completion.
- Improvements to enable access from Teasel Way onto Yarrow Road (point 10 above) need to be in place prior to the commencement of construction to minimise impacts and consideration of how dust from lorries hauling to/from the site will be reduced/eliminated will be particularly important for residents who back onto Yarrow Road.
- Noise and mud on the road from heavy lorries removing tons of soil from the site.

Consultation, communication, access to site

- Poor communication to date with local residents.
- As is so often the case communication will be vital. There were no obvious plans on how the project proposes to communicate with impacted residents. The developer's earlier communication approach did not bode well, and it does not seem this has been addressed. Residents deserve that this is addressed as part of any approval process. This should include a need to agree logistical plans with residents, as well as parish and local council, and to outline how channels of communication will be

maintained prior to and during any construction and then for subsequent management.
- Proposals include areas of open space for the enjoyment of employees and the public. The site won't be gated but PTP is not gated yet access is controlled by security.

The site and its surroundings

317. The site lies within the administrative boundary of South Cambridge District Council ('SCDC'). The western boundary of the Site forms the boundary with Cambridge City Council ('CCC') and the Peterhouse Technology Park ('PTP'). The site is approximately 4.5 kilometres (km) to the south-east of Cambridge city centre and directly south of Cherry Hinton. The site is rectangular in shape covering an area of approximately 7.03 hectares (ha) currently in use as arable fields. The Site is bound to the north by Fulbourn Road/Cambridge Road, with amenity green space and residential development beyond. Open agricultural lies to the east and south which forms part of the Cambridge Green Belt.

318. Levels on the site vary considerably with the highest point of the site (31 AOD) in the south western corner, falling to 21 AOB adjacent to Fulbourn Road.

319. There are no existing vehicular accesses to the site. Fulbourn Road to the north of the site provides vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access to the surrounding area and beyond. Two bus stops are located nearby the proposed site entrance on Fulbourn Road serviced by the Citi 3 which runs between Fulbourn and Fen Ditton, via Cambridge City Centre.

320. The Site is not subject to environmental designations and is located within Flood Zone 1, as indicated by the Flood Map for Planning. The application therefore has a low probability of flooding.

321. A gas main easement runs along the front of the site adjacent to Fulbourn Road which requires a 10 metre exclusion zone.

322. The Site is not located within a Conservation Area, nor are there any listed buildings within close proximity. The Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area lies approximately 40 metres to the north east of the Site.

323. The adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) Policy E/3 releases the site from the Green Belt and allocates it for employment use (offices and research and development). The adjacent PTP comprises a mix of commercial high-tech and research and development business premises.

The proposal

324. The application is a hybrid application for a total of 56,473sqm of commercial floorspace for Use Classes E(g) i (offices), ii (research and development), ii (light industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution – limited to data centres) uses. The hybrid application comprises three applications as follows:

a) an Outline Application with all matters reserved (except for access) for the development of up to 44,671 sqm of floorspace, with associated access, structural landscaping, car and cycle parking and associated infrastructure works;

b) a Full Application for the first Phase comprising the main access, one commercial building, a multi- decked car and cycle park and associated landscaping and infrastructure works; and

c) a Full Application for the details of initial enabling works comprising site wide earth works and drainage.

325. Each element of the application is discussed in more detail below together with the relevant application documents.

Environmental Statement

326. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (EIA) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011, the applicant submitted a request for a Screening Opinion from the local planning authority at the pre-application stage. A formal Scoping Opinion was issued on 8 January 2001 which concluded that the Scoping Request satisfied the relevant requirements of the 2017 Regulations and provided a sound basis upon which to consider the potential environmental impact of the development. In addition to the environmental topics proposed to be assessed, Cultural Heritage and Lighting were also requested to be assessed in the ES. The ES submitted was prepared in accordance with the Scoping Request and Scoping Opinion.

327. The ES includes three volumes as follows:

- Volume 1: Main Report and Main Addendum Report
- Volume 2: Technical Appendices including additional or updated appendices; and
- Volume 3: Non-Technical Summary Addendum

328. The ES Appendices include the following documents:

- Scoping Request (Appendix 2.1)
- Scoping Opinion (Appendix 2.2)
- Ecological Impact Assessment (Appendix 2.3)
- Aboricultural Impact Assessment, including Tree Protection Plan (Appendix 2.4A)
- Open Space Strategy and Access Plan (Appendix 4.1A)
- Enabling Works and Phasing (Appendix 4.2)
- Sustainability Assessment (Appendix 4.3)
- Energy Statement (Appendix 4.4)
- Operational Waste Management Plan (Appendix 4.5A)
- Construction Environment Management Plan (Appendix 4.6A)
- Traffic Management Plan (Appendix 4.7A)
- Planning Policy Context (Appendix 6.1)
- Detailed Assessment and Monitoring Approach (Appendix 6.2)
- Existing Habitat Results (Appendix 6.3)
- Low Emission Strategy (Appendix 6.4)
- Archaeological Desk Base Assessment (Appendix 7.1)

- Heritage Statement (Appendix 8.1)
- Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 9.1)
- Drainage Strategy (Appendix 9.2A)
- Ground Contamination Report (Appendix 10.1)
- LVIA – Figures 1-7 (Appendix 11.1)
- Figure 8 Photo sheet (Appendix 11.2)
- Published Landscape Character Assessments Extracts (Appendix 11.3)
- Extracts from Policy Documents (Appendix 11.4)
- Landscape and Visual Effects Tables (Appendix 11.5)
- Consultation (Appendix 11.6)
- Lighting Pollution Statement (Appendix 12.1)
- Noise and Vibration Technical Appendices (Appendix 13.1)
- Health Impact Assessment (Appendix 14.1)
- Transport Assessment including Travel Plan (Appendix 15.1A)
- Cumulative Projects to be Considered (Appendix 16.1)

Outline application

329. The first element of the hybrid application is an outline application which seeks to establish the principle and design parameters for the development of up to 44,671 sqm of commercial development on the site. A suite of four parameter plans and a landscape open space strategy plan have been submitted with the application to establish the proposed land uses, building heights, access and movement and open space and landscaping. The DAS includes illustrative material which demonstrates how the proposals could be delivered within the proposed parameters.

330. The site will be accessed by a new fourth spur off the Yarrow Road roundabout, providing vehicular, cycling and pedestrian access into the site. This establishes a north to south route through the site splitting the development east and west. A road also runs east to west through site which aligns with and could provide a possible future connection to the adjacent PTP, however this is not part of the current application.

331. Buildings 1 and 2 are located to the front of the site on the western side and have the potential to form a physically linked single building. Buildings 4 and 5 and a single decked car park are located on the eastern part of the site.

332. Building 3 and the Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP) are located in the south western part of the site and are applied for in full as part of this hybrid application.

333. The buildings, with the exception of the single decked car park, would have a maximum height of 13.5m, which accommodates three storeys. The single decked car park would have a maximum height of 4.5m.

334. The spaces between the buildings would be used for access and movement as well as to create external spaces of activity, providing a connection between buildings and throughout the site.

335. The developable area is surrounded by a landscape border, which accommodates a minimum 9.8m landscape buffer to the east increasing to 18.2m. Along the southern boundary the buffer is between 9m and 13.3 m. To the west, there is an established

buffer on PTP and this will be extended on this site with a minimum buffer of 9m. To the north (front) of the site a 25m landscape buffer is proposed. The landscaping is to screen the site from the agricultural land to the south and east, while also allowing the site to organically merge into the surrounding area. An infiltration basin and a balancing point are proposed in the north eastern corner of the site and is a multifunctional area of approximately 1,861sqm. In addition to performing the required drainage functions, the area sets the built form back from the site's boundary and will comprise a landscaped area of water, shrubs, bushes, grasses and trees to enhance biodiversity and providing green space for staff on the site and members of the public to access.

336. The proposed MSCP would provide car parking for the occupants of buildings 1,2 and 3. The eastern decked car park would provide parking to serve buildings 4 and 5 if deemed necessary. Designated cycle routes and enclosed bike storage is incorporated across the park, allowing for employees to cycle to work – making cycling and walking a convenient choice. The scheme will provide 1,811 sheltered cycle parking spaces (based on the 1:30 GIA) in total.

Full application – Phase 1 (Building 3 and Multi Storey Car Park)

337. The second element of the hybrid application is a full application for the first phase of development comprising Building 3 and the MSCP in the south western part of the site. The full application also includes the delivery of the access into the site from the Yarrow Road roundabout and the hard and soft landscaping surrounding Building 3, the MSCP and adjacent to the site access.

338. Building 3 is a three storey office building with a Gross External Area of 11,802sqm which has been designed to achieve a BREEAM Excellent rating. Located at the building's centre is a central core, consisting of all regular and accessible WCs, as well as showers, lifts, cleaning stores, and central services. The building's western elevation features the entrance to the building, fronting the adjacent MSCP, and incorporates a triple height atrium and canopy. The northern and eastern elevations feature an array of vertical fins which offer a complexity of displacement and shadow to the façade. The southern elevation includes the use of a 500mm brise soleil solar shading, a feature of the building's solar performance. The building's roof features photovoltaic arrays and a brown roof.

339. To the rear of Building 3 a single storey building is proposed comprising a refuse and recycling store and substation. The external materials comprise a timber screen to the enclosure with a brown roof.

340. The MSCP is adjacent to Building 3 and is comparable in height and will comprise a total of 931 car parking spaces, including disabled bays and EV Charging. The cycle parking for Building 3 is also included in the MSCP. Initially, the MSCP will provide a total of 275 car parking spaces to serve Building 3, with the remaining spaces to be available once buildings 1 and 2 are occupied.

341. An area of public realm is proposed between Building 3 and the MSCP, known as the public plaza. The plaza space is primarily pedestrianised and aims to engage workers moving to and from office buildings and the MSCP. The space comprises hard and soft landscaped areas, including planting and furniture and provides views to the Green Belt to the south.

342. This first phase of development includes the delivery of landscaping around Building 3, the MSCP and the access road. Importantly it will also deliver the first section of the southern buffer zone, which comprises a zone extending to 11.8m wide that includes a mix of hedge and tree planting and a 3m wide access and maintenance pathway, to function as an amenity area and to screen the buildings from the Green Belt.

Full application – Site Wide Enabling Works

343. The third element of the hybrid application is a full application for site wide enabling works. This comprises the proposed ground works and site-wide drainage to deliver development-ready parcels. It includes site wide excavation and land profiling to deliver the ground levels for all buildings and internal roads. In addition, buffer planting will also be delivered to provide an effective landscaping screen for this first phase of works.

344. The excavation works are required to cut the building platforms into the hill in order to keep the built form low relative to the local context. The majority of soil will be retained on site to limit the amount of off-site transportation, thereby reducing HGV journeys and transport related emissions and limiting landfill wastage.

