



**Report to:**

Joint Development Control  
Committee

15 December 2021

**Lead Officer:**

Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

---

**20/05040/FUL. – Cherry Hinton (Land to the West of Peterhouse Technology Park, Fulbourn Road, Cambridge, CB1 9NJ)**

Proposal: The erection of a new building comprising E(g) floorspace with car and cycle parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure

Applicant: The Master (or Keeper) and Fellows of Peterhouse in the University of Cambridge

Key material considerations: Principle of development;  
Landscape, townscape, and visual impact  
Design, character and appearance  
Transport, access, and parking  
Amenity  
Ecology and biodiversity  
Carbon reduction and sustainable design  
Flood risk, drainage, and water management

Date of Member site visit: N/A

Is it a Departure Application: No

Decision due by: 24 December 2021

Application brought to Committee because: Major Development

Presenting officer: Guy Wilson, Principal Planning Officer, Strategic Sites

## Executive Summary

1. The site was removed from the Green Belt and allocated for employment use through the Cambridge City Local Plan 2018, subject to consideration of landscape, ecology, and the visual and residential amenity impact of development.
2. An office building with 9,976sqm (square metres) of floorspace (use class E(g)) is proposed for the site, alongside associated parking and landscape works. The principle of development is supported in accordance with the Local Plan 2018. Whilst development of the site will have an adverse impact on localised views, particularly from neighbouring dwelling, this will moderate over time as planting establishes, and is considered to be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.
3. The proposed building is considered to represent high quality design, which provides continuity with the neighbouring ARM A & B development with respect to its scale, massing, and materials. The building adopts a sustainable design, with decarbonised heating, and will achieve BREEAM 'Very Good' for the shell finish, with BREEAM 'Excellent' targeted for the first fit-out.
4. The layout of the site, design of the building, and landscape works will minimise the landscape and visual impact of the proposals and the impact on residential amenity. The proposals will also not harm nearby wildlife site, and the site will achieve a biodiversity net gain.
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.

## Application Update

6. This application was deferred at the JDCC meeting in October 2021. Members raised queries in relation to a number of issues including the impact on neighbours, the landscape and visual impact, transport matters, and drainage. Additional information has been submitted to provide clarification on these matters. Significant changes to the officer report and additional planning conditions are reported in bold in the report below.

## Recommendation

7. Officers recommend that JDCC **approves** this application, subject to consultation with the Secretary of State, completion of a s106 agreement, and the conditions and informatives set out at the end of the report.

## Relevant planning history

8. The following applications are relevant to the site itself:

19/1032/SCRE – EIA Screening request for option S – Proposals would not be EIA development

19/1033/SCRE – EIA Screening request for option T – Proposals would not be EIA development

9. The following nearby applications are considered of particular relevance to the determination of this application:

15/0893/FUL - Land West Of ARM 1, Peterhouse Technology Park (ARM A & B) - Detailed planning application consisting of: the demolition of ARM2; the construction of new buildings for B1 use; two multistorey car parking structures; additional temporary car parking spaces; new cycle parking spaces; hard and soft landscaping works; new internal roads, foot and cycle paths; ancillary and associated facilities and site infrastructure - Granted December 2015

20/04886/SCOP –Technology Park, Fulbourn Road (Cambridge International Technology Park) - Request for a formal scoping opinion for commercial development at Land South of Fulbourn Road, Cambridge

21/00772/OUT –Technology Park, Fulbourn Road (Cambridge International Technology Park) - 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 – Refused November 2021

## Planning policies

### **Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)**

10. 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 document relevant to this site is the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

### **Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended)**

11. 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.

12. 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**

13. 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.

### **14. Cambridge Local Plan 2018**

- Policy 1: The presumption in favour of sustainable development
- Policy 2: Spatial strategy for the location of employment development
- Policy 5: Strategic transport infrastructure
- Policy 8: Setting of the city
- Policy 27: Site specific development opportunities
- Policy 28: Carbon reduction, community energy networks, sustainable design and construction, and water use
- Policy 29: Renewable and low carbon energy generation
- Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle
- Policy 32: Flood risk
- Policy 33: Contaminated land
- Policy 34: Light pollution control
- Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration
- Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust
- Policy 37: Cambridge airport public safety zone and air safeguarding zones
- Policy 38: Hazardous installations
- Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space
- Policy 42: Connecting new developments to digital infrastructure
- Policy 55: Responding to context
- Policy 56: Creating successful places
- Policy 57: Designing new buildings
- Policy 59: Designing landscape and public realm
- Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment
- Policy 69: Protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance
- Policy 70: Protection of priority species and habitats
- Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development
- Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development

Policy 82: Parking management

Policy 85: Infrastructure delivery, planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy

**15. National Planning Policy Framework 2021**

Section 2: Achieving sustainable development

Section 4: Decision-making

Section 6: Building a strong, competitive economy

Section 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities

Section 9: Promoting sustainable transport

Section 12: Achieving well-designed places

Section 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 15: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

**16. Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) and other Guidance**

Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD adopted 2020

Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD adopted 2018

Public Art SPD adopted 2010

Planning Obligations SPD 2014

**17. Greater Cambridge Local Plan**

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.

## **Consultation**

### **Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Team**

Application as submitted

Car and cycle parking

18. 332 cycle parking spaces are proposed, representing 1 space per 30sqm of gross internal floorspace. The TA should demonstrate this is sufficient to accommodate demand should Travel Plan targets be met. Car parking provision is proposed at 217 additional spaces, or 1 space per 46sqm of gross internal floorspace. Given the highly congested surrounding road network, a robust mitigation strategy and high quality Travel Plan should be used to significantly shift the mode share away from car borne trips.

Trip generation and mode share

19. Vehicle trip rates have been formulated from 2018 traffic surveys from the technology park, and typical trip rates for offices calculated using TRICS software, with an anticipated 171 two-way vehicle trips in the AM peak and 187 two-way vehicle trips in the PM peak. Multi modal trip generation has been determined

using data for the technology park obtained in 2013 and compared against data obtained in 2018 for the Cambridge Science Park. If more recent mode share data is available, this should be used.

#### Baseline capacity assessment

20. Additional modelling is required to include the following junctions:

- Cambridge Road/Shelford Road mini-roundabout in Fulbourn
- Gazelle Way/Cherry Hinton Road roundabout
- Cherry Hinton Road/Airport Way junction
- Church Road/Airport Way junction
- A1303 Newmarket Road/Airport Way roundabout

21. Modelling currently accounts for the permitted ARM expansion, Land North of Cherry Hinton, and the Wing development. Modelling should also include the following committed developments:

- Land south of Greenlands and west of Babraham Road (06/0795/OUT)
- Land between Long Road and Shelford Road (07/0620/OUT)
- Cambridge Biomedical Campus (06/0976/OUT)
- Cambridge Biomedical Campus Phase 2 (16/0176/OUT)
- Land north of Worts Causeway (GB1)
- Land south of Worts Causeway (GB2)
- Land south of Fulbourn Road (21/00772/OUT) – East of Peterhouse Technology Park

#### Future capacity

22. Background traffic growth inputs should be provided. The opening year capacity assessment should be pushed back to 2023 as 2021 is an unrealistic opening date. The future year operational assessment should consequently be pushed back to 2028.

#### Application as amended (June 2021)

23. Baseline traffic conditions are agreed, trip generation, and baseline junction capacity are agreed. The data used for background traffic growth is not agreed and clarification is needed on how committed developments have been modelled. The modelling should also account for the proposed fourth arm to the Fulbourn Road/ Yarrow Road roundabout. Car parking provision should be reduced from 197 spaces to 166 spaces to achieve the proposed trip budget.

#### Application as amended (August 2021)

24. Parking provision of 193 spaces, potentially reducing to 166 spaces subject to monitoring of parking demand is agreed.

25. Proposed trip generation rates, assessment of traffic growth and junction modelling are agreed.

## Impact on Highway Network

26. A combination of measures such as implementation of the Travel Plan, limiting car parking provision, designated car sharing spaces, working from home, promoting off-peak travel, and the delivery of sustainable travel infrastructure have been determined to result in a 35% reduction to the development trip generation. These measures are anticipated to reduce the development trip generation to 134 two-way trips in the AM peak and 122 two-way trips in the PM peak. An evidence base has been submitted demonstrating that the percentage reduction figures proposed for each measure are realistic.
27. The impact of the development on the surrounding highway network following a 35% reduction to peak hour trips to consider the above mitigation has been assessed. All junctions are anticipated to operate better during the 2031 with mitigation scenario than during the 2031 baseline scenario.
28. The development's impact on the surrounding network should be controlled by assessments of car parking provision provided on-site. On-site car parking provision should be limited to 193 spaces (1 space per 52sqm). This is the maximum provision that can be delivered whilst ensuring that trip generation for the development in the peak periods does not exceed the development trip generation reduced by 35% demonstrated to have a negligible impact on the surrounding network. The demand and uptake of these car parking spaces should be regularly monitored as part of the Car Parking Management Strategy.

