



Planning Committee Date	05 March 2025
Report to	Cambridge City Council Planning Committee
Lead Officer	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
Reference	24/03964/FUL
Site	Land at 6-7, 8, 9-11, 13, 14-16 Mercers Row Cambridge
Ward / Parish	Abbey
Proposal	<p>A hybrid application for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Detailed (full) application for two buildings to be used for Mid-Tech Purposes within Use Class E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2, B8 including details of access, parking, servicing, landscaping, staff amenity area, boundary treatment and associated works.b) Outline permission with all matters (save for access) reserved for the demolition of existing units and erection of up to 5,700 sq. m (GIA) of commercial floorspace within a range of buildings for Mid-Tech (Use Classes E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2, B8), Industrial (Use Classes B2/B8), and Community facilities (Use Classes E) and Sui Generis uses comprising MOT Testing Centre, Vehicle Repairs
Applicant	Wrenbridge LLP and Cambridge City Council
Presenting Officer	Michael Sexton

Reason Reported to Committee	Third party representations Land within ownership of the Council
Member Site Visit Date	Anticipated 03 March 2025, (TBC)
Key Issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Principle of Development;2. Design, Layout, Scale and Landscaping;3. Impact on Heritage Assets;4. Highway Impacts;5. Parking Provision;6. Residential Amenity;7. Other Matters
Recommendation	APPROVE subject to conditions / S106

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The application is for a hybrid permission for:
- a) Detailed (full) application for two buildings to be used for Mid-Tech Purposes within Use Class E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2, B8 including details of access, parking, servicing, landscaping, staff amenity area, boundary treatment and associated works; and
 - b) Outline permission with all matters (save for access) reserved for the demolition of existing units and erection of up to 5,700 sq. m (GIA) of commercial floorspace within a range of buildings for Mid-Tech (Use Classes E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2, B8), Industrial (Use Classes B2/B8), and Community facilities (Use Classes E) and Sui Generis uses comprising MOT Testing Centre, Vehicle Repairs
- 1.2 The site lies in an existing industrial estate which is protected by Policy 41 of the Local Plan. However, the proposed uses in both phases are considered to be acceptable on the site and Officers consider that the scheme is acceptable in principle.
- 1.3 The scheme has been part of multiple pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority and Officers consider that the proposed scheme has a well thought out design that would result in a positive improvement to the area. It is considered that the scheme would not result in any harm to the nearby heritage assets.
- 1.4 Officers consider that sufficient car and cycle parking would be provided and the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the safety of the public highway.
- 1.5 There are third party comments objecting to the scheme in relation to impact on heritage assets, noise and disturbance to local residents and parking provision. It is considered that these can be overcome by way of appropriate conditions. Third party comments in support have also been received.
- 1.6 Officers consider that the application is compliant with the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and recommend that the Planning Committee approve the application, subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement to be delegated to Officers.

2.0 Site Description and Context

None-relevant		Tree Preservation Order	
Conservation Area	Adj	Local Nature Reserve	Adj
Listed Building	Adj	Flood Zone	1

Building of Local Interest	Adj	Green Belt	Adj
Historic Park and Garden		Protected Open Space	Adj
Scheduled Ancient Monument		Controlled Parking Zone	
Local Neighbourhood and District Centre		Article 4 Direction	

*X indicates relevance

- 2.1 The application relates to part of an existing industrial estate along Mercer's Row, which lies to the north of Newmarket Road. The site is bounded by the railway line to the south east and Stourbridge Common to the north. Over the railway line lies some residential properties. To the south and west lie commercial buildings which form part of the wider industrial estate. The site forms part of a wider protected industrial site which falls under Policy 41 of the Local Plan.
- 2.2 The site lies immediately adjacent to the Riverside and Stourbridge Conservation Area. The site lies within the setting of the Grade I listed Chapel of St Mary Magdalene (The Leper Chapel) which is located approximately 100 metres to the south, however, it is physically separated from the site by the railway, other built form and dense planting. The site also lies within the setting of the Barnwell Junction Station Platform Building which is a Building of Local Interest (BLI) which is located approximately 30 metres to the east.
- 2.3 Stourbridge Common, which borders the northern part of the site, is a designated Protected Open Space and a City Wildlife Site, County Wildlife Site and Local Nature Reserve. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) however part of the site is at risk of surface water flooding.
- 2.4 The Phase One area of the Site extends to approximately 1.23ha. It currently comprises the vacant and cleared DS Smith Paper Recycling Depot and an area of open storage to the north. The Site did include a two-storey office element by the entrance with associated car park. All the buildings have been demolished pursuant to Prior Approval: 23/04457/PRIOR
- 2.5 The Phase Two area of the Site extends to approximately 1.32ha. It currently comprises self-storage, a children's soft play centre and nursery and a grocery delivery centre. There is also a telecom mast opposite the entrance to the DS Smith Recycling Centre.

3.0 The Proposal

- 3.1 The application is seeking planning permission for a hybrid application for:
- a) Detailed (full) application for two buildings to be used for Mid-Tech Purposes within Use Class E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2, B8 including details

of access, parking, servicing, landscaping, staff amenity area, boundary treatment and associated works; and

- b) Outline permission with all matters (save for access) reserved for the demolition of existing units and erection of up to 5,700 sq. m (GIA) of commercial floorspace within a range of buildings for Mid-Tech (Use Classes E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2, B8), Industrial (Use Classes B2/B8), and Community facilities (Use Classes E) and Sui Generis uses comprising MOT Testing Centre, Vehicle Repairs.