345. The foul drainage system to serve Building 3 and the MSCP will also be delivered as part of the enabling works and the foul drainage to Buildings 4 and 5 (in the outline application) which go under the new access road, would also be provided. This includes the attenuation tanks and foul drainage connection to the main sewer. Full details of which are set out in the submitted Drainage Strategy.

346. The drainage system, including the infiltration basin and balancing pond, to serve Building 3 and the MSCP will also be delivered as part of the enabling works in accordance with the submitted Drainage Strategy.

Submitted documents

Revised and additional information

347. The application was the subject of a revised submission in July 2021 with the submission of a suite of documents comprising amendments to the scheme and additional information. This submission followed, and sought to address, responses received from consultees and neighbours during initial consultation period. The main amendments to the scheme comprise:

348. For all phases:

- An ES Addendum to provide an update to the originally submitted ES, to assess the environmental effects of the changes to the proposed development, and supplement the ES with further environmental information has been prepared since the submission of the application;
- A Good Neighbour Plan to document and control how the construction of the site will be managed with full consideration and respect to the surrounding community;
- An updated Construction Environmental Management Plan, with additional detail on dust suppression and phasing, and a Traffic Management Plan to show how construction traffic will be managed and controlled;
- A Transport Assessment Addendum to address the County Highway Authority's comments and requests for further information;
- Biodiversity Net Gain Report Assessment Report, Ramboll, June 2021

- A Landscape Open Space Strategy to include a looped trim trail, open spaces and areas of outdoor working.

349. For the outline application:

- A proposal to retain the majority of the frontage (northern edge) planting in its existing natural form and tall height, rather than reduce its height with a clipped appearance as originally proposed;
- Increased width of the eastern buffer planting area;
- Commitment to a Parking Management Strategy to review whether the full extent of proposed car parking to serve buildings 1, 2, 4 and 5 is required, at that time at which they are delivered through subsequent reserved matters applications;
- Massing and height of the building frontage along Fulbourn Road and Cambridge Road has been reduced from three to two storeys by setting the top floor 10.5m back. The recessed area created will be utilised as a brown ecology roof with no employee access. To the edge of the recessed area will be a planted edge to screen any views from the top floor of the building towards the residential properties to the north; and
- Updated set of Parameter Plans to convey the scheme changes, most notably to establish the reduced building heights (set back) to the front of the site and increased areas of site-edge buffer planting.

350. For the detailed application (Phase 1):

- Revisions to the planting scheme to allow longer-distance views through the site from Yarrow Road into the countryside beyond to the south;
- The Multi Storey Car Park has been assessed by the Cambridgeshire Constabulary Design Out Crime Officer against Park Mark and Secure by Design; and
- To include for road infrastructure to enable a potential future connection through to Peterhouse Technology Park, as shown on the Indicative Link Access Road plan.

351. For the detailed application (enabling works)

- An increased amount of the site-edge buffer planting to be provided as part of the first stage works on site;
- The infiltration basin has been redesigned to include a balancing pond to achieve appropriate infiltration and ground water conditions for the site and create a new ecological habitat;
- The proposed surface water drainage design has been refined to more robustly ensure that the filtration rate and storage volume required to attenuate surface water run-off in a critical storm event is provided;
- The land Cut and Fill analysis to minimise material being sent to landfill, whilst setting the buildings as low as possible into the slope, has been updated and forms a clearer presentation arising from more detailed work. Along with the preparation of a Soils Management Plan, which includes a Suspended Soils Statement;
- Further information to provide greater clarity to the type of surface treatment to prepare the ground for construction to ensure a tone and texture that would be in context; and
- An Arboricultural Impact Assessment, which now includes Tree Protection Details, is provided to demonstrate how retained trees will be protected over the course of the scheme construction.

352. In summary, in addition to the application forms, drawings and the ES and ES Addendum (including appendices) this application is accompanied by the following documents:

- Overall drawing - Site Location Plan – Existing Outline Planning CITP-SBR-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-8100 RevP4
- Design and Access Statement Addendum, June 2021
- Planning and Consultation Statement, Bidwell, January 2021
- Landscape Strategy Addendum
- Transport Technical Note, Bryan G Hall, August 2021
- Technical Note in response to LLFA document, Ramboll, 23 July 2021
- Letter and attached drawing 8474-D-AIA Rev C from Hayden's, 3 September 2021
- Biodiversity Net Gain Report Assessment Report, Ramboll, June 2021
- Good Neighbour Plan, Bowmer + Kirkland, April 2021
- Soil Management Plan, Bowmer + Kirkland, May 2021
- Parking Management Strategy

Planning assessment

353. From the consultation responses and representations received, and from inspection of the site and the surroundings, the main issues are considered to be:
    - Principle of development
    - Character and appearance of the area and adjacent Green Belt
    - Cultural Heritage
    - Carbon Reduction and sustainable designs
    - Environmental impacts and residential amenity
    - Transport and highways
    - Flood risk and drainage

Principle of development

354. Policy E/3: Fulbourn Road East (Fulbourn) of the South Cambridgeshire local Plan (2018) states that the land adjoining Peterhouse Technology Park is allocated for employment use. The application in its entirety therefore allocated for employment use. The second part of Policy E/3 states that:

"Development proposals will need to demonstrate how the site can be designed and landscaped to effectively mitigate impact on the wider Cambridge Green Belt. This will include excavation to achieve appropriate profile and setting against the Cambridge Green Belt and agricultural land, and the creation of landscaped buffers on the southern and eastern boundaries."

Employment Uses and Economic Benefits

355. Supporting text to Policy E/3 at para. 8.27 states *"The Employment Land Review identified demand for employment land on the edge of Cambridge. The Inner Green Belt Study Review (2012) highlighted an opportunity to provide additional employment land next to the Peterhouse Technology Park whilst avoiding significant impacts on the Green Belt. There are also two areas allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan to the west of the existing development."* At para. 8.28 it is acknowledged that the "*Technology Park is cut into rising ground, and cannot be seen from higher ground to the south. Similar treatment will be required for this site. It is bound by an existing hedgerow, which should be retained and enhanced, together with a new landscaped boundary to the south and east."*

356. The Greater Cambridge Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Study (2020) provides a more up to date set of evidence. The Study states that the modelling suggests a small undersupply in Class B1a (office) provision before taking into account B1 supply contributions. However, the Greater Cambridge area is represented by a more blended market of Class B1a and b uses. Combining these requirements identifies a significant shortfall. Within Class B1b (laboratories), the *"modelling points to a shortfall which could be in the order of 50,000 – 100,000 sqm when taking into account the potential contribution of mixed use sites"* which reflects the higher growth scenario is assumed to be for research and development employment.

357. One of the cornerstones of achieving sustainable development through the planning system is helping to building a strong competitive economy. The key chapter in the NPPF 2021 is chapter 6 'Building a strong, competitive economy' which, at paragraph 81, states that *"Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which business can invest, expand and adapt"*. It then goes on to say that *"Significant weight should be places on the need to support economic growth and productivity…".* Further development of this well-established employment and education site is broadly aligned with this national objective.

358. Paragraph 83 specifically recognises the importance of networks or clusters of knowledge and high technology industries, whereby decisions address their locational requirements. This is reflected in Policy S/2 of the Local Plan which sets out the vision for the growth within South Cambridgeshire which includes supporting its position as a world leader in research and technology based industries.

359. The proposals are for employment uses falling within Use Classes E(g) and B8 (limited to data centres only within this use class). Use Class E(g) includes uses which can be carried out in a residential area within out detriment to its amenity comprising:

- E(g)(i) Offices to carry out any operational or administrative functions,
- E(g)(ii) Research and development of products or processes
- E(g)(iii) Industrial processes

360. The proposals would provide approximately 54,000sqm of employment floorspace and would potentially generate approximately 2,700 employees (refer page 13 of the Design and Access Statement Addendum June 2021). The proposals will contribute to meeting the objectively assessed employment needs for South Cambridgeshire, making an important contribution to the 22,000 additional jobs identified in Policy S/5, supporting the Cambridge Cluster and providing a diverse range of local jobs.

361. The adjacent Peterhouse Technology Park (PTP) makes an important contribution to the Greater Cambridge area, providing employment that contributes to the Cambridge Cluster of knowledge-based industries. In accordance with Policy E/9, the proposed development seeks to strengthen the contribution that this cluster makes to the Greater Cambridge economy and represents a continuation of the recent development of ARM A & B, which lie adjacent to the site. The proposals will enable the potential of the site to be fulfilled and contribute to the important role that the PTP cluster has in regard to economic growth and meeting employment needs.

362. In terms of the Construction Economic Effects, these are covered in Chapter 14 of the ES. The Applicant has estimated the total construction build cost to be £140m and would likely take two years if it were to be built in one phase. However, the construction will take place in phases, therefore the construction economic effects will be felt intermittently. As the development is not a continuous and permanent expenditure stream into the

economy, direct construction employment is measured in 'job years' in accordance with Treasury Guidance. Direct employment is calculated by dividing the estimated capital cost of the project by the average gross output per construction industry employee derived from the ONS Annual Business Survey (ABS). The ABS indicates that the construction industry had a total expenditure on goods and services of £181,345m in 2018 (the latest data) and had a labour force of 1.534m people. This would suggest a gross output per construction industry employee of £118,217. By dividing the total construction cost of the Proposed Development by this gross output, it is estimated that the Proposed Development would support 1,184 job years over the two-year construction period. Based on the convention adopted by the Treasury that 10 job years of employment can be taken as equivalent to one permanent full-time job created, it is estimated that there will be the equivalent of 118 full time construction jobs supported by the proposed development.

363. To ensure the development is retained in employment use in accordance with Policy E/3 and to meet the strategic employment needs, a condition restricting its use is proposed (see **condition 4 Remove PD rights – Employment Use**).

Impact on the Cambridge Green Belt

364. Due to the sloping nature of the site, the proposals include extensive excavation to ensure the building will sit as low as possible on the site to reduce their impact on the adjacent Green Belt. In addition to the excavation, substantial landscape belts are provided along the southern and eastern site boundaries to mitigate against the impacts of the development. The proposals demonstrate that the excavation and landscaping effectively mitigate the impacts of the development on the Green Belt in accordance with Policy E/3 of the Local Plan. These are discussed in more detail in the following section of this report.

Character and appearance of the area and adjacent Green Belt

365. The NPPF identifies, as part of the "social" objective of sustainable development, the need to foster a well-designed and safe built environment. Paragraph 124 states that "The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is key to what the planning and development process should achieve". At paragraph 134 it states that "development that is not well designed should be refused" and goes on to say that significant weight should be given to developments the reflect local design polices and government guidance on design.

366. Local Plan policies NH/2, HQ/1, SC/9, CC/6 and NH/6 are relevant to the landscape and visual impacts associated with the application. Together they seek to: permit development only where it respects and retains or enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and its National Character Area; ensure development preserves or enhances the character of the local urban and rural area and responds to its context in the wider landscape; ensure no unacceptable adverse lighting impact on the surrounding countryside; ensure construction spoil is used to take account of landscape character and to avoid the creation of features alien to the topography; and ensure development contributes to the green infrastructure network within the District. The District Design Guide SPD (2010) and Landscape in New Developments SPD (2010) provide additional landscaping guidance.