## Multi-modal impact

29. It is anticipated the existing public bus service provision and ARM shuttlebus will be able to accommodate the additional bus users generated by the development both with and without implementation of the Travel Plan.
30. The development is anticipated to generate an additional 32 walking and 95 cycle movements in the peak periods. The number of walking and cycling movements to and from the site will further increase following implementation of the Travel Plan. As noted within previous responses, 24%, 14%, and 12% of cycle trips generated by the development are anticipated to use Cambridge Road, Cherry Hinton Road, and Queen Edith's Way to access the site. Many of the accidents recorded on these links involved cyclists. The developer is willing to provide a S106 monetary contribution towards safety and access improvements for cycle users travelling to and from the development site. This is agreed. The provision of the Fulbourn to Cambridge Greenway by the Greater Cambridge Partnership will provide a safe and direct route from Fulbourn and Cambridge City Centre to the site.

## Mitigation and conclusion

31. The following off-site mitigation package is considered adequate to mitigate the development impact and is in line with the planning tests:
  - Car Parking Management Strategy

- S106 contribution of £20,000 towards parking surveys and any parking controls identified to be required by the parking surveys
- S106 contribution of £361,735 towards the Fulbourn to Cambridge Greenway
- Upgrade the eastbound bus stop on Fulbourn Road to the west of the PTP main site access to comprise a shelter with £10,000 maintenance contribution
- S106 contribution of £18,000 towards the installation and maintenance of a RTPI unit at the eastbound bus stop on Fulbourn Road to the west of the PTP main site access
- Travel Plan (inclusive of bus taster and/or cycle discount vouchers for staff)

32. The Highway Authority does not object to the proposals subject to the mitigation package.

### **Cambridgeshire County Council Highways**

33. Given the size and nature of the proposed development Transport Assessment Team within the County Council should be consulted on this application.

### **Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology**

34. Our record indicate the site is in a landscape of high archaeological potential. Finds of prehistoric worked flint are recorded in the vicinity, and Bronze Age barrows are known to the south of the site. Excavations to the immediate of the site identified Neolithic activity. The War Ditches site to the south west is a defended Iron Age site, with evidence of occupation into the Roman period. We do not object to the proposals however a programme of archaeological investigation should be secured, including a field investigation.

### **Natural England**

35. Whilst the site is within 50m of the Cherry Hinton Pits SSSI, appropriate mitigation measures have been identified to ensure that the development will not have an adverse impact on the special interests for which this site has been notified, primarily four species of nationally uncommon plants and supporting areas of herb-rich chalk grassland.

36. Mitigation including drainage/pollution and dust control measures and biodiversity protection and enhancement should be secured through appropriately worded conditions.

### **Environment Agency**

37. The Environment Agency have no objection. The site is underlain by Zig-Zag chalk Formation which is a principal aquifer and is of moderate sensitivity with potential pollutant/contaminant linkages to controlled waters. If contamination is

found to be present, a remediation strategy should be developed detailing how contamination will be dealt with.

38. Surface water from roofs should be piped direct to an approved SuDS system using sealed downpipes. Only clean, uncontaminated surface water should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer. Surface water from roads and impermeable parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies and passed through an oil interceptor.

### **Lead Local Flood Authority (Cambridgeshire County Council)**

39. The submitted documents demonstrate that surface water from the proposed development can be managed through the use of SuDS features, and surface water will then infiltrate the ground. This is supported by infiltration testing.
40. The site is located within flood zone 1 and is also at low risk from surface water flooding. Overland flows from fields will also be captured in a swale to prevent them being directed to adjacent developed areas.
41. No objection, subject to conditions requiring details of the surface water drainage system, and details of the long term maintenance of the SuDS system.

### **GSCP Sustainability**

42. The development targets BREEAM 'Very Good' for the base build, with BREEAM 'Excellent' targeted through the first fit-out of the office. The BREEAM pre-assessment shows a score of 61.35% (base built) with a potential score of 70.95% (post fit-out), which would take the scheme just of the minimum requirements for BREEAM 'Excellent.' This approach is slightly at odds with policy 28, however particularly given the development futureproofs the scheme with decarbonised heating, the approach is considered acceptable.
43. The building has been designed to reduce heating and cooling demand and uses air source heat pumps for heating and cooling. The brown roofs will reduce the heating and cooling demand as well as improving biodiversity. Overall the proposals are supported
44. Condition to secure BREEAM certification are recommended.

### **GSCP Urban Design**

#### Application as submitted

45. At pre-application stage different massing options were presented to officers, who expressed a preference for the massing to be broken up. However, officers do not object to the layout, scale, and massing of the current proposals, as the massing would be similar to the adjacent ARM A & B development. The architecture of the proposed building is simpler than that of the ARM A & B development, however

the design is considered acceptable given the location of the building closer to sensitive boundaries. A condition should be imposed to ensure the materials are of a high quality.

46. The proposed building layout is logical and flexible allowing different configurations. The southern courtyard is supported, and should include fixed furniture to facilitate outdoor working. The entrance 'plaza' on the north side will provide a good sense of arrival. The detailed landscape and lighting design will be important to the success of this area, and should be secured by condition.
47. The green corridor within the car parking area should be widened to form a more prominent feature. Additional planting and the omission of parking near to the southern and western boundaries will provide a greener edge to these sensitive boundaries.
48. The detailed design of the landscape buffer on the northern end of the site will be important to mitigating any visual impact address residential amenity.

#### Application as amended (June 2021)

49. Officers welcome the proposed changes to the parking provision and site layout plan from a design perspective. The overall design approach is considered to comply with the design objectives set out in Chapter 12 of the NPPF and Policies 27, 55, 56, 57 and 59 of the 'Cambridge Local Plan' (2018). Conditions recommended at the last consultation still applies to the revised scheme.

### **GCSP Landscape**

#### Application as submitted

50. The overall methodology of the LVIA is supported.
51. From the submitted viewpoints there are concerns that the building would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring dwellings, and there appear to be some errors/omissions on the viewpoints. We would question the height of the planting shown at year 15. The route and implications of the gas main and water main also need to be clarified. The landscape buffer should be planted as soon as possible and should include some semi-mature planting.
52. Detailed sections along the northern boundary would be useful to illustrate the distance height difference between existing houses and the proposed building.
53. The car parking does not allow space for planting. As a minimum there should be adequate space for large tree species and ground cover and aisles separated by hedging. Rootcells combined with stormwater drainage features should be used rather than the proposed drainage channels currently proposed.
54. Integration of cycling parking within the main building would have been preferable.

55. The proposed brown roof is supported.

Application as amended (June 2021)

56. The clarification regarding the conclusions of the LVIA are welcomed, however there remain concerns about the planting strategy.

57. Mitigation of the visual impact of development on the neighbouring properties to the north relies on the buffer planting along the northern boundary. There remains some uncertainty regarding the gas easement and confirmation of its dimensions are needed. Christmas trees are proposed adjacent to the easement, to be felled on a 7 year rotation. This species is inappropriate. Further planting should be provided to compensate, potentially by removing some hard paving between the easement and the road, with native species woodland trees used.

58. The 0.5m strip between parking bays does not provide sufficient space for tree planting, particularly with the need to accommodate cabling for EV charging and a filter drain.

Application as amended (August 2021)

59. We can see that further opportunities for tree planting along the northern boundary, particularly in the location of Tweedale, have been taken with additional tree planting along the entrance road. In order to create more of a landscape buffer between the housing and the proposed building, as well as respect the gas main easement, we previously made particular recommendations for the planting. The planting should be intermittent native woodland species planted in clumps such as *Carpinus betulus*, *Acer campestre*, *Alnus* as well as an understorey shrub species such as *Crataegus*. We appreciate that this form of planting will move away from the formal line of tree planting that is currently proposed, but it would create more of a buffer. This change can be shown when the conditions are discharged.