- 3.2 The full element of the application (Phase 1) relates to Nos.9-11 Mercer's Row and would involve the erection of two buildings for mid-tech following the demolition of the existing recycling centre, which was done in August 2024. Both units would have a depth of 63 metres and a width of 37 metres. They would be characterised by a saw tooth roof with a maximum height of 15 metres. PV panels would be installed on the sloped roofs. Each unit would have a warehouse with reception and end of journey facilities at ground floor with a mezzanine level above for office space. Associated parking, service yards and landscaping would be provided.
- 3.3 The outline element of the application (Phase 2) relates to Nos.6-8 and 13-16 Mercer's Row and seeks outline permission with all matters reserved, except for access, for the demolition of the existing units and the erection of commercial buildings for Mid-Tech, Industrial, Commercial and Sui Generis uses. The indicative plans demonstrate two new buildings and a pocket park. The access to the site would be from the west along Mercer's Row.
- 3.4 The application has been amended to address representations and further consultations have been carried out as appropriate.

4.0 Relevant Site History

Reference	Description	Outcome
<u>Nos.6-7</u> C/94/1001	Change of use from building and civil engineering contractors (sui generis) to light industrial (B1c) or storage or distribution (B8)	Perm 13.04.1995
<u>No.8</u> 17/1326/FUL	Reinstatement and repairs to existing fire damaged unit, including introduction of new cladding to exterior walls and roof and reinstatement of an up and over door	Perm 25/09/2017
<u>No.8</u> 05/0420/FUL	Change of use from use Class B1(b) to use Class D2 including external changes to the building	Perm 23.06.2005

<u>No.8</u> 04/1242/FUL	Change of use from B1(b) (Business) to B1, B2 (General Industrial) or B8 (Storage and Distribution) in the alternative	Perm 09.02.2005
<u>Nos.9-11</u> 23/04457/PRIOR	Prior approval for the demolition of all existing buildings on the Site	Prior Approval Not Required 18.12.2023
<u>Nos.9-11</u> C/74/0461	Erection of building for the sorting and baling of waste paper, maintenance and repair of vehicles and ancillary purposes	Perm 27.11.1974
<u>Nos.12-13</u> 11/1432/FUL	The Replacement of buildings with new buildings for taxi firms offices, call centre, workshop and carwash, and restroom, snack bar and smoking area	Refused 13.02.2012
<u>Nos.13-16</u> C/00/1063	Change of use from builders storage yard (sui generis) to storage (B8) use by siting 100 containers on site, with ancillary landscaping and office	Perm 15.12.2000

4.1 The scheme has been subject to extensive pre-application discussions with officers of the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service.

5.0 Policy

5.1 National

National Planning Policy Framework 2024
National Planning Practice Guidance
National Design Guide 2021
Environment Act 2021
Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017
Equalities Act 2010
Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20) Cycle Infrastructure Design
Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

Policy 1: The presumption in favour of sustainable development
Policy 2: Spatial strategy for the location of employment development
Policy 4: The Cambridge Green Belt
Policy 5: Sustainable transport and infrastructure
Policy 9: Review of the Local Plan
Policy 28: 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: Human health and quality of life
Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust
Policy 37: Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone and Air Safeguarding
Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space
Policy 41: Protection 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 the public realm
Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of historic environment
Policy 62: Local heritage assets
Policy 65: Visual pollution
Policy 67: Protection of open space
Policy 69: Protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance
Policy 70: Protection of priority species and habitats
Policy 71: Trees
Policy 73: Community, sports and leisure facilities
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

5.3 Neighbourhood Plan

N/A

5.4 Supplementary Planning Documents

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020
Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016
Health Impact Assessment SPD – Adopted March 2011
Landscape in New Developments SPD – Adopted March 2010
Open Space SPD – Adopted January 2009
Public Art SPD – Adopted January 2009
Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009

5.5 Other Guidance

Riverside and Stourbridge Common conservation area

6.0 Consultations

6.1 Access Officer – No Objection

6.2 Happy comments have been included in the Design and Access Statement.

6.3 Anglian Water – No Objection

6.4 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 planning permission be granted.

6.5 Cambridge City Airport – No Objection

6.6 Provides crane advice (informative).

6.7 Conservation Officer – No Objection

6.8 The proposal would not cause harm to designated heritage assets, namely the Riverside and Stourbridge Conservation Area and the Chapel of St Mary Magdalene (Leper Chapel). The proposal would not harm the significance of the non-designated heritage asset (being the signal box beside the railway east of the site as a building of local interest).

6.9 Designing Out Crime Officer – No Objection

6.10 Appears to be an acceptable layout providing high levels of natural surveillance where pedestrian and vehicle routes are aligned and well overlooked it appears staff and visitor safety has been considered.

6.11 Advise the applicant to consider submitting a secured by design commercial application as believe this development could achieve the accreditation with discussion.

6.12 General guidance provided on Secured by Design and several matters including security and crime prevention, lighting, glazing, access and movement, and CCTV.

6.13 East West Rail – No Objection

6.14 The application does not fall within the safeguarded area and is therefore not covered by the Safeguarding Directions.

6.15 Ecology Officer – No Objection

6.16 Recommend conditions for Ecological Sensitive Lighting Scheme, Construction Ecological Management Plan, Biodiversity Net Gain and Nest Boxes

6.17 Object to proposed access link to Stourbridge Common Local Nature Reserve (LNR).

6.18 Given it is recognised that such a link could have 'potential adverse significant impact' on the LNR, this element of the proposals should not be considered or relied upon in determining the applications, without further survey works to explore impacts on the woodland belt, grassland, soil hydrology, lighting implications etc.