Landscape and visual impacts and impact on the openness of the Green Belt

367. Land to the south and east of the site lies within the Cambridge Green Belt where the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence (NPPF, para 137). Local Plan Policy NH/8 seeks to mitigate the impact of development adjoining the Green Belt through careful landscaping and design measures of a high quality. Policy NH/2 of the Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance the landscape character of the District.

368. Aside from the Green Belt, the site has no other statutory landscape designation such as an AONB or National Park and does not affect any statutory landscape designations nearby. Most of the site falls within the lowland village chalklands landscape character type, as identified by Landscape East in Landscape Character Typology for the East of England. The character type is described as “Low lying, but gently rolling arable landscape, dissected by small streams, with a distinctive pattern of nucleated villages and a patchwork of woodlands and shelterbelts”. The site comprises arable land which rises across the site from north to south and east to west, with the highest point being in the south eastern corner.

369. An LVIA (see Chapter 11 of the ES Vol 1 Main Report and relevant appendices) was submitted with the application which assesses the effect of the development on the landscape and the people who view that landscape. Officers are satisfied that the study area (2 kilometres from the centre of the site) and methodology are appropriate. and visual receptors within the LVIA were appropriate. The LVIA considered the impacts which would result from the development during the construction phase, at completion and during the operational phase of the development from a series of visualisations from 26 separate viewpoints. The viewpoints were agreed by the Council’s Landscape Officer and are sufficient to assess the likely landscape impacts that would arise from the scheme.

370. The LVIA identified that the Proposed Development would have some adverse landscape and visual effects. However, none of these were considered to be significant. The most notable landscape effects are to the fabric of the site itself and the loss of the land as part of the arable farmland. However, it is considered that the proposals would result in a minor, localised loss of existing arable farmland. The proposals would introduce a development that is characteristic of the adjacent PTP site and includes measures to enhance existing boundary treatments.

371. The LVIA concluded that most notable adverse visual effects would be to occupiers of those residential properties within close proximity to the Site, most notably the residents of Westbourn Farm Cottages. However, it considered that once the planting surrounding the attenuation basin has established along with the structural planting on the sSite boundaries these effects are reduced.

372. The proposals include a number of mitigation measures to reduce the landscape and visual impact of the development including:

- Enhancing and reinforcing the existing landscape character of the area through significant buffer planting along the countryside edges of the site including the planting of new sections of native hedgerows. Existing hedgerows along the Site’s northern boundary would be improved and reinforced.

- Other than the vegetation loss required to facilitate the access, the proposals maintain and reinforce the existing boundary vegetation. Provision of new planting of native hedgerows and trees along the eastern and southern site boundaries to help provide enclosure to the proposals as well as providing screening of the new buildings in views

from the surrounding area. Further details of the landscaping are included in the sections below. In addition, this planting will be secured at an early stage of the development through **condition 39 Soft Landscaping – timing and Implementation** which requires that this planting is provided in the first planting season following the completion of the site wide works.

- New tree planting and hedgerows are proposed to the front of the site along Fulbourn Road that mimics the frontage planting of the adjacent PTP complex.

- A new landscaped infiltration basin and a balancing pond in the north eastern corner of the site adjacent to Cambridge Road to provide an attractive SuDS feature, as well as providing separation between the adjacent residential properties and proposed development.

- Ground level / low level car parking within the eastern part of the site to allow the retention of views of the rising arable farmland to the south of the site from the residential properties immediately adjacent to the site on Cambridge Road.

373. The above measures, together with the protection of trees during construction, will reduce the landscape and visual effects of the proposals and ensure the impact of the development on the openness of the Gren Belt is appropriately mitigated. Further details on landscaping are discussed below.

374. In terms of the enabling works, within the outline application area the building plots would be established and capped with soil stabilisation. Surface water and foul drainage are included at this stage of development across the site. Landscaping is also proposed around the site entrance and on the southern boundary.

375. Officers are satisfied with the findings and conclusions of the LVIA and are satisfised that subject to the proposed mitigations measures the proposal is in accordance the policies NH/2 and NH/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

Building heights

Detailed application

376. Building 3 and the MSCP would both have a maximum height to parapet level of 13.5 metres (39.45 AOD). Building 3 comprises 3 storeys of commercial / laboratory floorspace whilst the MSCP is built over 5 storeys. No flues are included on Building 3. Given the land levels, extensive cutting to the rear of the buildings would be undertaken to ensure they sit as low on the site as possible in order to minimise visual impact and impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Outline application

377. In terms of the outline planning application, following concerns raised by neighbours and a local Ward Member, the heights of the buildings fronting Fulbourn Road were amended. The buildings were initially all 3 storeys in heights with a parapet height on 35.90 AOD. However, following concerns raised about the height of these frontage buildings, Parameter Plan 2 Buildings Heights includes a 10.5 metre set back along the length of frontage buildings with a height of 31.40 AOD, this set back is shown as E on Parameter Plan 2. The set back area would include safety guards and planting. The remainder of the frontage buildings (shown as D on Parameter Plan 2) would be a maximum height of 35.90 AOD. It is considered that the set back is of sufficient depth to

ensure the frontage buildings appear more consistent in height with the neighbouring buildings on the PTP site.

378. Concerns were raised about the visual impacts caused by the heights of the buildings. In response to this, the proposals have increased the amount of tree and hedge planting along the site frontage to mitigate the impact of the building heights.

379. To the east of the site the building in area D would have a maximum height of 27.00 AOD, with building(s) in area B to the rear of the site having a maximum height of 38.80 AOD.

380. The amended Parameter Plan 2 includes a note stating *"Any roof top plant and related screening to be set back from the building edges by no less than 10m and to be no greater than 0.5 above parapet levels, excluding flues that can be 8m above roof level"*. This had not been a detail included in the original submission. Further information was requested regarding the potential impact on flues on the Green Belt and the LVIA.

381. This LVIA Response (September 2021) has reviewed the provision for the potential of (up to) 8m flues upon buildings 1, 2, 4 and 5. The requirement for both office and laboratory spaces across the outline scheme results in the possibility that future occupiers (currently unknown) may require flues. Given the outline nature of this part of the scheme, the actual position, height and scale of any potential flues is difficult to model for the proposals. The flues are noted at a total maximum height of 8m, this is an industry driven standard and will ensure that the building will have the capability of attracting the highest quality of scientific research and development, however this is a maximum height and flues are likely to be less than this subject to the requirements of the occupants' operational needs. The submitted LVIA Response reviewed the assessment contained within the initial LVIA and the LVIA Addendum and found that the provision of potential flues does not result in any adjustment to the identified effects associated with the proposals. Council's Landscape Officer agrees with the LVIA Response findings however has raised a concern regarding the potential impact of flues on Building 5, to the rear of the site and at a higher level than the other buildings, on the rural character of the surrounding areas and the openness of the Green Belt. Accordingly, **condition 59 – flues** is recommended to specifically enable the consideration of any flues within Area B on Parameter Plan 2 (adjacent to the southern boundary) at reserved matters stage.

Scale, massing and layout

382. The Design and Access Statement contains an analysis of the site context which demonstrates that various layout options have been considered in the initial stages of the design development. The site layout reflects that of the adjacent PTP with its single access point and arrangement of buildings with public realm plaza spaces connecting key points of building access. The buildings on the site have been positioned to respond to the site constraints namely the gas easement at the front of the site limiting the siting of buildings along Fulbourn road, the position of the new central access roadway running east to west through the site and the need for appropriate landscape buffers on the southern and eastern sides of the site adjacent to the Green Belt. The relationship of buildings to the central roadway is defined by the entry levels into the buildings and the building levels in the natural slope of the site.

383. The abovementioned gas main results in the frontage buildings being set back a minimum of 25 m from the front boundary of the site (as shown in Parameter Plan 1 Land Use). This set back provides a separation distance between the two storey front elevation

of the proposed frontage buildings and the rear elevation of the residential dwellings on Coltsfoot Close, the nearest residential properties.

384. The scale and massing of the proposals reflect that of the more recent development on PTP, in particular buildings ARM A + B.

Design and materials of Building 3 and MSCP

385. The western elevation of building 3, adjacent to the MSCP, features the entrance to the building which is marked by the triple height atrium and canopy, providing a clear and distinct building entrance.

386. The northern elevation of building 3 features an array of vertical fins. These fins aim to offer a complexity of displacement and shadow to the facade to assist visual interest. Similarly, the eastern elevation features an array of vertical fins. However, these act in a more functional capacity, providing protection for the balanced interior climate from the rising sun.

387. The southern elevation is distinct from the others, due to the use of 500mm horizontal brise soleil solar shading. This is a significant feature of the building's solar performance - reducing incident sunlight in the summer. The southern elevation also includes the aluminium louvre screen to the plant area which is enclosed within the building.

388. The MSCP has been designed to complement Building 3 both in terms of its architecture and materials. The design of the triple height canopy on the eastern elevation, identifying the buildings pedestrian and cycle entrance, match that of the canopy on Building 3 and provide a strong visual link between the two buildings across the pedestrian plaza. The external materials comprise perforated and solid aluminium strips which provide an effective screen for the parked cars whilst allowing for glimpses into and out of the building. Two vehicular access points are located on the northern entrance to the building. These access points are relatively low key, with the focus on the building being on the visual focus of the building being its eastern elevation.

389. A single storey building to the rear of Building 3, housing the refuse and recycling store and substation, will be timer clad with a brown roof. The materials are considered appropriate in this location.

390. The contemporary architectural style proposed for Building 3 and the MSCP is supported and would relate well to the recently completed office buildings ARM A & B in the neighbouring PTP site, whilst respecting the surrounding natural landscape. **Condition 14 – Materials** requires details of all external materials to be submitted for approval to ensure a high quality finish.

Landscape and public realm

391. Policy HQ/1 requires the provision of high quality landscaping and public spaces that integrate with its surroundings. Ensuring the provision of a high quality public realm through a well-considered landscaping scheme with appropriate ongoing management and maintenance is a key issue for this site.

392. As discussed above, one of the main forms of mitigating the impact on the development on the adjacent Green Belt is through providing landscape buffers along the southern and eastern boundaries of the site. Such is the importance of ensuring this

landscaping details of the landscaping scheme have been provided for both the detailed applications and outline applications to ensure early implementation. As shown on Parameter Plan 4 Open Space and Landscape, the eastern, southern and western boundaries of the site are all shown to include a significant landscape buffer.