60. We see that the amended car park plan shows a central planting strip amended to be 1m wide to better accommodate tree planting. The car park also shows wheel stops at the head of every bay to stop vehicles bumping into tree trunks. However we note from the amended drainage plan that the perforated pipes beneath the permeable surface in the car park have been moved away from the central planting strips, but still remain within some of the tree planting pits. We will need this drainage/planting arrangement to be covered under the conditions so that we have assurance that the tree planting will take precedent over the drainage system, i.e. that the tree planting will not be sacrificed to accommodate the drainage. This arrangement can be achieved with the use of rootcells with the drainage pipe running through the cells.

61. Conditions are recommended on details of landscape works, landscape maintenance and management, boundary treatments, details of tree pits, and details of the brown roof.

## **GCSP Conservation**

62. It is considered that there are no material Conservation issues with this proposal.

## **Cambridge City Council Ecology**

### Application as submitted

63. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal 2020 update is acceptable. A Biodiversity Net Gain metric (DEFRA V2) should be submitted to calculate the net gain achieved from the proposed development.
64. The comments from Natural England are agreed.
65. The proposed landscaping scheme includes appropriate habitats to compliment adjacent designated sites and farmland. The proposed chalk grassland creation is supported, and details of the species mix should be included in the proposed landscape condition.
66. The landscape plan and management plan should detail how the swale will be constructed and maintained, avoiding importing top soil. Revised plans should show the location of next box provision for swifts and barn owls. Alternatively these could be secured by condition.
67. The proposed lighting strategy will sufficiently reduce artificial lighting along the boundary of the local Nature Reserve. Hours of lighting should be controlled by condition
68. A condition requiring pre development checks for badgers and reptiles would be appropriate.

### Application as amended (June 2021)

69. Content with Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment for the proposal, demonstrating a BNG of at least 15% from the proposed habitat creation and management.

## **Cambridge City Council Environmental Health**

### Application as submitted

#### Construction management

70. Pollution during demolition and construction has the potential to affect the amenity of neighbouring residences if not controlled. In the interests of amenity standard conditions on construction/ demolition / delivery noise/ hours/ and dust should be imposed.

#### Lighting

71. The lighting report only provides detail on street lighting, which will be reviewed the County Council highways team. An artificial lighting assessment is required to establish the impact on neighbouring residences. This can be secured by condition.

#### Acoustic assessment

72. The submitted acoustic assessment provides reasonable plant noise rating limits at the northern and southern boundaries. Plant noise should not exceed background noise limits, and this should be measured from the nearest noise sensitive received.

#### Collections and deliveries

73. Service collections and deliveries, including for waste/recycling should be limited to reasonable daytime hours by a condition.

#### Contamination

74. Based on preliminary desk-based assessments and subsequent targeted site investigations, the contaminated land assessment concluded no further assessment and no remediation is required.

#### Air Quality

75. The site is outside the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) but will generate additional vehicle movements within the AQMA. The development is predicted to increase pollutants at receptor locations, however pollutant levels will remain well below objective levels. The installation of Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCPs) represents suitable mitigation. The building is proposed to have a decarbonised heating and cooling system.

76. The commitment to install 12 EVCPs is welcome however is not considered sufficient. Additional slow charging capacity should be provided, alongside passive provision for remaining spaces.

#### Conditions

77. Conditions are recommended in relation to construction hours, collections during construction, demolition/noise/vibration, dust, plant equipment, lighting, delivery hours, and electric vehicle charging.

#### Further comments on the application as amended (June 2021)

78. The EVCP strategy is based on the provision of 176 permanent car parking spaces and would involve 11 fast chargers, 83 slow chargers, and passive provision for a further 30 space, with capacity in the proposed substation to support these spaces. Whilst this is at the lower end of what would be sought,

given the known capacity issues in this part of the city, it is considered a viable package.

### **Cambridge City Council Public Arts**

79. The application should include a public arts strategy. The applicant should appoint an arts consultant and develop a strategy for a site. The approach and budget should be agreed.

### **Anglian Water**

80. 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.

81. The sewerage system at present has capacity to accept flows from the development.

82. The preferred method of surface water disposal would be for a SuDS system with infiltration, and connection to a sewer seen as the last option. The proposed development does not propose to discharge to Anglian Water assets so there are no comments on surface water management. The Lead Local Flood Authority or Internal Drainage Board should be consulted.

### **Police Architectural Liaison**

83. The application has been reviewed to confirm that community safety and vulnerability to crime has been addressed. Supportive of the measures being undertaken including level of external lighting covering key areas such as car parking, cycle storage and pedestrian routes around the site. No further comments at this time.

### **National Grid/ Cadent Gas**

84. Cadent Gas do not object to the proposal in principle. The high pressure gas pipeline close to the development has an easement in operation. Landscaping with the easement is restricted and must have formal written approval from Cadent Gas prior to commencing works. The developer is to contact Cadent Gas for further guidance before commencing works.

### **Health & Safety Executive (self-service portal)**

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

## **Airport Safeguarding (Marshalls)**

86. The proposed development has been examined from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective and could conflict with safeguarding criteria unless any planning permission granted is subject to conditions removal permitted development rights for cranes and construction equipment, and for submission of a bird management plan prior to commencement.
87. Agree to amended conditions which would allow details of cranes and other works 10m above ground level to be approved by condition, and for the bird hazard management plan to be submitted prior to occupation of the building.

## **Access Officer**

88. The proposals have been reviewed by the Council's Disability Panel who commented:
89. The Panel would like to see sliding (pocket) doors on the accessible WCs as these are easier to manoeuvre from a wheelchair. Within the ground floor core that would be accessible to visitors, the inclusion of a Changing Places cubicle is recommended. These are increasingly becoming a feature in places of work and public buildings and are included within BS8300. The upgrade required from the proposed shower rooms would be minimal and yet it would significantly improve the building's access credentials.
90. This is a very well thought out scheme with an impressive variety of access features proposed. The constraints regarding the gas main and level change that will impact options on entering the building are noted, but the Panel are generally very supportive.

## **Representations from members of the public**

91. Two local residents have individually objected to the proposed development. A petition signed by 32 residents of Ainsdale, Tweedale and Fulbourn Road objecting to the proposal has also been submitted. Objections raised by residents are summarised as:
- The trees and buildings will block or reduce sunlight leading to a loss of light to neighbouring residences.
  - The proposed building would be overlooking neighbouring residences resulting in a loss of privacy.
  - The residential character of Ainsdale and Tweedale will be damaged with a huge building right next to flats, resulting in harm to visual amenity.
  - There will be noise and disturbance, pollution, and odour from the proposed parking.
  - The development will result in traffic generation. The Peterhouse Technology Park along with Adenbrooks area new buildings and increase in personnel have resulted to severely increased traffic in the area, yet there are no plans of new roads, existing roads widening or any infrastructure to alleviate the traffic. The extra employees of the proposed

new building many of whom will drive to work will worsen an already unbearable situation.

- The land in the West of Peterhouse Tech Park is a natural habitat of wild life including squirrels, mice, pheasants, hares, buddleias bush and many kinds of birds. Additionally it is neighbouring the Limekiln Nature Reserve, home of many more different species. The planned building would destroy the natural habitat of the land and will damage the ecosystem of Limekiln Nature Reserve which then will have an enormous building and car park right next to it. The recent ARM A & B development has already disturbed wildlife which would be compounded by further development.
- The proposed landscaping is inadequate to support wildlife.
- The technology park should expand to the south away from residences and the wildlife sites.

92. Residents who have objected, as well as another resident, have also commented on the neighbouring ARM A & B development:

- There is often noise out of hours including alarms at night.
- Vibrations from heavy machinery causing disturbance and property damage.
- Spoil has been left where the new building is proposed, having a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- There is considerable light pollution from the existing ARM building.
- The landscaping has not been finished.
- The multi-storey car park is poor quality and detracts from the character and appearance of the area.

## **The site and its surroundings**

93. The site is a broadly rectangular parcel of land measuring approximately 2.2 hectares (5.4 acres). The site is bordered by Peterhouse Technology Park to the east, and residential development on two streets (Ainsdale and Tweedale) to the north. The site slopes up to the south and west towards agricultural fields to the south and the Cherry Hinton Chalk Pits, Limekiln Close and East Pit wildlife sites to the west.

94. The site is undeveloped, however it has temporarily been used as a construction compound and car park for the construction of the neighbouring ARM A & B development.