6.19 Environment Agency – No Comments

6.20 No comments to offer.

6.21 Environmental Health – No Objection

6.22 Recommend conditions for:

- Land Contamination
- Materials Management Plan
- Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan
- Commercial Operational Noise Impact Assessment / Mitigation (including plan)
- Commercial Extraction Discharge Ductwork
- Cooking Oduor
- Operational Hours
- Delivery Hours
- Servicing and Operational Noise Minimisation Management Plan
- Artificial Lighting
- B8 Use (restriction)
- EV Charging Point
- Gas Risk Assessment
- Piling Risk Assessment
- Construction Method Statement

6.23 Recommend an informative relating to the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.

6.24 Health and Safety Executive – No Comment

6.25 The development does not provide a relevant building for comment (residential or educational accommodation).

6.26 Historic England – Comment

6.27 Concerned that the application would affect, to some degree, the way in which the grade I listed chapel is experienced and appreciated in the context of its wider setting. Therefore, conclude that this would result in a level of harm to the significance of the heritage asset that we would judge to be less than substantial in NPPF terms.

6.28 It would therefore fall to the Local Planning Authority to carry out the weighing exercise pursuant to paragraph 208 of the NPPF and be satisfied that the development would deliver sufficient public benefit to outweigh that harm.

6.29 However, the visual impact might be mitigated if the cladding was to be finished in a darker colour than that which is currently being proposed that would be less eye-catching and recessive relative to the chapel.

6.30 Historic Environment Team (Archaeology) – No Objection

6.31 Existing site works are likely to have truncated any surviving archaeological remains within the development area (reinforced by the geoenvironmental report submitted), therefore no comment or objection to the scheme.

6.32 Landscape Officer – No Objection

6.33 Recommend conditions for Hard and Soft Landscaping, Tree Pits, Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan, and Biodiverse Roofs.

6.34 Lead Local Flood Authority – No Objection

6.35 Recommend conditions for a surface water drainage scheme and measures to deal with surface water run-off during the construction phase. Informatives relating to pollution control and construction of surface water maintenance are also recommended.

6.36 Local Highways Authority – No Objection

6.37 Recommend conditions relating to Falls and Levels (of roads and pavement areas within the site that abut the public highway) and a Traffic Management Plan. An informative relating to works to or within the public highway is also recommended.

6.38 Ministry of Defence – No Objection

6.39 The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) Safeguarding Team represents the Ministry of Defence and has no objection to the proposed development.

6.40 Natural England – No Objection

6.41 No significant adverse impacts on statutory protected nature conservation sites or landscapes.

6.42 Section 106 Officer – No Objection

6.43 Seeks to secure an “Employment and Skills Strategy” and “Employment and Skills Strategy Monitoring Regime”.

6.44 Sustainability Officer – No Objection

6.45 Recommend conditions BREEAM Design Stage certifications, BREEAM Post Construction Certification, BREEAM Future Compliance, Grey water, Rainwater harvesting, Water Calculator, and Implementation of the Site Wide Sustainability Strategy.

6.46 Transport Assessment Team – No Objection

6.47 Recommend a condition to secure the provision and implementation of a Travel Plan.

6.48 Request Section 106 to secure the following:

- A contribution of £372,000 to the GCP Cambridge Eastern Access Proposals for active travel improvements on Newmarket Road;
- A study of options to improve access to the site and their deliverability to be produced by the applicant prior to commencement. The results of this study to include but not be limited to the provision of dropped crossings and additional waiting restrictions on Swanns Road, Mercers Row and Garlic Row. These results to be agreed with the LPA and LHA and implemented by the applicant prior to occupation as part of S278;
- A contribution of £10,000 towards the installation by CCC of additional waiting restrictions in the area of Mercers Row, Swanns Road and Garlic Row and the area in the vicinity of the site if required;

6.49 Trees Officer – No Objection

6.50 Recommend conditions to secure an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection plan, and the implantation of the approved tree protection methodology.

6.51 Urban Design – Support

6.52 Recommend conditions to secure details of external materials, a sample panel for the main external cladding, and to include the Design and Access Statement as an approved document.

6.53 Waste Team – No Objection

6.54 Recommend a condition to secure a Controlled Waste Regulations 2012 (CWCR).

6.55 Disability Panel Meeting

6.56 During pre-application discussions the proposals were not presented formally to the Disability Panel but were subject to discussion and review with Mark Taylor (Access Officer). These comments and inclusive access arrangements have been incorporated into the design of the development, as set out in the Design and Access Statement, as noted in Section 7.1.

As set out above, the approach is supported by the Council's Access Officer.

6.57 Design Review Panel Meeting of 27 June 2024

6.58 Summarise conclusion

6.59 The Panel welcomed early pre-application engagement and were able to provide comments on a range of matters, generally supportive of the approach to the site, offering suggestions for the applicants design team to take away and developer further through on-going engagement:

- Connectivity: The concerns around the possible route and the siting of the community gathering space have led the Panel to suggest that as part of the application and the illustrative masterplan, there could be a consolidation of vehicular access points.
- Landscape: The Panel agreed that the site's landscape design should be led by ecology, and taking a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) approach.
- Masterplan: The provision of an attractive community gathering space from the outset is crucial for employees, and to attract the type of mid-tech businesses that are to be sought. Suggestion that the design team considers whether the north eastern 'end' of the masterplan should have more of a sense of 'arrival', and a campus-type character.
- Sustainability: BREEAM 'Outstanding' target has been referred to and is welcomed; further engagement with the Council's Sustainability Officer intended.

6.60 A copy of the review letter is attached in full at appendix 2.

7.0 Third Party Representations

7.1 Three representations of support have been received, citing the following reasons:

- Increase employment opportunities for local people.
- Provide much needed space for businesses and technology companies.
- Positive improvement on a tired industrial estate.

8.0 Member Representations

8.1 None

9.0 Local Interest Groups and Organisations / Petition

9.1 Camcycle has made a representation objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Failure to align with Policy 80, which supports sustainable travel.