393. On the site's southern boundary, a post and rail fence is proposed with a native hedgerow to be planted inside the site boundary which would extend the length of the southern boundary. An 8m wider buffer is provided between the MSCP and the site's boundary together with a 1m wider culvert is located between the landscape buffer and the building's facade. Along the fence line a native hedgerow is proposed which would extend the length of the southern boundary. To the rear of Building 3 the landscape buffer widens up to 11.8 metres. There is also a 3m wide pathway adjacent to the face providing for access and maintenance. Full details of soft landscaping including the species, numbers and sizes have been provided.

394. Due to the significant change in land levels along the southern boundary a gabion retaining wall is proposed within the landscape area along the length of Building 3. Details of the retaining wall in terms of its siting, height and design are required via **condition 32** - **Retaining Wall Details**.

395. Further along the southern boundary, within the outline planning application site area, detailed soft landscaping plans have been submitted. The landscape buffer includes the native hedgerow along the fence line, immediately adjacent to this is native planting. Further in from the boundary, adjacent to the native planting buffer is a grassed area with woodland planting, with a more formal lawn area closest to the development area.

396. Similar landscaping buffers are provided along the eastern edge of the site. A woodland buffer between 9.8m and 18.2m in width is proposed along this boundary, and would comprise native structural planting, native hedgerow and native tree planting.

397. In the north eastern corner of the site is the proposed infiltration basin and pond. This is an important feature of the SUDs scheme but is also an important part of the site in terms of landscaping due to it being the first part of the site that will be seen when approaching from the east and encountering built form. This area will also form part of the woodland buffer, in accordance with Parameter Plan 4 Open Space and Landscape.

398. The Open Space Strategy has been designed to include a trim trail around much of the perimeter site in the outline planning application. In the detailed application the trail passes to the east and north of Building 3 and north of the MSCP. The trim trail would comprise mulch trail with timber ending together with some outdoor working/play equipment. Outdoor seating is also proposed in the landscaped area. Details of the trim trail including associated equipment would be required at reserved matters stage in accordance with **condition 51 – Trim Trail Details**.

399. The applicant has committed to the site, including the trim trail, being open to members of the public. However, concerns have been raised by third parties regarding public access to the site, noting that the adjacent site at PTP is not open to members of the public. To ensure that the site remains open to all users, **condition 10 – Public Access to Site** is recommended to secure access to members of the public in perpetuity.

Public art

400. Local Plan policy HQ/2 encourages the provision of public art for development, including offices, of more than 1,000 sqm.

401. The indicative design and location of the public art (shown as the golden bird sculpture) in the DAS is supported, as it would help enhance the quality of the public realm of the space between Building 3 and the MSCP. The DAS sets out the concept of the Public Art Strategy seeking to invite artists to create an installation within this area, with the intention of periodically changing the art work, in the hope that this would provide a platform for local artists and support the arts community in the area.

402. In addition, a 'development sculpture', is shown in the proposed new roundabout within the site in the detailed planning application. It is considered that a piece of public art in this location would assist in creating a better sense of arrival and to help enhance the identity of this site as a new international technology park.

403. It is considered that the public art can be secured through a condition requiring the submission of a site wide Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) through the detailed application for Building 3 and the MSCP with further PADP(s) being submitted at reserved matters stage which demonstrate compliance with the site wide PADP (see **conditions 18 and 67**).

Reponses to third parties

404. As set out above, the proposals were considered by the Design Enabling Panel in November 2020. The following table addresses the main points of consideration raised by the Panel.

DEP comment	*Officer response*
Extensive cut and fill due to locate the MSCP on highest part of the site.	Due to the slope of the land it is considered that any development on the site would require extensive cut and fill. Policy E/3 states that 'excavation to achieve appropriate profile and setting' would be required.
The Panel queried the siting of the decked car park adjacent to the eastern boundary as an office building could better benefit from the outlook.	It was considered important to keep the height of buildings adjacent to the eastern boundary to a lower level (see Area C on Parameter Plan 2 Building Heights) to minimise the visual impact of the development from the adjacent countryside. Bearing in mind that this part of the application is in outline only it may be that an office building rather than a decked car park comes forward in this location however it would be limited to the heights shown on Parameter Plan 2.
The heart of the campus, the space between Buildings 1, 2 and 3 has been illustrated. Providing the quality of place sought requires further development.	The proposals have been developed since the DEP considered them together with the Council's Urban Design and Landscape Officers to ensure a high-quality environment is provided.

405. Following representations received during the first public consultation period the applicant made a number of amendments to address the concerns raised and these were

included in the revised submission in June and were subject to a second round of public consultation. The points raised by members of the public are set out below:

Objections	*Officer response*
Buildings are still 3 storeys high and are overbearing. Buildings should be no more than 2 storeys.	The heights of the buildings are considered to be in keeping with the PTP site and are appropriate in this location subject to the mitigation proposed.
The set back of the frontage buildings has not addressed the overall height issues.	As discussed above.
Loss of open farmland and long distance views.	The site is allocated for development and there is no requirement to retain views across the site. A landscape buffer is required to mitigate impact on the landscape and openness of the Green Belt.
The PTP site is not open to members of the public.	The subject site will be open to the public as secured by **condition 10**.
Planting is higher and used to 'hide' the buildings but will reduce light and cast a cold shadow over the road	No objection raised in terms of highway safety from shadowing. Planting is used to assist in mitigating the impact of development in keeping with the PTP site.
Request new crossing with lights on Fulbourn Road to allow pedestrians to access bus stop	This has been included in the revised proposals (see Proposed highway layout drawing no. 20-281-100-003 Rev E)
A wide angle lens has been used to show the view from Yarrow Road, this exaggerates the gap that would be between the two buildings.	The gap between buildings has been clearly identified on the Parameter Plans which should the Development Area and what would be the minimum gaps between buildings.
How high will the new trees be?	The new trees are of varying heights as discussed above.
Due consideration has been given to the impact of the development when viewed from the high ground of Shelford Road, Fulbourn	The LVIA considered numerous points along Shelford Road.

Summary

406. The site is currently undeveloped, arable farmland with no buildings therefore the proposals will have a visual impact as well as an impact on the landscape and openness of the Green Belt. However, it is considered that through the design and layout of the proposals together with the mitigation measures proposed, such impacts will not result in adverse harm.

Cultural Heritage

Built heritage assets

407. Chapter 8 of the ES Vol 1 Main Report addressed the assessment of the potential impact of the development on built heritage. The potential impacts were scoped into the ES at the request of Historic England.

408. Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset, lies approximately 40 metres to the north east of the application site. The ES also identifies three non-designated heritage assets within the conservation area, these being Victoria House, Hereward House and Gatehouse.

409. In terms of non-designated assets, paragraph 203 of the NPPF requires a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. The applicant's assessment concludes that there would be a neutral impact on the contribution that setting make to the significance of Victoria House, and no impact on the significance of Hereward House and the Gatehouse. The Council's Conservation Officer concurs with this conclusion.

410. The Council's Conservation Officer has advised that the rural setting of the former asylum site which makes up the conservation area makes a small contribution to its significance. It is considered that the proposal would erode this rural setting to a limited extent, but that erosion would be mitigated by the nature of the vegetation on the southern boundary of the conservation area and the eastern side of the application site, the presence of the Cambridge Road between the site and the conservation area, and the proposed layout of the development. The proposal would have a very low level of visibility from within the conservation area. The Officer agrees with the applicant's conclusion that any harm caused to the significance of the conservation area would be at the extreme lower limit of the 'less-than-substantial' range in the context of paragraph 202 of the NPPF. Accordingly, the harm should be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal.

411. Public benefits of the proposal include an increase in Biodiversity Net Gain, public access to the site and employment provision both during and after construction. It is considered that these public benefits outweigh the less than substantial harm resulting from the application. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy NH/14 of the Local Plan and paragraphs 202 and 203 of the NPPF.

Archaeology

412. The ES included an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment which confirmed the absence of significant archaeology on the site. The findings of the assessment have been reviewed by Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology department who agreed with the findings and raised no objection and did not require any conditions to be imposed.

413. It is therefore considered that the proposed development will not have any adverse archaeological impacts, in accordance with policy NH/14 of the Local Plan.

Carbon reduction and sustainable design

414. The NPPF notes that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future and great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability (paragraph 131). Policy CC/1 requires new development to embed the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation into the development. Policy CC/3 requires new major developments to reduce carbon emissions by a minimum of 10% through the use of on site renewable energy. Policy CC/4 requires

proposals for non-residential development to achieve a minimum water efficiency standard of 2 BREEAM credits for water use. The Sustainable Design and Construction SPD provides further guidance on implementation of relevant Local Plan policies regarding sustainable design.

415. Building 3 is an office building intended for use by technological companies and the building has been designed to reflect this though providing functional and efficient office space. The building has a number of design features to ensure a BREAAM rating of 'excellent' is achieved including:

- high performing thermal envelope
- window to wall ratio of 39%
- external solar shading
- passive thermal design

416. The design of the facades of Building 3 in Phase 1 in the details planning application have also been informed by The London Energy Transformation Initiative (LETI) Climate Emergency Design Guidance strategies. In order to achieve an energy consumption figure of 55 kWh/m^2/yr, which is significantly lower than most Building Regulations compliant buildings, this has required a high performing envelope, a window to wall ratio of 39%, passive thermal design and crucially, the use of external shading to reduce the heating and cooling load of the building by 19% compared to an unshaded building. The orientation of the shading varies depending on the orientation of the façade. The horizontal brise soleil on the southern façade reduces incident sunlight within the building and this in turn reduces overheating. The vertical fins on the east, west and north facades also allow for the varied external shading. Conditions are recommended for Phase 1 requiring the submission of BREEAM certification (or equivalent measure) at both design stage and post construction stage (**conditions 16 and 17**).

417. The outline planning application also commits to all occupied buildings being designed to achieve a BREEAM rating of 'excellent', targeting an Energy Performance Certification of A and this is secured through **condition 47 BREEAM for Reserved Matters Applications**.

418. In terms of energy, Building 3 will utilise an all-electric approach, with air source heat pumps and a 97.2 m^2 photovoltaic panel array which is shown on the roof plan, drawing number CITP-SBR-B3-R1-DR-A-8303 Rev 4, which would be an approved plan (**condition 13 Drawings Compliance**) should permission be granted. Carbon calculations indicate a 10.6% reduction in carbon emissions, which is likely to reduce further over time as the grid decarbonises. This approach is supported and considered to be consistent with Policy CC/3 of the Local Plan.

419. To ensure this approach is taken forward in the outline application, later phases, **condition 48 Renewable Energy** requires the submission of a renewable energy statement with each reserved matters application which demonstrates that at least 10% of the development's total predicted carbon emissions will be reduced through the implementation of on-site renewable energy sources.