95. The existing access road to Fulbourn Road is included within the application site. The access road is formed of two-way streets, with a mini roundabout at the centre of the technology park. Pedestrian footpaths, set back behind a planted verge run alongside the streets.

96. The technology park comprises a series of typically two storey office buildings, together with two multi-storey car parks and further surface parking and landscape works. The site contains approximately 34,500sqm of floorspace, accommodating over 2,000 employees. The majority of existing buildings date from the 1990s, whilst the neighbouring ARM A & B buildings were completed in

2020. The ARM A & B buildings are largely glazed, with vertical metal fins. Older buildings within the technology park are typically buff brick with metal roofs.

97. Neighbouring dwellings to the north are typically two storey, in brick with tile roofs.

98. Land to the east of the technology park is allocated for development in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018). A rhybrid application (21/00772/OUT) for development of the site to provide employment floorspace was recently refused.

## **The proposal**

99. The application is a full planning application for a 3-storey office building (Use Class E(g)) with 9,976sqm of floorspace (GIA – Gross Internal Area). 217 car parking spaces (including 11 accessible spaces), and 332 cycle parking spaces were originally proposed alongside associated landscape and infrastructure works. A cycle store, bin store, and electrical plant enclosures are proposed to the west of the main building.

100. the proposed ground level and finished floor level for the building set at approximately 24m Above Ordinance Datum Newlyn (AOD), and the building is proposed to be approximately 12.7m high, measured from finished ground level.

101. The proposed building would be broadly rectangular in plan with a full height atrium on the eastern side which extends into the centre of the building. The second floor is proposed to be inset behind a terrace which wraps around the building. There will be pedestrian access to the building from all sides. The internal fit-out of the building will be determined by the occupier(s), although the building is anticipated to accommodate approximately 500 employees.

102. The facades of the building are proposed to be predominately glazed with vertical metal to the first floor which extend up to the second-floor balcony. Internal and external plant enclosures will be incorporated within the second floor to maintain a largely flat roof profile, and a brown roof system is proposed.

103. Vehicular access to the site will be through the existing technology park, itself accessed of Fulbourn Road where there is a priority junction with a ghost island. This access will remain unchanged.

104. Surface level car parking is proposed on the western side of the site.

105. In addition to the application form, drawings, and covering letter, this application is accompanied by:

- Design & Access Statement
- Planning Statement
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Transport Assessment
- Framework Travel Plan
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Drainage Strategy

- Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment
- Landscape Strategy
- Sustainability Statement
- Energy Statement
- BREEAM Pre-Assessment
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and SSSI Impact Assessment
- Archaeological Desk Based Assessment
- Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation
- Contaminated Land Report
- Air Quality Assessment
- Acoustic Assessment
- Lighting Strategy
- Fire Strategy
- Tree Survey & Arboricultural Assessment

106. This application follows a pre-application submission made in November 2018.

107. Since submission the proposals have been amended to reduce the proposed level of car parking to 193 car parking spaces (inclusive of 10 accessible spaces), to reconfigure the bin store and substation compound, and to amend the proposed landscape works.

108. Since the application was previously reported to the committee a number of additional/amended documents have been received:

- A Daylight and Sunlight Assessment
- A planning response document including additional visualisations of the proposed building within its context
- Travel Plan Note summarising the proposed travel plan measures
- Updated landscape plans showing the proposed development within the context of the ARM A & B development
- An updated drainage strategy and landscape masterplan to ensure consistency amongst the drawing package.

## **Planning assessment**

### **Principle of development**

109. Other than a narrow strip on the southern boundary, the site is allocated for development in the Cambridge City Council Local Plan 2018, designated as site GB3. Policy 27 of the Local Plan sets out that development of GB3 for employment use will be supported, subject to other policies in the plan and the following site-specific considerations:

- t. excavation of sites to achieve appropriate profile and setting against the Cambridge Green Belt and agricultural land;
- u. the creation of a landscaped buffer where the sites adjoin existing housing;

- v. the early establishment of a generous landscaped edge to the southern side of the sites, including retention and enhancement of existing hedgerows, to help create an appropriate buffer and distinctive city edge between the development, the Cherry Hinton Pit SSSI and the Cambridge Green Belt; and
- w. careful consideration of the design approach to development to ensure that the visual impact on the Cambridge Green Belt, Cherry Hinton Pit SSSI, and neighbouring residential uses is mitigated.

110. The established use of the site is as an agricultural field, however is in temporary use as a construction compound for the neighbouring ARM A & B development.

111. The development is proposed for employment use, specified within the application as Use Class E(g). Use class E(g) comprises offices, research and development, and any industrial uses suitable to be carried out in a residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area.

112. Peterhouse Technology Park is an important employment site within Cambridge, and serves as the headquarters of ARM, a nationally significant technology company who are a leading global designer of computer processors. Whilst the development is not tied to any specific occupier, high quality office accommodation in this location in close proximity to the ARM headquarters is likely to be attractive to ARM itself, or to other employers in related sectors. The provision of employment floorspace here will make a positive contribution to meeting the employment needs of the district, providing a significant number of jobs at both the construction phase as well as housing approximately 500 employees on occupation. Significant weight is attached to the economic benefits of the proposals.

#### Landscape impact and mitigation, design, and amenity

113. Landscape, ecology, design, and the impact on residential amenity are discussed in more detail in the relevant sections of this report below. The site is proposed to be re-profiled to minimise the height of the building, although in order to minimise the need for material to be exported from the site, the extent of excavation is proposed to be limited, with soil excavated from the southern side of the site to be deposited on the northern side.

114. A landscaped buffer is proposed along the northern boundary in order to provide screening to protect residential amenity, and moderate the visual impact of the proposals. The nature and extent of planting proposed close to the boundary is limited by the presence of a high-pressure gas main, and will primarily comprise hedging plants and dwarf apple trees. This will be supported by an avenue of trees either side of the main access. A landscaped edge is also proposed to the southern and western sides of the site, with the transition between the office building, countryside and wildlife site reinforced through the use of extensive tree planting within the car park. The landscape context and character of the surrounding area has been considered in the design of the

proposed building, with the overall height and massing reflecting that of the adjacent ARM buildings and limiting its landscape impact.

115. It is considered that the development complies with each of the site-specific requirements listed in Policy 27 of the Local Plan, as well as the overall requirements of the policy, and therefore the principle of development is acceptable.

116. The site was removed from the Green Belt through the Local Plan in 2018 specifically to meet the strategic employment needs of the district. The development falls within Use Class E which includes a wide range of uses beyond conventional employment uses. For clarity, and to ensure the building continues to meet strategic employment needs, is considered reasonable and necessary to impose a condition restricting the use of the site to those falling within E(g), together with any associated ancillary uses.

### Green Belt

117. A strip of land along the southern part of the site, measuring approximately 6m wide, is within the Green Belt. The only works proposed within this part of the site are landscape works including the provision of a swale.

118. National Planning Policy sets out that most forms of development are inappropriate in the Green Belt, and should only be approved in very special circumstances. Certain forms of development are potentially appropriate within the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it, including engineering operations, and material changes in the use of land (such as for outdoor recreation). It is considered the works proposed within the Green Belt are not inappropriate development, would preserve the openness of the Green Belt, and would not conflict with its purposes. As such these works are considered acceptable.

### Conclusion on principle of development

119. The site is allocated for employment use in the local plan, and the provision of almost 10,000sqm of high-quality office accommodation in this location will make a positive contribution to meeting the employment needs of Cambridge and the Greater Cambridge area, to which substantial weight is attached. Subject to consideration of landscape and visual effects discussed below, the proposed development is considered to fulfil the site-specific requirements set out in Policy 27 of the Local Plan 2018. It is also considered that the proposed landscape and drainage works with the Green Belt would not be inappropriate and would not affect the openness or purposes of the Green Belt. On this basis the principle of development of the site for employment purposes is considered acceptable in accordance with policies 1, 2, 8, 27, 40, 69, & 70 of the Local Plan 2018.

### **Landscape, townscape, and visual impact**

120. The site has historically formed part of an agricultural field. It has recently been cleared and used as a construction compound associated with the adjacent

ARM A & B development, with the site currently formed primarily of scrub and temporary parking. Notwithstanding its current temporary use, the site is typical of the landscape to the south, formed of a gently rolling arable landscape, and is also part of the settlement edge to Cambridge. There are elevated views of the city from Limekiln Road to the south west, however the site and technology park are screened by a combination of the landform and established vegetation. Similarly there are limited views of Cambridge from Wort's Causeway/ Shelford Road to the south east however the rolling landform screen the site and surrounding development.