- Fails to provide basic investment and commitment required to support active travel.
- 9.2 Cambridge Past Present and Future has made a representation objecting to the application on the following grounds:
- Impact on Grade 1 Listed Chapel (Cambridge Leper Chapel, also known as the Chapel of St Mary Magdalene).
- 9.3 A representation has been received on behalf of the Residents of Barnwell Junction objecting to the application on the following grounds:
- Height impact and insufficient landscaping to soften.
 - Security alarms causing nuisance.
 - Lighting impact, including vehicles.
 - Solar panel reflection.
 - Overlooking from CCTV to residential properties.
 - Construction impacts, including piling.
- 9.4 A representation has been received on behalf of the Riverside Area Resident Association objecting to the application on the following grounds:
- Shortfall in on-site parking provision and resulting impact on surrounding streets.
- 9.5 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

10.0 Assessment

10.1 Principle of Development

10.2 Policy 2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 states that there is a particular emphasis of growth of the Cambridge Cluster of knowledge-based industries building on existing strengths in 'knowledge-based' activities. Proposals that help reinforce the existing high technology and research cluster of Cambridge will be supported. Employment development will be focused on the urban area, Areas of Major Change, Opportunity Areas and the city centre.

10.3 The application proposes new employment land within the Mid-Tech industry. Mid-Tech is defined within the Greater Cambridge Employment and Housing Evidence Update by Icení (2022) as 'typically combines a former 'mixed B' type unit including manufacture with dry/tech labs and storage space and can be crucial to life science supply chain'. Subsequently, it is considered that the proposed use of mid-tech would support the existing knowledge based activities. The site is located within an urban area. As such, the proposal is compliant with Policy 2 of the Local Plan.

- 10.4 Mercer's Row falls within a protected industrial site and so Policy 41 applies. Policy 41 states that within protected industrial sites development that would result in the loss of floorspace or land within use class B or sui generis research institutes will not be permitted.
- 10.5 The Council has accepted that Mid-Tech constitutes B uses within the Icen Report. In terms of the full element of the application, the existing paper recycling centre was not a B use or a research centre. Whilst the loss of the recycling centre would have resulted in the loss of jobs, it is considered that this was a low number and the proposals would lead to an increase of employment on the site.
- 10.6 The Icen Report states that 'Demand has risen for manufacturing, light industrial, warehousing and mid tech space'. However, it states that this is 'crowding out space for warehousing and light industrial, both of which have strong requirements for Cambridge residents.
- 10.7 At present, Phase 2 seeks approval for flexible uses including Mid-Tech, and Industrial along with Sui Generis comprising MOT Testing Centres and Vehicle Repairs. It is considered that these flexible uses would allow warehousing and light industrial to occupy these units if the demand allowed.
- 10.8 The Sui Generis would allow for some of the existing uses within the wider industrial estate to be relocated following redevelopment. This has been limited within the submitted documentation to 500 square metres (Transport Technical Note). As this use has the potential to have a different impact on the area in terms of vehicular movements and noise it is considered reasonable to restrict the amount of this use to 500sqm, as per the basis of supporting technical notes.
- 10.9 Phase 2 would also provide a nursery/soft play centre which would fall outside of the uses within Policy 41. However, Unit 8 currently provides this use and so this would allow the use to be retained within the area.
- 10.10 As Phase 2 of the proposal would involve the demolition of a nursery/soft play centre then Policy 73 would apply. Table 8.2 of the Local Plan identifies a 'creche, day nursery or playgroup' as a community facility. Policy 73 states that the loss of a community facility will only be permitted if it demonstrated that the facility/site can be replaced within the new development. Phase 2 would allow for the provision of replacement nursery/play centre and this can be secured by way of condition.
- 10.11 In addition, the applicant has agreed to accept a Planning Obligation for an Employment and Skills Plan which require the submission of a site-wide strategy for encouraging employment and training opportunities.

10.12 Subsequently, it is considered that the proposal would comply with Policies 2, 41 and 73 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and the development is acceptable in principle.

10.13 Design, Layout, Scale and Landscaping

10.14 Policies 55, 56, 57 and 59 seek to ensure that development responds appropriately to its context, is of a high quality, reflects or successfully contrasts with existing building forms and materials and includes appropriate landscaping and boundary treatment.

10.15 The existing site is relatively run down and does not act as a positive contribution to the visual amenity of the surrounding area. As such, it is considered that redevelopment of the site would have a positive visual impact.

Overall scheme

10.16 Whilst the application has been submitted as a hybrid application with 2 phases, they have been developed as one place. It is considered that the overall approach for the layout of both phases successfully creates transformative potential of the site while respecting the special qualities of the sites most sensitive edges. Through the more innovative spatial arrangement and the strong focus on creating a people friendly environment, an engaging street scene and places for social interactions and landscape, it is considered that the scheme would act as an enabler for positive change.

10.17 The overall layout would create a street based layout that would create a clear distinction between the public fronts and more private backs screening servicing and parking from the public realm.

10.18 Together, it is considered that both Phases would not result in any significant adverse landscape and visual effects either at year 1 or year 15, subject to a suitable mitigate strategy.

Phase 1

10.19 Full planning permission is sought for Phase 1 and the proposal includes the erection of two buildings with a footprint of 2,331sqm each. Both would be characterised by a saw tooth roof with a maximum height of 15 metres.

10.20 It is considered that the arrangement of the two buildings would deliver a meaningful portion of the new car free arrival space and would support good place making and the activation of adjacent streets and key spaces.

10.21 Both buildings would have a large footprint. The proposed saw tooth roof is considered to create a strong vertical rhythm that breaks down the massing of the large footprint and contributes and would create a rich and

layered fabric as seed from outside the site from Stourbridge Common and Newmarket Road.