420. The Council's sustainability officer has considered the details submitted and is in support of the applicant's approach to sustainable construction subject to the conditions set out above being imposed. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with the NPPF and policies CC1, CC/3 and CC/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

Environmental Impacts and Residential Amenity

Construction impacts

421. The nearest residential neighbours to the site are to the north of Fulbourn Road, on Coltsfoot Close. It is likely there will be some impacts on neighbours during construction and residents have raised concerns in this regard. The applicant submitted a Construction Environmental Management Plan which details how impacts during the construction phases will be minimised. The Council's Environmental Health Practitioner initially requested a number of conditions relating to hours of construction, airbourne dust and phasing of construction activities. A revised CEMP was submitted which covers all of these points and the Environmental Health Practitioner subsequently advised that the details for dust management and phasing on construction activities have been adequately dealt with and are not required to be conditioned. It is considered appropriate, for reasons of clarity, to include a condition for hours of construction throughout the construction phase (see **condition 2 – Hours of Construction**).

Overlooking, privacy, overbearing

422. The nearest residential neighbours to the site are to the north of Fulbourn Road, on Coltsfoot Close and Harebell Close. The residential properties are on a lower level than Fulbourn Road whilst the application site rises up from Fulbourn Road, therefore consideration of any overlooking that would result in loss of privacy must be considered.

423. Parameter Plan 1 – Land Use shows that the area to be developed is set back 25m from the front boundary of the site. Therefore, the minimum distance any occupied building can be from the front boundary is 25m (it is anticipated that single storey bike stores may be located to the front of the buildings, but these would not have windows or result in any overlooking). Between Fulbourn Road and the boundaries of the residential properties on Harebell Close and Coltsfoot Close is a landscaped green, providing a buffer between the residential properties and Fulbourn Road. The rear elevation of the nearest residential property is sited 65m from where the front elevation of the closest occupied building could be.

424. In the first round of consultation, a number of residents raised concerns about the impact on privacy due to the heights of the proposed buildings. Taking these concerns, and others regarding the visual impacts on the buildings adjacent to Fulbourn Road and Cambridge Road (on both sides of the proposed new access), the applicant amended the plans to include a 10.5m set back at second floor level of the frontage buildings which would comprise a brown roof together with a privacy screen and planting to ensure there is no overlooking from the second floor and no access for building occupants is permitted, this is secured by **condition 54 Brown roof – No public access and condition 55 – Means of enclosure for roof set back**. The amendment results in buildings that could be a maximum of two storeys high at a minimum distance of 65m from the rear elevation of the nearest neighbour on Coltsfoot Close and approximately 40m from the side elevation of the nearest neighbour on Cambridge Road, with the façade of the second storey being a minimum distance of 75.5m and 50.m respectively.

425. It is also noted that additional soft landscaping is proposed along the front boundary of the site to enhance the existing vegetation. This will assist in reducing views into and out of the site.

426. It is considered that the frontage buildings, due to their distance from neighbouring properties, the intervening landscaping and height of the buildings (including the set back and mitigation measures) will not result in a form of development that would be overbearing, nor would it result in the loss of privacy through overlooking.

Sunlight and overshadowing

427. The application is supported by sections in the Design and Access Statement (pages 94 and 95) to demonstrate the angle of the sun to enable an assessment of potential loss of sunlight. Page 94 shows the angle of the summer sun and winter sun in relation to the nearest neighbour on Coltsfoot Close. The diagram illustrates that the proposed frontage buildings are sufficiently set back and at a height that will not result in any loss of sunlight to residential properties. Page 95 includes a similar section for the nearest residential property opposite the site on Cambridge Road. Given the position of the buildings in relation to the sun's path, the buildings would not cause overshadowing to the residential properties. Accordingly, the proposals are not considered to result in any adverse impact due to loss of sunlight or overshading.

Noise and vibration

428. Operational noise from the buildings themselves will be primarily limited to noise from any exposed plant equipment. Plant equipment is proposed to be enclosed within the building envelope which will limit noise output. However, the Council's Environmental Health Officers have recommended a condition requiring the submission of a noise assessment and attenuation measures for any plan to ensure noise levels are restricted (**condition 20 – Noise Attenuation**). A similar condition, **condition 49**, is recommended in the outline planning application to ensure such details are submitted with reserved matters application(s). In addition, given the proposed office / research use, noise and disturbance is likely to be limited.

429. There will likely be some impacts from noise during construction however these are anticipated to be minimal and can be mitigated through ensuring the hours of construction are limited (**condition 2 – Hours of Construction**) and compliance with the submitted CEMP (**condition 3 – Compliance with CEMP**).

430. Subject to recommended conditions restricting deliveries and limiting noise from plant equipment, the development is not likely to result in an unacceptable level of noise or disturbance to nearby residences in accordance with policy SC/10 of the Local Plan.

Land Contamination

431. Policy SC/11 of the Local Plan requires applicants to demonstrate there will be no adverse health impacts to surrounding occupiers or end users from ground contamination. The site's previous use is as an agricultural field and as such has a relatively low risk in terms of potential contamination. The proposed use is also not particularly sensitive to the presence of contamination. The application is accompanied by an Interpretative Report which confirms that the site is a low risk in terms of contamination. The Council's Environmental Health officer agrees with the report's recommendation that there is a very low risk of harm to human health from the land on the application site and recommends that a precautionary condition (**condition 11 – Land Contamination**) be imposed to set out the procedure should any unexpected contamination be discovered.

Air quality

432. Policy SC/12 of the Local Plan is concerned with air quality impacts and explains that where development proposals would be subject to unacceptable air quality standards or would have an unacceptable impact on air quality standards they will be refused. The application is supported by an Air Quality Assessment, Low Emission Strategy and Transport Assessment all of which relate to local air quality.

433. The Air Quality Assessment considered the following potential impacts on air quality:
- Construction works - resulting dust impacts and associated effects on human health, amenity and ecological receptors;
- Construction works – the resulting construction traffic and associated traffic emission effects on human health receptors; and
- Operational – traffic resulting from the operational development in combination with other cumulative scheme and the associated effects on human health receptors both on and off site.

434. The methodology is set out in the Assessment and the Council's EHO considers the findings of the Assessment to be acceptable subject to a condition requiring the proposal to be in accordance with the submitted Low Emission Strategy which requires the provision of 68 rapid Electric Vehicle Charge Points. The provision of the EV charge points is secured in both the detailed and outline planning applications through **conditions 22 and 64 respectively.**

435. The proposed development is not considered to give rise to any significant air quality impacts. The proposal is therefore, in accordance with the NPPF and policy SC/12.

Artificial lighting

436. The NPPF 2021 states that good design needs to limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation. Policy SC/9 of the Local Plan sets out criteria which much be met in order to permit development including: light spillage and glare are minimised; no unacceptable adverse impact on neighbours or the surrounding countryside; lighting is kept to the minimum necessary for reasons of public safety, crime prevention/security and living, working an recreational purposes.

437. The Council's Environmental Health team has considered the application and advised that the submitted Lighting Pollution Statement (Reference 6775 REV S2A, dated 13th November 2020) provides very general information on the proposed lighting scheme however, Chapter 12 of the ES provides further detail and confirms a detailed lighting impact assessment will be carried out at the design stage. Post-completion lighting levels from external lighting e.g. highway, security, public area lighting, commercial areas etc. have the potential to cause nuisance to and be detrimental to the amenity of existing and proposed residential premises. The Environmental Health team has requested a condition be imposed requiring details of artificial lighting together with any mitigation measures to be submitted with any reserved matters application, this has been included at **condition 51 – Artificial Lighting**. However, it is also considered necessary to require the same information for the detailed planning application to ensure any impacts are addressed appropriately. Accordingly, it is recommended that a detailed lighting scheme is submitted and this is secured through **condition 26 - Artificial Lighting**.

438. Subject to the appropriate control over lighting impacts associated with the development of the site through the imposition of suitable conditions, the proposed development accords with SC/9: Lighting Proposals.

Trees

439. The site is agricultural land with trees and hedgerows around the perimeter. An Aboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and a Tree Survey (ES Appendix 2.4) have been undertaken and accompany the application. An addendum was provided to ensure the temporary access was included in the plans. Within this area a section of hedge and three trees will need to be felled. It is necessary to fell three low quality trees and a section of one low quality landscape feature in order to achieve the proposed development. The layout of the detailed Phase 1 works and the illustrative masterplan for the wider site do not encroach on the Root Protection Areas of any trees to be retained. For those trees that are to be retained it is recommended that an Aboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan is secured by way of condition to ensure their protection during the enabling works (**condition 40 – Tree Protection**). Overall, the report concludes that there are no arboricultural constraints that preclude the proposed development.

440. In addition, it is considered necessary to secure updated tree protection details in any reserved matters applications to ensure that all trees on the site, including those planted during earlier phases of development, are protected (**condition 57 – Tree Protection**).

441. The proposals therefore accord with Policies NH/2, NH/6 and NH/8 of the Local Plan.

Biodiversity

442. National planning policies seek to ensure that biodiversity is conserved and enhanced. At a local level, planning policy NH/4 requires new development to maintain, enhance, restore or add to biodiversity. There are no non-statutory protected sites in the vicinity that are likely to be affected by the application.

443. Third parties have raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposals on flora and fauna. In particular, third parties consider the site is an important habitat for deer, skylarks, bee orchids, swifts and bats.

444. The application is supported by an Ecological Impact Assessment (prepared by Ramboll, dated November 2020). The report finds that the site is of relatively low ecological value, and that any risks of harm to protected species can be removed through non-licensable avoidance and mitigation strategies. Key ecological features identified included the species rich defunct hedge along the northern boundary and the offsite wooded area to the west. The Council's Ecology Officer agreed with this analysis and recommended mitigation through **conditions 7 and 8** which require the submission of a Construction Ecological Management Plan and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan respectively. A subsequent conversation with the Ecology Officer has resulted in a further condition being recommended to require up to date ecological surveys are submitted if the outline application is not commenced within two years of permission (**condition 57 - Time limit on development before further surveys required**). This will ensure the ecological mitigation measures secured through conditions 7 and 8 are reviewed, amended and where necessary, updated.

445. In terms of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), following initial comments from the Council's Ecology Officer requiring the submission of BNG calculations, the applicant submitted a

BNG Report (prepared by Ramboll, dated June 2021) which showed that the application site would achieve a 16% net gain for area-based habitats and 740% net gain for linear habitats (hedgerows).

446. However, the Wildlife Trust also commented and raised a concern that the calculations used by the application were incorrect and that the biodiversity net gain is 13.3% and not the 16% purported in the report. The applicant was asked to address this concern and their ecologist responded as follows:

"The projected condition scores we anticipated for Introduced Shrub and Rain Garden were higher than the default of Poor. We assumed that the Introduced Shrub planting will contain a variety of nectar producing plants and the range of species would be beneficial for native biodiversity. With regards to the Rain Garden, similarly we assumed appropriate management of the Rain Garden in the long term will benefit biodiversity. The current guidance, Biodiversity Metric v.3, enables the Rain Garden habitat type to achieve a Moderate condition. We note that considering either a Poor or Moderate condition demonstrates a biodiversity net gain higher than 10%."