121. The proposed development and associated landscape works have been designed to include mitigation of potential landscape and townscape impacts. These mitigation measures include continuing the roof height of the neighbouring ARM A & B buildings to ensure the development is well screened within the surrounding countryside, and creation of appropriate landscape buffers to the southern, northern and western edges of the site.
122. A landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and accompanies the submitted application. This concludes that the development will have a slight adverse landscape impact, which in the long term would be reduced to a neutral landscape effect, once boundary planting and landscape works have established.
123. In terms of visual effects, the site is well screened from public viewpoints to the south. Established vegetation and topography also provide a strong visual barrier to views into the site from the Cherry Hinton Chalk Pit and Limekiln Close LNR, screening the site throughout the year from the west. Existing development at the eastern end of the technology park also screen the site from Cambridge Road from the east. It is noted the proposed Cambridge International Technology Park development would further limit any public from the east. As such views into the site are restricted to local views, primarily from Ainsdale, Tweedale, Limesdale Close, and Fulbourn Road. The submitted LVIA concludes that development will have a moderate or slight adverse visual effect from residences and viewpoints on these streets, reducing to slight or negligible effect once boundary and tree planting has established.
124. Following clarification on some of the information within the LVIA with regard to viewpoints, and amendments to the northern boundary planting proposals, officers agree with the conclusions of the LVIA.
125. **Since the deferral of the application the JDCC meeting in October, the applicant has provided additional visualisations to illustrate the impact of the development, with reference to a photograph of the ARM A & B building. These visualisations support the assessment in the LVIA that the proposed building will have a negative impact on views from Ainsdale and Tweedale, as a consequence of views of open countryside being replaced by views of an office building, but that the proposed building will not be unduly dominant and that the impact will reduce over time as intervening hedging and trees mature.**

126. **On the basis of the above it is considered the proposals will have an adverse impact on localised views, particularly immediate neighbours on Ainsdale and Tweedale. It is not considered the development is likely to have a significant impact on wider views. The proposals have been designed to mitigate the landscape and visual effects, including through the use of a stepped back second storey, recessed plant equipment, and the use of metal fins to add visual interest to and break-up the façade. Following earlier amendments, the proposed landscape works will provide layers of trees and vegetation to provide effective screening which will moderate the impact of the development as they mature. Notwithstanding this, there will inevitably be a residual negative impact from the change from open fields to the proposed office building. Therefore in respect to the landscape and visual impact, the proposal is considered to conflict with Local Plan 2018 policies 27, 55, 56, & 57.**

### **Design, character, and appearance**

127. The building is proposed to take a broadly rectangular form and be three storeys, with the third storey set back behind a balcony. Most plant equipment will be located within an enclosure on the third storey, avoiding the need for plant equipment on the rooftop. A glass atrium cuts into the building from the east.

128. The cycle store and other ancillary structures are proposed to be single storey and clad with horizontal timber planks.

129. The proposed design of the building largely follows that of the neighbouring ARM A & B buildings, which similarly have a setback third storey, glass atrium's running east-west, concealed plant enclosures, and metal fins. The general layout is typical of modern edge-of-centre office developments, with an open floorplan, built around a central circulation space and service cores. Whilst the architectural treatment of the building will be simpler than the neighbouring ARM A & B development, the design is considered appropriate for the site.

130. The proposed landscape works complement the building design, with pedestrian access provided east-west through the site, providing connectivity with neighbouring office buildings. The entrance plaza to the north will provide a clear entry point for visitors, whilst the southern courtyard will provide occupiers with a social space for breaks and informal meetings, away from nearby residences. The extensive planting proposed within the site will also serve to soften the proposed development, and provide a transition to woodland to the west and countryside to the south.

131. The plans show the building is designed to a shell finish with the internal fit out a matter for future occupiers. This approach to its design provides flexibility by allowing it to be occupied by either a single or multiple occupiers, as well as supporting the building's adaptability to future needs.

132. The building takes account of principles of inclusive design, with step free access from all sides of the building, and level access throughout the building other than within the atrium where a lift will be required due to the difference in

ground levels to the east. Accessible WCs and shower rooms are also proposed at all levels.

133. The Council seeks the delivery of public art from new developments, to ensuring a high-quality public realm, to reinforce local distinctiveness and identity. The application outlines a public art strategy whereby an art installation will be delivered, likely on the estate road. As no further details are available at this stage, a condition is recommended requiring submission of a detailed public art strategy.

134. Overall, the proposals are considered to represent a high quality of design in accordance with Local Plan 2018 Policies 55, 56, 57 & 59

## **Transport, access, and parking**

### Access and highways impact

135. The primary access to the site for vehicles and pedestrians is from Fulbourn Road via the existing Peterhouse Technology Park private access road, which comprises a two-way street with pedestrian footpaths on either side. The main Fulbourn Road access is in the form of a right turn ghost island priority-controlled junction. No changes are proposed to this access. There is also a secondary pedestrian access to the west of this, adjacent to the Cambridge Water offices, and again no changes are proposed to this access.

136. The proposed development would continue the existing access road west, into the proposed car park. Vehicle tracking has been provided which shows service vehicles can safely manoeuvre within the site, as well as entering and exiting in a forward gear.

137. There are a shared cycle/pedestrian path on Fulbourn Road on both sides of the carriageway to the west of the site access. The path on the southern side of the carriageway terminates west of the access, but continues towards Fulbourn on the northern side.

138. The nearest bus stops are located on Fulbourn Road in front of the Cambridge Water offices, just under 400m walking distance from the centre of the site. The Citi 3 bus service stops here, providing a frequent service (approximately every 20 minutes on weekdays) to Cherry Hinton and Fen Ditton via the city centre. The bus stops currently do not have shelters, although a shelter and Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) unit will be installed on the westbound stop, delivered by the neighbouring ARM A & B development. A free shuttlebus for ARM employees also currently operates between Ely, Cambridge Railway Station, and the Technology at weekday peak hours.

139. The applicant has produced a transport assessment, which includes an assessment of the likely traffic generation from the development and modelling of junction capacity in the vicinity of the site, and which has been updated following consultation with the County Council. This assessment of future scenarios takes

account of background traffic growth as well as the following planned developments:

- Peterhouse Technology Park - ARM A & B (15/0893/FUL)
- Land north of Cherry Hinton (18/0481/OUT) - 1200 dwellings
- Wing development (S/2682/13/OL) - 1300 dwellings and associated land uses
- Land south of Greenlands and west of Babraham Road (06/0795/OUT) - 270 dwellings
- Land between Long Road and Shelford Road (07/0620/OUT) - 2,300 dwellings, plus other facilities (500 dwellings unoccupied)
- Cambridge Biomedical Campus (06/0976/OUT) - Up to 215,000sqm of B1b/D1 use unoccupied
- Cambridge Biomedical Campus Phase 2 (16/0176/OUT) - Up to 75,000sqm of B1/D1 and A1-A4 use unoccupied
- Land north of Worts Causeway (GB1) - 200 dwellings
- Land south of Worts Causeway (GB2) - 230 dwellings
- Cambridge International Technology Park (21/00772/OUT) – 56,473sqm gross floor area of commercial floorspace

140. This is considered to represent a robust assessment of likely future traffic generation within south and east Cambridge.

141. The development is anticipated to generate 171 two-way trips in the AM peak, and 187 two-way trips in the PM peak, as well as 20 bus trips, 95 cycle trips, and 32 walking trips in peak periods.

142. The following junctions have been modelled for the 2031 scenario, both with and without development:

- The site access junction
- Fulbourn Road/ Yarrow Road roundabout
- Queen Edith's/ Limekiln Road priority junction
- Queen Edith's/ Fulbourn Road signal junction
- Cambridge Road/Shelford Road mini-roundabout in Fulbourn
- Gazelle Way/Cherry Hinton Road roundabout
- Cherry Hinton Road/Airport Way junction
- Church Road/Airport Way junction
- A1303 Newmarket Road/Airport Way roundabout

143. The modelling suggests all junctions will operate over capacity in 2031 in both with/without development scenarios. The site access junction is anticipated to operate over capacity by the 2028 future scenario during the PM peak, however this will only affect vehicles exiting the Technology Park and will not affect the operation of Fulbourn Road.

144. To mitigate the impact of the development, a number of measures are proposed comprising implementation of a Travel Plan, limiting car parking

provision, designating car sharing spaces, and delivery of sustainable travel infrastructure.