- 10.22 Whilst the buildings would be tall, the 'Accurate Visual Representations' contained within the Landscape and Townscape Visual Impact Assessment (LTVIA) demonstrates that the proposed buildings do not compete with the overall height of the trees on Stourbridge Common or detract from their prominence within their surrounding context.
- 10.23 The overall approach to the design of the elevations is supported in urban design terms. The predominant proposed external materials of the two buildings are to be a profiled waved cladding which would allow for the creation of depth, texture and visual interest to the large façade. The colour of the cladding would be different but harmonious views of red oxide, the final shades and details of which can be secured by way of condition.
- 10.24 It is considered that there would be a good overall balance between hard and soft landscaping and the overall design approach for landscaping is supported. The final details of which, including implementation and maintenance, can be secured by way of condition.

Phase 2

- 10.25 Notwithstanding that the details for Phase 2 are reserved, the submitted Design and Access Statement includes a parameter plan, master plan and key design principles. It is considered that if these principles are followed, the scheme would result in high quality design of the final scheme. The outline parameter plan would 'lock in' the key spatial structuring elements fixing the location and size of the main public open space. These elements can be secured by way of listing the design and access statement an approved document.
- 10.26 The visual representations within the Landscape, Townscape, and Visual Impact Assessment (LTVIA) show a wireline view of Phase 2 based on the maximum height. It is considered that the scale parameter provides a comfortable starting point for the detailed design of future reserved matters applications.
- 10.27 The Local Planning Authority have been made aware that since the publication of the submitted LTVIA several trees near the site have been removed. It is understood that these were removed due to the low health of the trees. The applicant has submitted an addendum to the LTVIA to show updated views following the removal of the trees. It is considered that the removal of these trees does not change the results of the LTVIA and does not result in any further harm on the surrounding area created by the development.
- 10.28 Overall, the proposed development is a high-quality design that would contribute positively to its surroundings and be appropriately landscaped.

The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57 and 59 and the NPPF.

10.29 Trees

- 10.30 Policy 59 and 71 seeks to preserve, protect and enhance existing trees and hedges that have amenity value and contribute to the quality and character of the area and provide sufficient space for trees and other vegetation to mature.
- 10.31 The application is accompanied by Arboricultural Impact Assessments for Phase 1 and Phase 2.
- 10.32 The Phase 1 proposal would require the loss of trees with limited long term value. However, the more significant trees and those of value to the adjacent Local Nature Reserve are to be retained and replacement planting is proposed to mitigate the loss of canopy cover. The Council's Tree Officer has raised no objection to Phase 1, subject to conditions relating to the submission of an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.
- 10.33 Less detail has been provided in regard to Phase 2, being an outline element, and there are concerns with the potential impact of the proposed path from the corner of Swanns Road and Mercer's Row on existing trees. It is also important that the height of the building at the northern edge should be limited to allow existing trees to over sail and reach the canopy potential. Notwithstanding these concerns, there is no objection in principle to Phase 2.
- 10.34 Prior to determination of any reserved matters application relating to Phase 2, a more detailed Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been requested by the Council's Trees Officer to allow full assessment of the impact on the trees. This can be secured by way of condition and is considered appropriate given that Phase 2 is in outline form only at this stage.
- 10.35 Subject to conditions as appropriate, the proposal would accord with policies 59 and 71 of the Local Plan.

10.36 Heritage Assets

- 10.37 The application lies adjacent to the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area. The application is within the setting of The Chapel of St Mary Magdalene (Leper Chapel) which is a Grade I Listed Building and Barnwell Junction Station Platform Building which is a Building of Local Interest (BLI).
- 10.38 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that a local authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving features of special architectural or historic

interest, and in particular, Listed Buildings. Section 72 provides that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

- 10.39 Para. 212 of the NPPF set out that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Para. 213 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significant of a heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.
- 10.40 Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) requires development to preserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets, their setting and the wider townscape, including views into, within and out of the conservation area. Policy 62 seeks the retention of local heritage assets and where permission is required, proposals will be permitted where they retain the significance, appearance, character or setting of a local heritage asset.
- 10.41 The proposal has the potential to impact the Leper Chapel and Conservation Area through an increased scale of development within their setting. The LTVIA includes views to assess these impacts.
- 10.42 In views from Stourbridge Common within the Conservation Area, the Phase 1 buildings would be more visible than the pre-existing low rise structures. There would be elements of the scheme that would be glimpsed between the trees, however, they would still be screened to a large extent by the trees and as the buildings would sit below the established tree line it is considered this element of the development is not a serious concern in relation to the setting of the Conservation Area.
- 10.43 The development would be visible in the backdrop of the Leper Chapel when viewed from Newmarket Road. The proposed buildings would be taller than the existing, however, their ridge would continue to appear well below the chapel roofline and as such, they are not considered to overly dominate or detract from the listed building.
- 10.44 It is considered that the Phase 1 buildings have been orientated and detailed to respond to the heritage sensitive views and to mitigate harmful impacts. However, careful consideration of the final materials and PV specification would be important to minimise reflectivity and glare and to ensure the recessive qualities of the buildings are maintained. This can be secured by way of conditions.
- 10.45 The Phase 2 wireline on the views indicate the full extent of the development and this would be most visible from Stourbridge Common in view 16, although it would still be largely behind the trees. There would also be clear visibility of the upper parts of Phase 2 beside the Leper Chapel. There is concern that the three largest buildings would coalesce with cumulative negative impacts to the Conservation Area and Listed

Building, however, it is noted that the design principles within the Design and Access Statement address this stating 'Special consideration should be given to views from Stourbridge Common and Newmarket Road' which is considered to mitigate harm. It is noted that Cambridge Present, Past and Future have similar concerns in regards to the coalescence of the three buildings. However, the final details of Phase 2 are reserved and the impact of these buildings on the heritage assets will be considered in full at the reserved matters stage.