447. In either case, the proposals exceed the 10% BNG required. This matter was discussed with the Council's Ecology Officer who was satisfied that as the calculation exceeds 10% in both instances no further changes were required as the proposal is compliant in either case.

448. Brown roofs are proposed as part of the proposals, both in the detailed application and outline application. It is appropriate to secure details of the brown roofs are submitted for approval (see **conditions 33 and 66 – Brown Roofs**).

449. It is considered that the proposed development would preserve and enhance ecological interests, in accordance with the NPPF and Policies HQ/1, CC/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

Health Impact Assessment

450. Policy SC/2 of the 2018 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan states that developments of more than 5,000m^2 are subject to a full Health Impact Assessment (HIA). The HIA is a way of considering the positive and negative impacts of development on the health of different groups in the population with the aim of enhancing the benefits and minimising any risks to health. The submitted HIA has comprehensively reviewed the potential health impacts, both negative and positive, of the development on the local population. The outcome of the HIA has been assessed as Grade A which meets the required standards of Policy SC/2.

451. To assist in mitigating some of the negative impacts and create a work environment which promotes the health and wellbeing of employees and local residents, additional measures were recommended by the Council's Development Officer, Health. The table below sets out the recommended measures and how they have been addressed:

Mitigation measures

Requested mitigation	*Officer response*
Planting of fruit trees and wildflowers	The planting schedule proposed (drawing ref. CITP-LLA-ZZ-00-DR-L-0212-P02) sets out the various trees, hedging, shrubs, bulbs, hedgerow mix, native buffer

	mix and wildflowers across the site. Whilst no fruit trees have been proposed, the varied mix is considered appropriate for the adjacent rural setting by the Landscape Officer and offers a variety of flora across the site.
S106 funding to create pedestrian link to the PTP site	The applicant wishes to ensure this link is implemented however it is not necessary to make the application acceptable, nor is it included as part of this application, therefore cannot be required by way of an obligation. However, an informative is proposed requesting the applicant to use their best endeavours to achieve this.
S106 funding to create Trim trail/green gym on site	Details of the trim trail will be required to be submitted with the reserved matters application(s) (**condition 51**).
Health food licences to be conditioned	The applicant wishes to ensure this link is implemented however it is not necessary to make the application acceptable, nor is it included as part of this application, therefore cannot be required by way of an obligation. However, an informative is proposed requesting the applicant to use their best endeavours to achieve this.
EV charge points for scooters and bikes	There is provision for an electric scooter charging point within the cycle store in the MSCP in the detailed planning application. For reserved matters applications, a Travel Plan Informative is proposed in which the applicant is strongly advised to consider these in future phases where the trip cap is in place and a modal shift is required.
S106 funding for short term lease hire of electric bikes to encourage uptake of modal forms of transport	For reserved matters applications, a Travel Plan Informative is proposed in which the applicant is strongly advised to consider these in future phases where the trip cap is in place and a modal shift is required.
S106 funding for abundant planting of mature trees for shading	A variety of tree types and sizes are proposed. For example, within the central plaza between Building 3 and the MSCP, the trees would be a minimum of 4.5 m high when planted. Semi mature trees will be between 4-5m high when planted.

Waste and recycling

452. As a commercial development, it is for the occupier of the site to arrange for refuse collections, at a frequency to be agreed with their chosen service provider. A Waste Management Plan has been submitted with the application which details the number of bins to be provided for Building 3, frequency of collection and a swept path analysis of

the car park and access road has been undertaken to demonstrate the site can be accessed by a refuse vehicle, with space for the vehicle to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. However, there are concerns that the Plan is not sufficiently detailed, accordingly **Condition 34 – Waste Management Plan** seeks the submission of a detailed waste management plan to be submitted prior to occupation of Building 3. A further condition (**condition 70 – Updated Waste Management Plan**) requires an updated Plan to be submitted with each reserved matters application.

Transport and highways impact

453. The NPPF 2021, advises in paragraph 110 that in assessing development proposals it should be ensured that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be, or have been taken up; that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; the design of streets, parking areas and other transport elements reflect current national guidance; and that any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. In paragraph 111 it states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Paragraph 112 then goes on to set out the priority for pedestrian and cycle movements and layouts and facilities which encourage public transport use.

454. Policy TI/2 of the Local Plan requires new development to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and promote sustainable forms of transport. The policy requires new development to demonstrate that it will mitigate the likely impacts (including cumulative impacts) particularly in areas where there are significant transport implications and that opportunities for sustainable travel are maximised.

455. Local Plan policy TI/2 also requires developers to demonstrate adequate provision will be made to mitigate the likely impacts of the proposed development and, for larger developments, to demonstrate they have maximised opportunities for sustainable travel, and provided a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, including a Low Emissions Strategy Statement. Travel Plans must have measurable outputs related to the Local Transport Plan and include monitoring and enforcement arrangements. The policy allows for direct improvements and S106 contributions to address transport in the wider area including across the District boundary.

456. Local Plan policy TI/3 'Parking' advises car parking provision should be provided through a design-led approach in accordance with indicative standards. Cycle parking should be provided to at least the minimum standards. The policy requires that car parking provision takes into consideration the site location, type and mix of uses, car ownership levels, availability of local services, facilities and public transport, and highway and user safety issues, as well as ensuring appropriate parking for people with impaired mobility. It states that the Council will encourage innovative solutions to car parking, including shared spaces where the location and patterns of use permit, and incorporation of measures such as car clubs and electric charging points.

457. Chapter 15 of the ES deals with Transport and includes, at Appendix 15, a Transport Assessment and at Appendix 15.1A a Transport Assessment Addendum incorporating an updated Travel Plan. The applicant has provided additional information, following an earlier consultation response from the County Council Transport Assessment Team in the form of a Transport Technical Note dated August 2021. The application is also

supported by a Cycle Strategy and Parking Strategy details. The County Council's Transport Assessment Team has considered this information and is satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to make a sound assessment.

Trip Generation and Capacity

458. The Transport Assessment details a trip rate of 1.57 vehicle arrivals in the AM peak and 1.72 departures in the PM peak. This information was taken from the survey of the adjacent PTP site. This would result in 803 vehicle arrivals in the AM peak and 881 vehicle departures in the PM peak. This has been the subject of discussion between the applicant and the TA Team and, noting that due to the pandemic there is no further Travel Plan data available that could be used, a comparison with the 2018 Travel Plan for PTP site together with data from the Cambridge Science Park, was considered a robust approach.

459. Junction modelling has been undertaken by the applicant. The modelling work has found that some junctions are already over capacity (without the proposed development) whilst others would be over capacity with the proposed development. The County's TA Team has considered the details submitted and advised that the detailed planning application is acceptable however beyond that, the outline planning application can only proceed on a monitor and manage basis. Accordingly, each reserved matters application would be subject to an assessment of the trip generation, trip budget, travel plan, mode shares and parking utilisation of the development through the submission of a revised Transport Assessment (**condition 61**). Each phase would therefore be subject to a transport assessment and review and only able to proceed subject to agreement of Cambridgeshire County Council. The TA Team has requested the trip budget be included as mitigation within the S106 agreement.

Access

460. A temporary access from Fulbourn Road is proposed during the construction period. No objection has been raised to this access.

461. Access to the site will be through enlarging the existing Fulbourn Road / Yarrow Road / Cambridge Road roundabout and the construction of a fourth arm to the south of the roundabout. The proposals include new, 3 metre wide shared use footways/cycleways on both sides the new southern arm of the roundabout to provide access into the site. These shared use footways / cycle ways continue into the site, adjacent to the proposed vehicular carriageway.

462. New splitter islands over all four arms are proposed to allow both pedestrians and cyclists to cross each arm of the roundabout in two stages. In addition, a new traffic signal controlled crossing would be provided to the north of the roundabout on Yarrow Road.

463. The junction has been the subject of a successfully completed Road Safety Audit Stage 1 therefore the initial objection from the Highways Development Management officer has been overcome. The Highways Development Management officer has requested that the Proposed Highway Layout Plan (no. 20-281-100-003 REV E) be included as an approved plan. The TA Team has requested a condition requiring that the junction be constructed in accordance with the approved plan prior to occupation of Building 3. The plan is listed as an approved plan for the detailed planning application in **condition 13 – Drawing Compliance.** In addition, the Heads of Terms (HoTs) for the Section 106 agreement requires for the construction of the junction prior to first

occupation. On this basis it is considered that the proposed works to the roundabout are satisfactory and would not result in an unacceptable impact to highway safety.

Walking and cycling provision

464. There are shared footway and cycleways which could be used to cycle or walk to the site: along Fulbourn Road, leading to the signal junction with Queen Edith's Way; along Cambridge Road to Fulbourn; and along Yarrow Road to the railway line crossing. In addition, the site is near to the proposed Fulbourn Greenway which link Fulbourn with Cambridge Railway Station and the rest of the Cambridge City cycle network. The construction of the Fulbourn Greenway is considered essential for the modal shift required for this site and as such a contribution towards it is sought by the TA Team (as detailed in the mitigation section below). On arrival at the site, access into the site is provided in the new junction layout, as discussed above.

465. A total of 1811 cycle parking spaces are provided site wide; this conforms to the current policy of 1 space per 30sqm.

466. For the detailed planning application, a total of 366 cycle spaces are provided within the MSCP at ground floor level. The cycle parking is proposed to be a mix of Sheffield stands and double stackers. Within the cycle store there is provision for an electric scooter docking station and two cycle maintenance stations. Sheffield stands are provided for visitors outside the MSCP, under the canopy. It is noted that there is no provision for non-standards bikes, such as cargo bikes. Accordingly, **condition 24 – Cycle parking** requires details of cycle parking, including for non-standard cycles, to be submitted for approval to ensure appropriate provision. Within Building 3 are changing facilities, lockers and eight showers. This provision is appropriate and will assist in encouraging cycling to and from the site.

467. For the outline planning application, it is anticipated that cycle provision will be made in the form of external cycle storage buildings. However, details of this will be provided through the submission of reserved matters application(s) secured through **condition 65 – Cycle parking**.

Car parking

468. The provision of one car parking space per 40 sqm results in a total proposed provision of 1362 parking spaces. Whilst this may follow the South Cambridgeshire District Council parking standards, this provision is considered to be excessive, taking into account the circumstances of the highly congested surrounding road network.

469. The applicant has proposed a mitigation strategy infrastructure provision and a high quality Travel Plan (included as an appendix to the Transport Assessment addendum 15.1A), to significantly shift the mode share away from car borne trips. The Travel Plan includes a number of measures which aim to result in peak hour reductions shown below in relation to trip generation:

- Measures already identified in the updated Travel Plan – 10% reduction;
- Limiting car parking numbers – possible 33% reduction;
- Car sharing – in the order of 10% reduction;
- Working from home – 10%-20% reduction;
- Encourage to travel off-peak - 10% reduction; and
- On and off-site infrastructure such as cycle parking, pedestrian crossings and bus stop enhancements - 5-10% reduction.