**145. Mitigation measures have been developed in consultation with the County Council as the Local Highways Authority. They are underpinned by a sustainable transport hierarchy which prioritises measures to support walking and cycling, followed by public transport, in order to promote active lifestyles, and to reduce carbon emissions and cut congestion caused by private vehicle use.**

**146. This package has also been considered within the wider context, although it is important to emphasise that any mitigation measures must be compliant with the CIL regulations, including being proportionate and necessary to mitigate the impact of the development itself. It is not appropriate to seek mitigation to seek to address pre-existing issues or the impact of other developments.**

147. The package of mitigation measures includes planning obligations for:

- £361,735 towards improved cycle infrastructure to support modal shift, which will be used to support the delivery of the Cambridge to Fulbourn Greenway.
- £10,000 towards maintenance of a bus shelter (to be delivered directly by the applicant) on the eastbound Fulbourn Road stop west of the site access, and £18,000 towards installation and maintenance of a RTPI unit at the bus stop.
- £20,000 towards the design and implementation of a parking controls within the vicinity of the site, if parking surveys demonstrate this is required.

148. This package of mitigation is anticipated to reduce trip generation from the development by 35%, to 134 two-way trips in the AM peak, and 122 two-way trips in the PM peak. All junctions modelled are anticipated to operate better in this mitigation scenario than during the 2031 baseline scenario. Subject to the package of mitigation measures to be secured by way of planning conditions and a s106 agreement, the Local Highways Authority have no objection to the proposals.

**149. Alongside the above package of measures, the application is accompanied by a framework travel plan. The full travel plan, including periodic reviews to ensure it is effective is proposed to be secured by way of condition. Travel plan measures proposed at this stage include:**

- **Travel Pack and personalised travel planning**
- **Promotion of the Cycle to Work scheme**
- **On-site cycle servicing**
- **Provision of pool-cycles**

150. On this basis, and subject to suitable conditions, the proposals are not considered likely to have an unacceptable impact on highways safety or result in

a severe residual cumulative impact on the road network. As such the proposals are considered acceptable in accordance with paragraphs 110-113 of the NPPF 2021 and Local Plan 2018 policies 80 and 81.

### Parking

151. A total of 330 cycle parking spaces are proposed, equivalent to approximately one space per 30sqm GIA, in compliance with the cycle parking requirement in the Local Plan 2018. This is also well in excess of the estimated number of daily commutes by cycle (approximately 125). The majority of spaces are proposed to be located within a cycle store to the south west of the main building, approximately 50m walking distance from the western and southern building entrances. 66 spaces are proposed to be provided through Sheffield type stands, including 24 visitor spaces at the entrance plaza. The other 264 spaces are proposed to be provided in two-tier stands. Shower blocks and lockers are proposed to be delivered as part of the fit out, the location of which is to be confirmed and determined by the specification of the future occupier. A condition is recommended to require submission of details of the final cycle store layout and provision of shower and changing facilities to ensure adequate cycle parking provision and high quality facilities.
152. The Local Plan sets a maximum level of parking for office developments of 1 space for every 40sqm GIA. Since submission the application has been amended to provide 193 car parking spaces in total, or one space for 52sqm GIA, of which 27 will be 'monitor and manage spaces' which can easily be removed in the future, subject to the effectiveness of Travel Plan measures. If all the monitor and manage spaces are removed, the overall car parking provision would fall to 166 spaces, or one space for every 60sqm GIA. This equates to 2/3 of the maximum level of parking allowed under the Local Plan. 10 accessible parking spaces are proposed, 4 of which will be located at the entrance plaza for use by visitors. Space for up to 12 motorcycles is also proposed within the car park.
153. The proposed level of parking reflects the accessibility of the site by sustainable means, the proposed measures to support modal shift, whilst also acknowledging that it is not in a city centre location. It is considered to represent an acceptable balance between restricting parking to promote modal shift and limiting the potential for parking to be displaced to surrounding streets. The provision of 'monitor and manage' spaces, and a requirement for parking surveys to be undertaken will provide a robust mechanism to further refine this balance once the development is occupied.
154. Overall the level of car and cycle parking is considered acceptable in accordance with Local Plan 2018 policies 80, 82, and 83.

### **Amenity**

#### Overlooking and privacy

155. There are a number of neighbouring dwellings to the north which have private gardens and rear elevations facing the site, with more limited views through to other dwellings on Tweedale, Ainsdale, and Limedale Close. The land slopes down to the north, with neighbouring dwellings at a lower level than the development site, with ground level for the nearest dwellings being approximately 21m AOD (3m below the proposed ground level for the building).
156. **The proposed development has been designed to limit any overlooking or loss of privacy experienced by these neighbours, with the building proposed to be set back towards the southern side of the site. The proposed metal fins will provide screening between the building and nearby dwellings. The separation distance between the proposed building and the nearest dwellings will range from approximately 36m to 39m, which is considered sufficient to limited actual and perceived overlooking of the dwellings from occupiers of the proposed building.**
157. **The element most likely to give rise to concerns over loss of privacy is the terrace proposed at second floor level. Since the application was last reported to committee, an additional condition is proposed which would restrict access to the north facing part of the second floor terrace to maintenance purposes only, in order to avoid any potential loss of privacy.**
158. The proposed landscape works will further limit the potential for overlooking or any loss of privacy, albeit this effect will be reduced in winter. Existing and proposed hedging in particular will also limit any loss of privacy experienced as a result of staff walking to the site or through the car park.
159. Overall, and subject to appropriate conditions, it is considered the development proposal is not likely to result in any significant overlooking or loss of amenity for nearby residents.

#### Sunlight and daylight

160. The application is supported by shading analysis which shows the proposed building will not result in a significant loss of direct sunlight, with overshadowing limited to a short period in midwinter. At approximately 36m or more, the separation distance to neighbouring dwellings will also ensure there is no significant loss of daylight at any time of the year from the proposed building.
161. **Since the application was last reported to committee, the applicant's have provided a detailed sunlight and daylight analysis, undertaken in accordance with BRE guidance and using a full range of assessment mechanisms for assessing the impact on daylight and sunlight within dwellings, namely Vertical Sky Component, No-Sky Line/ Daylight Distribution, Average Daylight Factor, Annual Probably Sunlight Hours. Sun-on-Ground analysis has also been used the assess the likely impact on gardens. This analysis has looked at all dwellings along the northern boundary of the site where there is potential for overshadowing.**

162. **This proposed development has been assessed as satisfying all of these methodologies with respect to all dwellings other than 6 Tweedale, with no noticeable change to daylight or sunlight levels. For 6 Tweedale, there is a measurable impact on two south-facing ground-floor rooms when assessed under the No-Sky Line methodology. These ground floor rooms are part of a rear extension and are relatively deep at 6.7m and 5.2m. However as stated in the report, BRE guidance acknowledges that breach of the No-Sky Line methodology may be unavoidable in these circumstances where there are deep rooms with no side windows. 6 Tweedale also passes the relevant criteria under all other methodologies used in the assessment. On this basis it is considered any loss of daylight and sunlight to 6 Tweedale is likely to be minimal.**

163. **Planting is proposed between the building and nearby dwellings. Due to the gas main easement, planting close to the boundary will be limited to hedging plants and dwarf apple trees which will grow to a height of approximately 3m. As a consequence, and given deciduous tree species are proposed, the proposed planting is not likely to result in a significant loss of direct sunlight or daylight.**

164. Overall the proposals are not considered likely to result in significant overshadowing or loss of daylight to neighbouring residences.

#### Operational noise and disturbance

165. The proposed development will inevitably result in an increased levels of noise and disturbance compared to neighbouring residences to the north, primarily from employee parking and refuse collections. Given the proposed use of the building, vehicle movements are likely to be largely limited to the daytime with access to the site early in the morning and at night likely to be very limited. Buffer planting along the northern boundary of the site will also provide some mitigation.

166. The refuse store is proposed to be located approximately 70m away from the nearest dwelling which will limit noise from collections. The Council's Environmental Health Officers have recommended hours of deliveries and collections be restricted to between 7am and 11pm on weekdays, and 8am and 1pm on Saturdays, with no deliveries on Sundays and public holidays.