- 10.46 It is noted that Historic England considered that the proposal would affect, to some degree, the way in which the Grade I Leper Chapel is experienced concluding it would result in less than substantial harm. However, no further comment was provided on the re-consultation referring to the Council's Conservation Officer, who themselves have state stated that it would cause no harm to the heritage assets.
- 10.47 Should the development be considered to result in harm to the Grade I Leper Chapel, this would be the lower end of less than substantial harm. In that situation, paragraph 215 of the NPPF would require the harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The benefits of the scheme would include additional mid-tech floorspace, increased employment opportunities, the positive redevelopment of a relatively run down brownfield site, and a net gain in biodiversity.
- 10.48 While Officers do not consider there to be harm to the Grade I Leper Chapel, it is considered that the public benefits would in any event outweigh any identified harm and comply with paragraph 215 of the NPPF.
- 10.49 It is considered that the scheme would not have an impact on the immediate setting of the Barnwell Junction Station Building which is a BLI which is a railway setting and the proposal would not alter this.
- 10.50 It is considered that the proposal, by virtue of its scale, massing and design, would not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or the setting of listed buildings or other heritage assets. The proposal would not give rise to any harmful impact on the identified heritage assets and is compliant with the provisions of the Planning (LBCA) Act 1990, the NPPF and Local Plan policies 60 and 61.

10.51 Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design

- 10.52 The Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020) sets out a framework for proposals to demonstrate they have been designed to minimise their carbon footprint, energy and water consumption and to ensure they are capable of responding to climate change.
- 10.53 Policy 28 states development should take the available opportunities to integrate the principles of sustainable design and construction into the design of proposals, including issues such as climate change adaptation, carbon reduction and water management. The same policy requires new

non-residential buildings to achieve full credits for Wat 01 of the BREEAM standard for water efficiency and the minimum requirement associated with BREEAM excellent for carbon emissions.

- 10.54 Policy 29 supports proposals which involve the provision of renewable and / or low carbon generation provided adverse impacts on the environment have been minimised as far as possible.
- 10.55 The application is supported by an Energy and Sustainability Statement, Preliminary BREEAM Assessment, Urban Greening Factor drawing and Whole Life Carbon Assessment.
- 10.56 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Sustainability Officer who raises no objection to the proposal subject to conditions relating to carbon reduction technologies and water efficiency.
- 10.57 The Phase 1 buildings would include a range of measures that would achieve a BREEAM outstanding rating.
- 10.58 The applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance and compliant with Local Plan policies 28 and 29 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

10.59 Biodiversity

- 10.60 The Environment Act 2021 and the Councils' Biodiversity SPD (2022) requires development proposals to deliver a net gain in biodiversity following a mitigation hierarchy which is focused on avoiding ecological harm over minimising, rectifying, reducing and then off-setting. This approach is embedded within the strategic objectives of the Local Plan and policy 70. Policy 70 states that proposals that harm or disturb populations and habitats should secure achievable mitigation and / or compensatory measures resulting in either no net loss or a net gain of priority habitat and local populations of priority species.
- 10.61 In accordance with policy and circular 06/2005 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation', the application is accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment Report for both Phases and a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment.
- 10.62 The site lies adjacent to Stourbridge Common, which is a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and City Wildlife Site. Whilst the development would not be located within this designated area, there is the potential for demolition, construction, drainage or lighting impacts on the site and the site is considered as High Suitability, continuous, high quality habitat likely to be used regularly by community bats. The Impact Assessment Report has been reviewed by the Council's Ecology Officer who has stated that given the low ecological value of the existing site, it is deemed that the development proposals are acceptable, subject to conditions that presume

the presence or protective species on the adjacent reserve and provide appropriate mitigation. The recommended conditions require the submission of an Ecological Sensitive Lighting Scheme and a Construction Ecological Management Plan.

- 10.63 The Ecology Officer's objection to an access link to Stourbridge Common is noted. However, this element does not form part of the current application. The link is shown for illustrative purposes only to demonstrate that the layout of the site could accommodate one, should such a link be desired and agreed with all relevant landowners/parties at a later point, with appropriate ecological considerations.
- 10.64 The proposal has the potential to provide a significant onsite Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) through planting and landscaping on a developed site with a very low baseline. The final details can be secured by way of the statutory condition.
- 10.65 In consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer, subject to appropriate conditions, officers are satisfied that the proposed development would not result in adverse harm to protected habitats, protected species or priority species and achieve a biodiversity net gain. Taking the above into account, the proposal is compliant with 57, 69 and 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

10.66 Water Management and Flood Risk

- 10.67 Policies 31 and 32 of the Local Plan require developments to have appropriate sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems and minimise flood risk. Paras. 159 – 169 of the NPPF are relevant.
- 10.68 The site is in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore considered at low risk of flooding. However, part of the site is at risk of surface water flooding.
- 10.69 The applicants have submitted a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy.
- 10.70 The Local Lead Flood Authority has advised that the submitted documents demonstrate that surface water can be managed. The applicant has also provided a detailed maintenance plan. Subject to conditions relating to a detailed surface water drainage scheme and submission of details indicating how additional surface water run-off from the site will be avoided during construction works.
- 10.71 Anglian Water has advised they have no objection to Phase 1 of the development and advises that the applicant consult them in regards to Phase 2.
- 10.72 The applicants have suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, and subject to conditions the proposal is in accordance with Local Plan policies 31 and 32 and NPPF advice.