470. Within the Travel Plan it is stated that car sharing will be promoted to employees by way of the Cambridge Car Share network (www.zipcar.co.uk/car-hire-cambridge) and also the national scheme Liftshare website will also be used (www.liftshare.com/uk/community/ camshare).

471. Compliance with the Travel Plan for the detailed planning application is secured through **condition 30 – Travel Plan Compliance**. Each reserved matters application is required to include an updated Travel Plan (**condition 62**) to specify how travel to the site by car will be discouraged and how more sustainable forms of travel will be encouraged.

472. The full application for the first building has a provision of 275 spaces to be provided within the MSCP, resulting in a provision of 1 space per 43sqm. Should approval be given a condition is proposed to determine how these spaces will be provided in the MSCP through a Car Park Management Plan (**condition 31 – Car Park Management Plan**). If the multi storey car park (MSCP) of 915 spaces is built as the sole parking provision, then the ratio of parking would reduce as the site is built out, with a potential ratio of 1 space per 60sqm with 56,000sqm of GFA. Each reserved matters application requires the submission of an Updated Car Park Management Plan (**condition 63**) to identify how the MSCP in the detailed application is to be used for the whole development. The applicant proposes that spaces for car sharing and off peak travel will be provided within the car park. It is considered that there is potential for the ratio of parking to be reduced over time as the site builds out by implementing travel plan initiatives and by not building the second car park.

473. Accessible car parking provision is provided a ground floor level within the MSCP and to the front of the MSCP and is secured via **condition 23**. Should future car parking be provided on site under the outline planning application, accessible parking bays would be required in accordance with the current standards and secured via **condition 63**.

474. Concerns have been raised by residents that any under provision of car parking on the site would lead to an increase in on street parking in the local area. This is recognised as a potential impact and as such a contribution towards the carrying out of on-street parking surveys and any necessary parking management scheme is sought in the S106 agreement.

Public Transport

475. This is noted to be the Citi 1 route which is a direct service to Cambridge Railway station along Cherry Hinton Road which takes approximately 13 minutes. This service has a frequency of a bus every 15 minutes during weekday peak periods. The Cambridge Guided Busway can be reached at Cambridge Railway station.

476. The nearest bus stops are outside the site boundary on Fulbourn Road. There is a small shelter for the Cambridge bound stop and no shelter for the Fulbourn bound stop. Provision of new bus shelters are considered necessary as part of this application and are secured via **conditions 27 and 29**. **Condition 28** requires details of a temporary access to be provided to link the bus stop with Building 3 while **condition 72** of the outline planning application secures details of a permanent link to the site. It is proposed that financial contribution towards the maintenance of bus stop shelters be sought together with a contribution for the provision and maintenance of Real Time Passenger Information displays at the two bus stops adjacent to the site. These mitigation measures would be secured in the S106 agreement.

Construction traffic

477. The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) submitted with the application details management measures will be introduced within the construction programme to ensure that all HGV construction traffic will be effectively managed. Other measures such as wheel washing, construction traffic routing and timing management will be implemented are set out in the CEMP. It is appropriate to secure the implementation of the CEMP via **condition 3**.

478. Concerns were also raised by residents about the potential for contractors to park in the residential streets during the construction phase.

Mitigation

479. The Local Highway Authority does not object to the proposals subject to the following mitigation package:

Conditions

Mitigation requested	*Officer response*
That the revised site access junction is constructed prior to occupation of the first building in accordance with drawing 20-281-100-003 Rev. E. agreed by Highways Development Management. Works to be undertaken as a S278 agreement with CCC.	The drawing is included as an approved plan. It has subsequently been agreed with CCC officers that the junction works will be secured via the S106 agreement.
Travel Plan to be agreed prior to occupation of each building. To include up to date monitoring of travel behaviour for buildings occupied beyond the first phase.	See **conditions 30 and 62**.
A car park management plan to be agreed prior to occupation of each building. A CPMP to ensure that the amount of parking available for use does not exceed 275 spaces for the first phase of development, the provision for each phase of development, and include the provision of spaces allocated to car sharing and off peak journeys.	See **conditions 31 and 63**.
That no additional car parking above the 915 spaces within the MSCP is provided unless this provision is demonstrated not to impact upon the trip cap.	See **condition 61**.
To detail whether a walking / cycling link is required to the neighbouring Peterhouse Technology Park. This should be detailed at each reserved matters application, with details of the link and when it is to be constructed if it is required.	No link between the site and the PTP site has been included as part of this application; it was shown as illustrative only. Accordingly, this cannot be imposed as a condition. However, there is nothing to stop the applicant liaising with PTP and submitting a planning application in the future.

To improve the westbound bus stop on Fulbourn Road opposite the site with a pedestrian link to the site, and a larger bus shelter and hard standing area. To install these works under a S278 agreement prior to occupation. The details of the bus shelter to be agreed with CCC and the existing shelter to be passed to Fulbourn Parish Council for reuse.	See **conditions 27, 28 and 72** which secure the bus stop together with the pedestrian link (both temporary provision and a permanent link).
To improve the eastbound bus stop on Fulbourn Road opposite the site with an appropriate bus shelter. To install these works under a S278 agreement prior to occupation. The details of the bus shelter to be agreed with CCC.	See **condition 29**.

Section 106 obligations

480. The NPPF states that LPAs should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Policy TI/8 of the Local Plan states that planning permission for new developments will only be supported where there are suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision and phasing of infrastructure, services and facilities necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.

481. In discussions with the Highway Authority the following transport mitigation measures are considered necessary:

Obligations requested	*Officer response*
A trip cap on vehicle entering and departing the site of 106 arrivals in the AM and 117 departures in the PM peak during Phase 1 development and 522 arrivals in the AM and 573 departures in the PM during the full development, with vehicle flows to be monitored annually for the duration of the development.	A trip cap is considered necessary to mitigate impacts on the surrounding highway network.
That each reserved matters application is subject to approval of a Transport Assessment. This will review vehicle trips and Travel Plan monitoring to ensure that the peak hour vehicle flows are within the vehicle cap, and that the trips associated with each reserved matters application would not result in the trip cap being exceeded.	This is necessary to ensure future phases of development do not harm the safety of the highway network. However, it has subsequently been agreed with CCC officers that this can be secured via condition rather than planning obligation (see **condition 61**). A contribution for Travel Plan monitoring is also necessary.
A contribution towards strategic infrastructure. This is to be primarily for the Fulbourn to Cambridge greenway and any measures to enable mode shift from car to non-car in the surrounding area of a total of £1,842,325. Of this a contribution of	It is critical that a significant mode shift occurs from the use of cars to access the site to non-car use. The contribution towards the Fulbourn Greenway, given its proximity, is considered key to providing access to an alternative form of access to

£375,195.15 in relation to phase 1 with the remaining to be in proportion to the area of each reserved matters.	the site. Timing of the phasing of the contribution for the outline planning application is to be agreed.
A contribution of £20,000 towards the future maintenance of the bus stop shelters to be passed to Fulbourn Parish Council.	It is considered that the contribution is necessary to assist with the mode shift. Discussions with the Parish Council have not yet commenced but will happened as part of the S106 negotiations.
A contribution of £36,000 for the provision and maintenance of a Real Time Passenger Information RTPI display at the two bus stops opposite the site.	It is considered that the contribution is necessary to assist with the mode shift. Discussions with the Parish Council have not yet commenced but will happened as part of the S106 negotiations.
Parking surveys to be undertaken in the surrounding area before and after development every year for a period of 5 years post occupation of the final building. A contribution of £40,000 is requested to cover the costs associated with consultation, scheme design, and implementation of a managed or other parking scheme should the surveys demonstrate a problem and there is support among local residents for this.	This obligation is appropriate to ensure that any offsite parking generated by the proposed development is identified and measures to mitigate this are available.
That the revised site access junction is constructed prior to occupation of the first building in accordance with drawing 20-281-100-003 Rev. E. agreed by Highways Development Management. Works to be undertaken as a S278 agreement with CCC.	As set out in the table above, this is more appropriately secured in the S106 agreement.

482. The applicant has agreed the above obligations however the triggers for when the contributions are to be paid are currently being negotiated.

Third party comments

Third party comments	*Officer response*
Request new crossing with lights on Fulbourn Road to allow pedestrians to access bus stop	This has been included in the revised proposals (see Proposed highway layout drawing no. 20-281-100-003 Rev E – approved plan for the detailed application for Building 3).
The suggested accident data is missing many unreported events, one recent fatality (on 31 July 2020).	The Transport Assessment (TA) Team was satisfied the Transport Assessment considered all relevant accidents. The fatality referred to occurred a sufficient distance from the site as to not warrant inclusion in the assessment.

Take this opportunity to allow public access and connect a public right of way from Fulbourn Road to connect with the Roman Road PROW at Shelford Road	The site boundaries do not connect in any way with the PROW therefore it is not possible to secure a connection to it.
Parking provision is inadequate. With car parking on site reduced to 1 space for 40sqm it is likely people will park on surrounding residential streets. Employees will still drive to work.	A balance is required between providing car parking spaces on site and ensuring a modal shift. Parking surveys are required as park of the mitigation measures (s106 agreement) to monitor this.
There are already a number of developments proposed or being constructed on the Fulbourn Hospital site which will have an impact on Fulbourn Road/Cambridge Road/Yarrow Road	The cumulative impacts of these developments were considered in the ES. The TA Team was satisfied with the information submitted.
Why has access from the existing PTP site not been considered?	The application does not include access to the site from PTP therefore the existing PTP access cannot be used.
It is unclear is buses will be re-routed through the site, if they do it disadvantages residents in neighbouring roads	The link between the site and PTP is indicative only and is not part of this planning application. Accordingly, this application will not result in buses being re-routed.
The Travel Plan still refers to the Cambridge Science Park which is not representative of this site	The TA Team is satisfied that there are sufficient comparisons between the application site and the CSP (as set out above).
Moving the bus stop on Fulbourn Road will result in elderly residents walking further to access public transport	The bus stop is not being moved but mitigation measures to enhance the bus stop provision are proposed (see **conditions 27 and 29**).
Traffic flows through Fulbourn to the site from the A11 have not been adequately addressed	The TA Team is satisfied that Transport Assessment adequately covers travel flows and junction capacity.
There will now be no improvements to remove the 'line of sight' impacts at the Yarrow Road/Fulbourn Road/Cambridge Road roundabout. A serious omission to address road safety.	The proposed roundabout has satisfactorily completed the Road Safety Audit Phase 1. The Local Highways Authority is satisfied there will not be any severe harm to highway safety.
The Design and Enabling Panel noted that the proposed hybrid application Phase 1 assumes a single building with a disproportionate amount of car parking.	This point is addressed through the Site Wide Parking Strategy.