167. Operation noise from the building itself is likely to be primarily limited to noise from any exposed plant equipment. Plant equipment is proposed to be located at first floor level and will therefore be largely shrouded by the roof, limiting the potential for noise to the nearest dwellings. The Council's Environmental Health Officers have recommended a condition requiring noise insulation to plant equipment to restrict noise levels. There is some potential for noise and disturbance from use of the balcony, as well as the car park and greenspace within the site. Given the proposed use of the development, noise and disturbance is likely to be limited, and largely restricted to standard working hours.

168. 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.

#### Construction management

169. The development site is in close proximity to a number of dwellings along Ainsdale and Tweedale, with limited vegetation providing screening. The site is also adjacent to a number of nature conservation sites which are potentially vulnerable to construction impacts.

170. A number of conditions have been recommended by the Council's Environmental Health Team. These would restrict deliveries, collections, demolition, and construction work to between the hours of 8am and 6pm on weekdays, 8am and 1pm on Saturdays, and at no time on Sundays and public holidays. The recommended conditions would also seek to control dust and noise and vibration and from piling and other works. It is proposed to consolidate most of these conditions into a single Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan as set out in the list of recommended conditions below. Although there will inevitably be some residual disturbance, given the temporary nature of the construction period, it is considered these measures will adequately mitigate the impact of the development during the construction phase on nearby residences, as well as controlling the wider environmental impacts of construction.

#### Air quality

171. The site is outside of the Cambridge Air Quality Management Area, and air quality within the site and its vicinity is not likely to present a significant risk to occupiers. As the proposed development will use decarbonised heating and cooling, the primary potential source of emissions from operation of the development will be from motor vehicles.

172. The application is accompanied by an air quality assessment, which concludes the site is not individually likely to result in a significant increase or worsening of air quality. Cambridge is however subject to a Air Quality Action Plan due to poor air quality, with one of the Action Plan measures being a requirement that 50% of parking spaces at non-residential developments have access to a slow charge point.

173. The delivery of larger scale electric vehicle charging infrastructure can be restricted by electrical distribution network capacity, due to the high electrical loads required to service a large number of charging points. Following discussion with the power network operator, the applicant has secured substation capacity to enable provision of 11 fast chargers (7.5kw) and 83 slow chargers (3.5kw), with capacity passive provision for 30 further spaces. This represents active provision to approximately 49% of parking spaces, including the 'monitor and manage' spaces. This package, which is proposed to be secured by condition, is considered sufficient mitigation of the impact of the development on air quality within the Cambridge Air Quality Management Area.

### Artificial lighting

174. An external lighting proposal has been submitted which includes details of lighting proposed for the site access road and car park. The Council's Environmental Health Officers have commented that further details are required to establish the impact of the proposed lighting on the surrounding environment.
175. The lighting assessment is proposed to be secured by way of condition, and this is considered necessary and appropriate to ensure artificial lighting does not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents.

### Contamination

176. The site has historically been used for agriculture, with recent development over much of the site and its use as a temporary construction compound for adjacent ARM A & B development.
177. A Contaminated Land Interpretative Report has been submitted following an earlier desk study and intrusive investigation. The site investigation included soil sampling, round gas and groundwater monitoring, and laboratory soil analysis. The intrusive investigation identified made ground above limited topsoil with chalk below. No source of contamination which poses a risk to human health has been identified, and it was also conclude that there is a low risk to controlled water from materials at the site. The report also sets out that any waste soil from the site which needs to be disposed of is likely to be classified as non-hazardous and would need to be disposed of at an inert landfill site.
178. Although the risk of contamination is considered low, the Environment Agency have recommended a precautionary condition setting that development should cease and a suitable remediation strategy be prepared in the event that any unsuspected contamination is found.

### Waste and recycling

179. 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. Bin stores with capacity for 14 1,100 litre bins are proposed, providing sufficient capacity in accordance with BN 5906:2005 (Waste management in buildings), based on waste being collected three times a week. 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.

### Gas Pipelines

180. There is a high pressure gas pipeline which runs along the northern and western sides of the site. If disturbed during or after construction, this could present a hazard to workers on site as well as nearby residents. Cadent Gas, who are responsible for the pipeline have not objected to the proposal. The Health and

Safety Executive also do not advise against the development. There is an easement in operation to protect the pipeline, and the proposed landscape works have been designed in accordance with Cadent's guidance on tree planting restrictions, which require no planting within 2m of a pipeline, and only certain species such as dwarf apples within 3-6m of a pipeline. On this basis the proposed development is not considered to represent a significant hazard in relation to the protection of the gas pipeline.

#### Airport Safeguarding

181. The site is within the designated Air Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport. The proposal have been reviewed by the airport operator who have recommended restrictions on using cranes during construction, which has been incorporated into the proposed DCEMP, as well as a condition requiring submission of a bird management plan, to limit the likelihood of species such as gulls which present a hazard to air traffic from nesting at the site. Subject to these conditions, the risk to airport operations is considered to be adequately mitigated.

#### Conclusion on amenity issues

182. Overall in relation to the above amenity issues, both during construction and operation, the development is considered acceptable in accordance with Local Plan policies 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37.

### **Ecology & biodiversity**

#### Site conditions

183. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal including site survey was undertaken in 2017, and an updated Appraisal has also been produced following a field survey in May 2020. The survey found the site was primarily formed of poor quality semi-improved grassland, as well as a small area of ephemeral vegetation and hardstanding.

184. A number of ash trees on the western boundary of the site are recorded as having bat roosting potential. The provides some potentially suitable bird nesting habitats in the form of hedgerows and areas of potential ground nesting habitat. Peregrine are also recorded as breeding in the neighbouring Cherry Hinton Chalk Pits site. The hardstanding and areas of bare ground within the site represent potentially suitable reptile habitat. Reptile surveys were undertaken in 2012 and 2017 with reptiles recorded.

#### Nature sites

185. The site is in close proximity to a number of designated nature conservation sites. The nearest of these are the Cherry Hinton Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), as well as the East Pit Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and Limekiln Close LNR. The three sites are designated for their areas of herb rich chalk grassland and nationally rare plants. The two LNRs are also designated as nesting and feeding grounds for a wide range of bird species.

186. A SSSI impact assessment has been undertaken, which has also considered potential impacts on the neighbouring LNRs. No direct impact on any of the nature sites is expected. The impacts of construction, including noise and dust are considered to have potential to disturb the peregrine who are known to nest in the adjacent LNRs, and it is recommended no major works take place during the breeding season (March to May). Other potential indirect impacts on the SSSI have been assessed including shading, air quality, drainage, the introduction of invasive plant species, light spillage, and recreational pressure with no likely significant effects anticipated, subject to standard construction management measures and an appropriate species mix for soft landscape works.

### Trees

187. There is established woodland bordering the western boundary of the site. There are also broken areas of hedging and some trees along the northern boundary of the site. A Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application which classifies the woodland as Grade 'B' and trees and hedging to the north as grade 'C' or 'U.' No trees are proposed to be removed, and temporary protective fencing is proposed. The restrictions on development along the northern and western boundaries due to the presence of the gas mean these trees are unlikely to be affected by the proposed works during construction.

### Mitigation and enhancement

188. There is considered a low likelihood of reptiles being present within the site, and a method statement for the removal of vegetation is recommended. It is also recommended that development takes place outside of the bird breeding season (March to May). Clearance of vegetation should also take place outside of the bird breeding season. The site also provides a potentially suitable habitat for badgers, with a survey in 2017 identifying no setts, but finding a single latrine in the north of the site. A further badger survey is recommended prior to commencement of development, together with appropriate mitigation if badgers are present.

189. The ecological assessment recommends mitigation measures including the retention of hedgerows, provision of an ecological buffer on the western side of the site, incorporation of bird boxes into the scheme, and the lighting scheme being designed to avoid light spill. The Council's Ecologist has commented they are satisfied with the proposed lighting scheme, however hours of operation for the lighting should be controlled by condition.

190. Following a request from the Council's Ecology Officer, the applicants have submitted a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment using the DEFRA Metric 2.0. This has used the baseline condition of the site prior to its current temporary use as a construction compound, an approach which is supported. Subject to the appropriate management and maintenance of created habitats, the development is calculated as likely to lead to a 15% net biodiversity gain.

191. Overall, subject to the mitigation measures outlined above and contained in the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, the development is not likely to have an unacceptable adverse impact on any nature conservation sites or protected species, and is likely to result in a net biodiversity gain in accordance with Local Plan policies 27, 57, 59, 69, 70, & 71.