10.73 Highway Safety and Transport Impacts

- 10.74 Policy 80 supports developments where access via walking, cycling and public transport are prioritised and is accessible for all. Policy 81 states that developments will only be permitted where they do not have an unacceptable transport impact.
- 10.75 Para. 116 of the NPPF advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- 10.76 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.
- 10.77 The application proposes the stopping up of the existing highway to create a car free space. Access to Phase 1 would be south of Building 2. The Urban Design Officer supports this access as it rationalises access and movement for vehicles away from the end of Mercers Row. The Access for pedestrians and cyclists within the site is greatly improved over the existing situation, shifting the balance from the end of Mercers Row from a vehicle dominated hard space to a people focussed place.
- 10.78 The application has been reviewed by the County Council's Transport Assessment Team who conclude that the proposal would result in an uplift of vehicular movements and active travel movements to and from the site. They consider that no mitigation for the vehicular trips would be required.
- 10.79 In order to mitigate the impact of active travel trips to the site, the Transport Assessment Team have requested mitigation package including a contribution to the GCP Cambridge Eastern Access Proposals for active travel improvements on Newmarket Road, submission of a study of options to improve access to the site, the results of which are to inform highway improvements which would be requested under a S278 application and a contribution towards the installation of additional waiting restrictions in the area if required. These elements can be secured by way of a legal agreement. In addition, they request a Travel Plan is secured by way of condition. These mitigation measures are considered reasonable.
- 10.80 The Local Highway Authority have raised no objections subject to mitigation measures that can be secured by way of condition. These measures include levels of the access road and the submission of a Traffic Management Plan.
- 10.81 Subject to conditions and S106 mitigation as applicable, the proposal accords with the objectives of policy 80 and 81 of the Local Plan and is compliant with NPPF advice.

10.82 Cycle and Car Parking Provision

Cycle Parking

- 10.83 The Cambridge Local Plan (2018) supports development which encourages and prioritises sustainable transport, such as walking, cycling and public transport. Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) requires new developments to comply with the cycle parking standards as set out within appendix L which for business states that two cycle spaces per 5 staff members or 1 per 30 sqm for office space, 1 space for every 3 members of staff for general industry and on merit for storage and other B use classes. To support the encourage sustainable transport, the provision for cargo and electric bikes should be provided on a proportionate basis.
- 10.84 A total of 74 cycle spaces would be provided for Phase 1 which includes 8 visitor spaces and 4 cargo bike spaces. The site plan demonstrates that these would be spread throughout the site with the visitor spaces being located to the front of unit 2.
- 10.85 The comments from Camcycle relating to the position of cycle spaces are noted. Since the receipt of these comments, visitor cycle spaces have been provided to the front of the units. Otherwise, the cycle spaces are located close to entrances to the buildings and are as, if not more, convenient as the car parking spaces.
- 10.86 The proposed cycle parking provision is supported. Phase 1 will be 100% Sheffield stands, which is supported as they are the most inclusive and convenient form of cycle stand. End of trip facilities of showers, changing facilities and lockers are proposed. The details of the cycle parking can be conditioned to ensure all these elements are provided.
- 10.87 The cycle parking provision for Phase 2 will be considered as part of any future reserved matters application. The Design and Access Statement details that a cycle hub is proposed to be provided within Phase 2.

Car parking

- 10.88 Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) requires new developments to comply with, and not exceed, the maximum car parking standards as set out within appendix L. Outside of the Controlled Parking Zone the maximum standard is no more than 1 space per 40sqm of floor space for offices and general industry and 1 space per 100sqm of floor space for storage. Car-free and car-capped development is supported provided the site is within an easily walkable and cyclable distance to a District Centre or the City Centre, has high public transport accessibility and the car-free status can be realistically enforced by planning obligations and/or on-street controls. The Council strongly supports contributions to and provision for car clubs at new developments to help reduce the need for private car parking.
- 10.89 A total of 52 car parking spaces have been provided for the employees of Phase 1. This would equate to a car driver share of less than 50% with the

applicant aiming to reduce the proportion of car drivers among users. This equates to approximately 1 space per 115sqm which is under the maximum standards. The site is close to the city centre. It is considered that its proximity to Newmarket Road which is a major route into the city offering numerous bus routes would allow future employees to travel to the site on public transportation. As such, officers consider that a car-capped development is suitable for this site.

- 10.90 The third party comments in relation to the concern regarding parking provision and that it would lead to on-street parking within the area are noted. The submitted Site-Wide Travel Plan provides measures to influence travel patterns away from car usage. These are considered to be appropriate measures to reduce the trips by car and the final details can be secured by way of condition.
- 10.91 The Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD outlines the standards for EV charging at one fast charge point for each 1 per 1,000m² of floor space and 1 per 2 spaces for slow charging points and passive provision for the remaining spaces to provide capability for increasing provision in the future.
- 10.92 The Design and Access statement states that there would be a 100% passive provision for electric charging, with 50% active provision. This is acceptable and can be secured by condition.
- 10.93 Subject to conditions, the proposal is considered to accord with policies 80 and 82 of the Local Plan and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.

10.94 Amenity

- 10.95 Policy 35, 50, 52, 53 and 58 seek to preserve the amenity of neighbouring and / or future occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance, overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing and through providing high quality internal and external spaces.

Residential Amenity

- 10.96 The closest residential properties to the Phase 1 site are located on the opposite side of the railway lines to the site approximately 50 metres from the site boundary and a minimum of approximately 70 metres from the proposed buildings. Due to the separation distance, it is considered that the proposed buildings would not result in an undue impact on residential amenity by reason of loss of light, loss of outlook, sense of dominance or loss of privacy.
- 10.97 Phase 2 would be located a minimum of 100 metres from the nearest residential neighbours at Signet Court. Whilst the scale, size and design are reserved matters and would be considered fully at a later stage it is

considered that it is unlikely that Phase 2 would result in any loss of light, loss of outlook, sense of dominance or loss of privacy.

Construction and Environmental Impacts

- 10.98 Policy 35 guards against developments leading to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise and disturbance.
- 10.99 The Council's Environmental Health team have assessed the application and have no objections as the supporting information in conjunction with recommended conditions will ensure that the specific operations do not result in noise emissions greater than the pre-existing background noise level. These conditions are considered reasonable and necessary to impose.
- 10.100 Noise and disturbance during construction would be minimized through conditions restricting construction hours and collection hours to protect the amenity of future occupiers. These conditions are considered reasonable and necessary to impose.
- 10.101 Third party comments made with concern in regards to alarms, reverse beeping, vehicle movements disruption and construction disruption concerns are noted. However, these concerns can be overcome by way of the conditions requested by the Environmental Health Officer.