Flood risk and drainage

483. In accordance with paragraph 166 of the NPPF, a Flood Risk Assessment was undertaken to evaluate the site-wide baseline flood risks. The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and the FRA found that it has less than 0.1% chance of flooding at a location in any one given year. The NPPF provides a classification of types of development according to their vulnerability. Commercial, professional services and office space is categorised as 'Less Vulnerable'. Because the site is situated in Flood Zone 1, the Sequential Test and Exception Test are not required under the NPPF.

484. The proposed surface water drainage system has been designed to incorporate the current Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) principles and approaches.

485. Each proposed building will incorporate a brown roof, details of which have been included within the Foul and Surface Water Below Ground Drainage Layout drawings.

486. The masterplan has been configured so that the site can make use of the highest infiltration rate and best groundwater conditions of the site to provide a pond and subsequent infiltration basin outfall in accordance with CIRIA Guidance (C753 Chapter 13). This will provide natural features for attenuation and infiltration to the ground, with appropriate associated landscaping. The design of these has been co-ordinated with the Landscape Architect and further details have been provided in the following sections.

487. The site-specific ground investigation information revealed that the available infiltration rate and water table depth is suitable to enable infiltration.

488. Pedestrian paving areas are to be permeable paving. The permeable pavement construction can be lined with an impermeable membrane, thus utilising the voids within the sub-base to provide attenuation. Perforated drainage pipes will convey water from the storage zone within the subgrade to the surface water drainage system.

489. The proposed surface water drainage design has been developed so as to ensure that the infiltration rate and storage volume required to attenuate surface water run-off from the critical 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) critical storm event, including a 40% allowance for climate change is provided on the development site. The Drainage Strategy and SuDS Report sets out the details for the surface water runoff. This will be achieved through the use of brown roofs on new buildings, rain gardens, permeable paving and swales. All surface water is directed to an infiltration basin in the north-eastern corner of the site.

490. As part of the site wide enabling works much of the surface and foul drainage will be provided including the temporary infiltration basin in the north eastern corner of the site and drainage connections to the main sewer for the Phase 1 development (Building 3). In addition, the future foul drainage under the new access road for buildings 4 and 5 (in the outline application) would also be provided.

491. The LLFA has advised that the submitted documents demonstrate that surface water from the site can be managed through the above methods and raises no objection to the proposal subject to conditions and informatives being imposed. The Council's Drainage Engineer suggested similar conditions be attached. Subsequent discussions with the Drainage Officer have been held as the application is accompanied by a CEMP, Site Investigation Report and Drainage Strategy which address all the information requirements of the suggested conditions for both detailed planning applications. Accordingly, compliance with the CEMP is secured for all applications in **condition 3** while compliance with the Drainage Strategy has been secured via **conditions 35** (enabling works application) **and 42** (phase 1 detailed application). It is considered necessary to include a condition on the outline planning application requiring either confirmation of compliance with the Drainage Strategy, or if any amendments are required, an updated Drainage Strategy to be submitted (see **condition 71**).

492. It is noted that Anglian Water considered the surface water strategy/flood risk assessment to be unacceptable. However, Anglian Water go on to say that it is important that control over the surface water drainage approach is dealt with via conditions, ensuring that evidence is provided that the hierarchy has been followed and any adverse

impacts and mitigation can be planned for effectively. The surface water drainage approach proposed does follow the hierarchy as set out in the submitted Drainage Strategy and SuDS Report. Anglian Water also state that advice should be sought from the LLFA. As set out above, the LLFA raises no objection to the proposals, subject to conditions, and are satisfied the surface water drainage approach is appropriate and will not result in adverse impacts.

493. The Environment Agency has requested details of a scheme to treat and remove suspended solids from any excavation dewatering or surface water run off during construction. **Condition 38** requires such information to be submitted and approved prior to the enabling works commencing.

494. Third parties have raised concerns in regard to potential surface water flooding given the slope of the land. However, as the LLFA and Council's Drainage Engineer are satisfied that the proposals include appropriate measures for surface water run-off, subject to conditions, officers are satisfied the proposals will not result in any adverse flooding impacts.

495. Subject to conditions, it is considered that the proposed development complies with policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

Other Matters

Airport safeguarding

496. Given the proximity to Cambridge Airport, the application has been considered by Cambridge Airport Limited in terms of aerodrome safeguarding subject to two conditions; one requiring the removal of permitted development rights for cranes and construction equipment and the other requiring the submission of a Bird Hazard Management Plan. Both conditions are considered reasonable and necessary and have been included as **conditions 5 and 9** respectively with some of the additional information for the Bird Hazard Management Plan included as an informative. With these controls in place, officers are satisfied that the proposed development will not give rise to airport safeguarding issues and is in accordance with policies SS/3 and TI/6 of the Local Plan.

Environmental Impact Assessment

497. Where a planning application is likely to result in significant environmental effects, the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended) require the application to be accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) which includes an assessment of likely effects and identifies appropriate mitigation. As set out above, the application was accompanied by an ES and an ES Addendum was submitted with the reports an appendices as set out in paragraphs 326-328 of this report.

498. The following table identifies the potential impacts identified in the ES and the mitigation proposed in the application itself or secured through planning conditions.

Environmental Aspect	**Effects and significance (where significance is greater than negligible)**	**Mitigation**

Air quality	Construction dust soiling and increase in PM10 concentrations due to construction works on off-site human health receptors was considered to be a slight adverse-Significant effect.	Details in the CEMP (wheel washing, dust management etc), see **condition 3**.
Archaeology	Impacts on archaeological remains during the construction phase, moderative / Minor Adverse effects.	The Historic Environment Team confirmed that a condition requiring archaeological investigation is not required in connection with this application.
Cultural Heritage	Impacts on the setting of the Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area would be Moderate / Adverse.	No additional mitigation required over and above that included as part of the application.
Flood Risk & Drainage	Potential impacts during construction and operational phases on downstream receptors, surface water flooding of adjacent areas, surface water flooding of the proposed development, and water quality are identified as Minor adverse or Moderate adverse.	During construction measures in the CEMP will provide temporary drainage solutions. The submitted Drainage Strategy includes drainage solutions to mitigate the impacts identified. These are secured via **conditions 3** (CEMP), **25** (drainage), **38** (suspended soils details), **42 and 71** (drainage).
Ground Conditions & Contamination	Potential impacts from leakages/spillages during construction to ground and surface water – Moderate adverse. Potential leakage of fluids / wet concrete to groundwater – Moderate adverse. Contaminants introduced by site users in the operational phase resulting in impacts on ground and surface water are identical as Moderate / Minor adverse. During the operational phase the change of use from agriculture resulting in the reduction of application of chemicals to the land is identified as a major beneficial impact.	On site risk assessments undertaken. Measures identified in the CEMP secured by **condition 3**. Design of the buildings will include measures to contain potential leakages / spillages during the operational phase. **Condition 11** (land contamination compliance) sets out developer requirements if contamination is identified during construction.
Landscape and Visual	A range of effects are identified as having minor impacts including: trees/hedgerows in the site; Landscape Character Assessments; Cambridge Green Belt Study.	The impacts of development have been mitigated through the design of the proposals, reducing the height of buildings through cutting into the slope and the planting of

	Moderate and Moderate / Minor include impacts on: arable land within the site; Coltsfoot Close, Harebell Close and Malletts Road residential properties; Fulbourn Road, Yarrow Road, Shelford Road, Fulbourn Hospital. A Major / Moderate adverse impact was identified for Westbourne Farm Cottages.	trees, shrubs and hedges around the edges of the site as set out in the Landscape and Visual Impacts section above. Landscaping mitigation is secured through a number of conditions including **conditions 25 and 52** (hard and soft landscaping), **condition 53** (landscaping implementation), **condition 39** (soft landscaping implementation), **conditions 33 and 69** (details of brown roofs), **conditions 40 and 57** (tree protection) **and condition 59** (flues).
Lighting	Negligible impact from artificial lighting identified,	Artificial lighting schemes are required at detailed and reserved matters stages (**conditions 26 and 50**) to ensure lighting does not adversely impact neighbours and surrounding areas.
Noise & Vibration	Impact of road traffic noise to residential receptors is identified as a Negligible / Minor adverse impact.	It is acknowledged that there may be some noise impact from road traffic however it is not considered to be more than minor and no specific mitigation is identified. No objection was raised by the Environmental Health team in relation to noise impacts.
Socio-Economic, Health & Wellbeing	Some minor and moderate beneficial impacts are identified through employment, access to open space, inclusive design.	The submitted Health Impact Assessment was reviewed and considered to be acceptable. A number of informatives are proposed as discussed in paragraphs 450 and 451 of this report.
Transport	Impacts on the surrounding road network are identified as Negligible / Minor adverse.	The Local Highways Authority is satisfied that the impacts of the development can be mitigated through the mitigation measures to be included in the S106 agreement and conditions for Travel Plan compliance (**condition 30**), the submission of new Travel

		Plan(s) with reserved matters applications (**condition 62**) and updated Transport Assessment(s) (**condition 61**) with reserved matters applications.

Planning balance and conclusion

499. Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). The NPPF is a material consideration which must be taken into account where it is relevant to a planning application. This includes the presumption in favour of sustainable development found in paragraph 11 of the NPPF, which requires approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay.

500. The NPPF lists the three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways to achieve sustainable development.

501. In terms of its economic role, the proposed development will deliver employment led growth on land allocated to deliver appropriate employment proposals. The development will provide employment space for approximately 2,700 employees and during construction it is estimated the development will provide the equivalent of 118 full time jobs

502. In a social role, the proposal will achieve well-designed buildings appropriate to its context in a modern business / technology park. The application includes a trim trail on the site which will be accessible to both employees and members of the public.

503. In an environmental role, the proposal with a building which embraces sustainable construction whilst also minimising energy consumption through its design and use of renewable energy, thus demonstrating a building which is adaptable and resilient to climate change. The proposed development will also provide a net gain in biodiversity and not cause harm to other aspects of the environment such as air, water or soil. The proposals will have an impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and on the adjacent green Belt. However, it is considered that through re-profiling the site and provision of landscape buffers, the harm will be mitigated. The visual effects of the proposals from adjacent properties will also be reduced over time once the trees and hedges have established.

504. The proposed development is therefore, considered to meet the objectives of sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

Recommendation

APPROVE planning permission subject to:

1. The prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 which includes the Heads of Terms (HoTs) as set out in section 482 in this report, and any other HoTs or detail including phasing and triggers, that are still under negotiation. The final wording of any significant amendments to the HoTs listed in the repot to be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair prior to the issuing of the planning permission.

2. The planning conditions specified in this report with the final wording of any significant amendments to these to be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair prior to the issuing of planning permission.

3. The relevant informatives as specified in this report to be included at the discretion of officers.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Condition and Informatives
Appendix 2: Design and Enabling Panel Report

Report Author:

Fiona Bradley – Interim Team Leader
Telephone: 07704 018408