### **Carbon reduction and sustainable design**

192. The application is accompanied by a Sustainability Statement as well as a BREEAM pre assessment. The BREEAM pre assessment sets out the building will target BREEAM 'Very Good' for the base build, whilst also targeting all mandatory credits necessary to achieve BREEAM Excellent, with an estimated score of 61.35%. The intention is then to achieve BREEAM 'Excellent' through the fit out of the building, with a potential score of 70.95%. This approach has been reviewed by the Council's Sustainability officer and is considered acceptable. Conditions can be applied to the permission to ensure the development achieves BREEAM 'Excellent' through the first-fit out.

193. Vertical fins together with low g-value glazing are proposed which is calculated to reduce cooling demand by 51% against a notional building constructed to comply with Building Regulations Part L, which will reduce energy use from operation of the building. Alongside this the development takes a decarbonised approach to heating and cooling, with use of air source heat pumps.

194. The submitted sustainability statement also calculates the estimated operation carbon emissions against the baseline Building Regulations Part L requirement. Using the current Building Regulations methodology (SAP 20212), the building would achieve a 25.3% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions, rising to 29% once the uses of renewable and low carbon technology is considered. Under the draft SAP 10 methodology (which takes account of recent progress in grid decarbonisation), the building would achieve a 15.3% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions against the Part L baseline, rising to 34.8% once renewable and low carbon technology has been considered.

195. Overall, subject to conditions relation to BREEAM certification, the proposals are considered to achieve an acceptable standard of sustainable design and construction in accordance with Local Plan policies 28 and 57

### **Flood risk, drainage, and water resources**

196. The site is fully within Flood Zone 1 where there is a low risk of flooding from rivers. Environment Agency mapping shows the site to be at low to very low risk of surface water flooding. The applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment which examines the risk of flooding from all sources. This states that the underlying chalk geology is prone to groundwater flooding, with anecdotal evidence of historic groundwater flooding in Fulbourn (2.8km from the site).

197. The surface water drainage system will use a series of SuDS features for attenuation including swales, porous paving, and underground attenuation tanks,

with water disposed of via infiltration. The use of infiltration is supported by infiltration testing which has been conducted on the site. Infiltration testing indicated groundwater levels are more than 10m below the surface, providing significant clearance between infiltration features and the water table. The surface water drainage system has been designed to not flood in 1-in-30 year or 1-in-100 year storm event, including a 40% allowance to account for increased rainfall expected as a consequence of global heating.

198. The proposed drainage strategy reflects national and local policy, and is supported by the Lead Local Flood Authority. The proposed development is not likely to increase the risk of flooding within the site, or nearby, and as such is considered acceptable.

199. The site is not within a groundwater Source Protection Zone. EA mapping does show it is within a principal aquifer. The Environment Agency have commented on the need to ensure contaminated water is not allowed to infiltrate into the ground, both during construction and during operation. It is considered this can be adequately controlled through the imposition of conditions relating to construction management and to address any unanticipated pollution, as well as a condition requiring details of pollution control features to be incorporated into the surface water drainage system.

200. **Since the application was last reported to committee, additional drawings have been submitted showing how the proposed landscape drainage strategy relates to that of the neighbouring ARM A & B. This includes the proposed interceptor swale which continues the line of the existing interceptor swale for ARM A & B.**

201. On this basis the development is considered acceptable in relation to flood risk and water management in accordance with Local Plan policies 32 and 59

### **Heritage & archaeology**

202. The site is not in close proximity to any designated heritage assets. A desk-based heritage assessment has however been undertaken which has concluded the site has high potential for prehistoric remains, moderate potential for Roman remains, and low potential for non-agricultural remains from other periods. The current temporary use of the site will have likely resulted in the loss of any artifacts within the topsoil, although below ground archaeological features are likely to remain undisturbed.

203. Due to the archaeological potential of the site, the County Council has agreed a Written Scheme of Investigation involving a detailed excavation of the site. The intrusive investigation has already commenced, and a condition is recommended to secure the outstanding elements of the archaeological works. Subject to this the proposals are considered acceptable in accordance with Local Plan 2018 Policy 61.

## **Planning Obligations**

204. Planning obligations can be used to mitigate the impact of a development and to which would otherwise render a development unacceptable. Local Plan policy 81 sets out reasonable and proportionate financial contributions and mitigation measures will be required where necessary to make the transport impacts of the development acceptable. The following mitigation is proposed to be secured through a s106 agreement:

- A Car Parking Management Strategy involving car parking surveys for a minimum of 5 years post-occupation.
- £20,000 towards the costs associated with consultation, scheme design, and implementation of a managed or other car parking scheme if demonstrated to be required by the car parking surveys.
- £361,735 towards strategic transport infrastructure in the vicinity of the site, including the Fulbourn to Cambridge Greenway.
- £10,000 towards the maintenance of the bus shelter to be installed at the eastbound stop on Fulbourn Road to the west of the main site access
- £18,000 towards the installation and maintenance of a Real Time Passenger Information display unit at the eastbound bus stop on Fulbourn Road to the west of the main site access.

205. These obligations are considered necessary to minimise motor vehicle trip generation by the development and to mitigate the impact of the development on the surrounding highways network. They will support the use of public transport and active travel, and also assist in managing parking demand within the vicinity of the site. The obligations are also considered to be a reasonable and proportionate package of measures which reflect the scale of the proposed development and its likely impact on the highway network. As such these obligations are considered to comply with Local Plan 2018 policies 81 and 85, and the statutory tests set out in regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy regulations.

## **Environmental Impact Assessment**

206. 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 which includes an assessment of likely effects and identifies appropriate mitigation. Under Schedule 2 of the regulations, non-residential proposals including urban development of over 1ha should be 'screened' by the local authority to consider whether it is likely to have significant environmental effects.

207. Two applications seeking screening opinions (19/1032/SCRE, 19/1033/SCRE) on two development options considered at the pre-application stage have submitted, for proposals of between 7,186sqm and 9,863sqm of employment floorspace. As the development had been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal accompanying the Local Plan, and given the scale of the development and sensitivity of the site and surrounding land uses, Officers considered that the

development was not likely to result in significant environmental effects and as such is not EIA development.

208. The application includes a slight increase of floorspace at 9,976sqm. It is however not considered the current proposals are substantially different from the proposals considered under application 19/1032/SCRE or 19/1033/SCRE, nor has there been any consequential change in policy or the site context which would require the Council's earlier assessment to be revisited. The application is accompanied by a number of reports which assess the likely effects of the development in relation to a number of issues including landscape, water resources, and wildlife sites, etc. It is considered the proposals are not likely to result in any significant environmental effects, and as such the proposals are not considered to be EIA development.

### **Planning balance and conclusion**

209. 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.

210. As set out above, limited conflict has been identified with Local Plan 2018 policies 27, 55, 56, 57, & 59 with respect to the landscape and visual impact of the proposed development. This conflict however has to be weighed against the benefits of the development, and considered within the context of the policies of the plan as a whole, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in Policy 1. As set out above, the site is allocated for employment use within the Local Plan, and complies in all other respects with the requirements of Local Plan Policy 27.

211. The site is allocated for employment use and the proposed development will deliver significant economic benefits, accommodating approximately 500 employees and assisting in meeting strategic employment needs, with the site being an attractive location for employers in technology and related sectors due to its proximity to employers such as ARM. Alongside this the moderate adverse visual effects of the development will only be experienced by a limited number of residences to the north of the site, and will reduce in the long-term once trees and hedging have established. Similarly the landscape effects will also be reduced in the long-term.

212. Given the benefits of the proposals, and the limited landscape and visual harm identified, the proposals are considered to represent a sustainable development the benefits of which outweigh the identified landscape and visual harm. Officers also consider the proposals to be acceptable in all other respects. It is recommended planning permission is granted.

213. **The Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2021 sets out that any proposals for inappropriate major development in the Green Belt should be referred to the Secretary of State prior to determination. Although only part of the site is within the Green Belt, and the proposed works are limited, it is recommended that the application is referred to the Secretary of State prior to determination.**

## **Recommendation**

214. **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to;

- a. The prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with delegated authority to officers to negotiate, secure and complete such an Agreement on the terms set out within this report and any others considered appropriate and necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; and
- b. 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.; and
- c. The relevant informatives as set out in Appendix 1 to be included at the discretion of officers.
- d. **The prior consultation on the application with the Secretary of State in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2021.**

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1: Conditions and Informatives

## **Report Author:**

Guy Wilson – Principal Planning Officer (Strategic Sites)  
Telephone: 07714 639 829