Summary

- 10.102 The proposal adequately respects the amenity of its neighbours and of future occupants and is considered that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 35, 50, 51, 52, 53, 57 and 58.

10.103 Third Party Representations

- 10.104 The remaining third-party representations not addressed in the preceding paragraphs are summarised and responded to in the table below:

Third Party Comment	Officer Response
Visual Impact	Considered in paragraphs 10.14 to 10.48
Impact on Heritage Assets	Considered in paragraphs 10.37 to 10.50
Parking Provision	Considered in paragraphs 10.88 to 10.93
Nuisance from noise, lighting and vehicles	Considered in paragraphs 10.62, 10.74 to 10.81, 10.98 to 10.101
Construction Impacts	Considered in paragraphs 10.98 to 10.101
Solar Panels	Considered in paragraph 10.117

	The solar panels are not considered to harm residential amenity.
Cycle parking location	Considered in paragraphs 10.83 to 10.87
Link to Stourbridge Common	Comments regarding the lack of a link to Stourbridge Common are noted, however, any link would be outside the red outline and so not within the remit of the application. It would also require other third party landowners to be involved.
CCTV	Third party comments in relation to CCTV resulting in the loss of privacy to neighbouring dwellings. Any future CCTV would be governed by data protection laws and privacy rights.

10.105 Planning Obligations (S106)

10.106 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

10.107 The applicant has indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Local Plan and the NPPF.

10.108 Policy 85 states that planning permission for new developments will only be supported/permited where there are suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision and phasing of infrastructure, services and facilities necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.

10.109 Heads of Terms

10.110 The Heads of Terms (HoT's) as identified are to be secured within the S106 and are set out in the summary below:

Obligation	Contribution / Term	Trigger
Transport	Active Travel improvements on Newmarket Road Contribution: £372,000 Installation of waiting restrictions in the area of	Negotiation to be delegated to Officers under S106 agreement Prior to the first occupation of either phase or other

	<p>Mercers Row, Swanns Road and Garlic Row: £10,000</p> <p>Submission of a study of options to improve access</p> <p>Implementation of dropped crossings and additional waiting restrictions following results of the aforementioned study</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of each phase or other</p> <p>Prior to occupation of each phase or other</p>
Employment and Skills Strategy	Submission of an Employment and Skills Strategy	Prior to occupation of each phase.
S106 Administration, Monitoring and Compliance	TBC	TBC

Transport

10.111 The Transport Obligations have been requested by the County Council's Transport Assessment Team and it is required to mitigate the transport impact of the development, including the impact on active travel. The contribution to Newmarket Road improvements is calculated based on floorspace. It has been considered that there is a need to introduce additional waiting restrictions in the area and as such a monetary fee has been requested for the County Council to install these.

10.112 It is accepted that there would need to be improvements to the access to the site. Due to the hybrid nature of the site, the exact needs and the ideal locations of this is not known. As such, it is requested that a study be conducted and the results to be agreed by the local planning and local highway authorities. The results of this study would then need to be implemented by the applicant.

Employment and Skills Strategy

10.113 This has been requested by officers. The applicant has agreed to this obligation.

Monitoring

10.114 Required to cover the costs of the administration and monitoring of the Section 106 agreement.

Conclusion

10.115 The planning obligations are necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 in are in accordance with policy 85 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

10.116 Other Matters

Air Safety

10.117 The site is located within 6km of Cambridge City Airport. A Glint and Glare Assessment has been submitted as part of the application. The Airport has been consulted on the application and have stated that they have no objections.

Bins

10.118 Policy 57 requires refuse and recycling to be successfully integrated into proposals. The Council's Waste team has been consulted on the proposal and subject to a condition requiring a waste management plan.

Contaminated Land

10.119 Policy 33 seeks to protect future occupants from adverse health risks resulting from ground contamination from existing/former uses. The Contaminated Land Officer has been consulted and raised no objections subject to conditions.

Designing Out Crime

10.120 The Designing Out Crime Officer supports the layout as it would provide high levels of natural surveillance. They recommend that the applicant should submit a secured by design commercial application as it is believed the development could achieve this and provides advice on elements to review. This can be recommended by way of informative.

10.121 Planning Balance

10.122 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).

Summary of harm

10.123 Officers consider that the proposed scheme is compliant with the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF and so no material harm is identified.

10.124 Summary of benefits

- 10.125 The proposal would result in additional mid-tech floorspace of which there is a demand for and can support knowledge-based activities in accordance with the Greater Cambridge Employment and Housing Evidence Update by Icení (2022).
- 10.126 The proposal would result in an increase in jobs in the area in both the short term, in terms of construction, and long term as it would result in employment floorspace.
- 10.127 The redevelopment of the site would result in a positive visual impact and would result in high-quality, well-designed buildings and landscaping to replace an existing run-down area. The proposal would also result in a biodiversity net gain on the site.

Conclusion

- 10.128 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the statutory requirements of section 66(1) and section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for approval.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1 Approve subject to:

- The planning conditions as set out in Appendix 1, with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to officers.
- Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement which includes the Heads of Terms (HoT's) as set out in the report with minor amendments to the Heads of Terms as set out delegated to officers.

- 11.2 In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development and submit all necessary documentation on behalf of the Council.

Appendix 1: Draft Planning Conditions

Appendix 2: Design Review Panel Comments

Background Papers:

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- Cambridge Local Plan 2018
- Cambridge Local Plan SPDs