

---

**MAIN CASE**

**Reference No:** 17/01838/ESF

**Proposal:** Hybrid planning application (part outline part full) for demolition, alteration and extension of blocks B, C and D, falling within Use Class B1 offices/laboratory, outline planning permission sought for the erection of an Amenities Block/Incubator Hub, Use Classes A1, A3 and D2 offices/laboratory, Use Class B1 a Gateway Building, Use Class B1 offices/Laboratory, Mid Tech Buildings 1 and 2, Use Classes B2 and B8, with associated site access, circulation, car parking, sub stations, landscaping and site assembly works (including retaining walls)

**Site Address:** LGC Limited Newmarket Road Fordham Ely Cambridgeshire CB7 5WW

**Applicant:** Hermes Property Unit Trust

**Case Officer:** Barbara Greengrass, Planning Team Leader

**Parish:** Fordham

**Ward:** Fordham Villages

Ward Councillor/s: Councillor Joshua Schumann  
Councillor Julia Huffer

**Date Received:** 11 October 2017 **Expiry Date:** 7 December 2018

[T145]

---

**1.0 RECOMMENDATION**

1.1 Members are recommended to approve the application subject to the signing of the S106 Agreement and the following draft conditions with authority delegated to the Planning Manager and Legal Services Manager to complete the S106 and to issue the planning permission. The recommended planning conditions can be read in full within Appendix 1.

1.2 The S106 agreement will secure the following;

- Provision of two bus stops on Newmarket Road prior to completion of Phase 1.
- Improvements to the A142/Snailwell Rd roundabout prior to completion of phase 3
- Financial contribution of £150,000 towards improvements to junction 37 of the A14.

### 1.3 Conditions:

- 1 Approved plans
- 2 Time limit full
- 3 Phasing
- 4 Archaeology
- 5 Contamination
- 6 Contamination Remediation Strategy
- 7 Surface Water Drainage Scheme
- 8 Infiltration of Surface Water
- 9 Piling and Boreholes
- 10 Foul Water Drainage Scheme
- 11 Materials Management Plan
- 12 Travel Plan
- 13 Junction Modification
- 14 Car park
- 15 Fire Hydrants
- 16 Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
- 17 Tree Protection
- 18 Soft Landscaping
- 19 Maintenance of Soft Landscaping
- 20 Landscape and Environment Management Plan
- 21 External Lighting
- 22 Ecology Mitigation
- 23 Construction and delivery times
- 24 Plant and Machinery
- 25 Times of Use
- 26 Materials
- 27 BREEAM
- 28 Hard Landscaping

#### **OUTLINE**

- 29 Reserved matters
- 30 Time Limit outline
- 31 Phasing
- 32 Archaeology
- 33 Contamination
- 34 Contamination Remediation Strategy
- 35 Surface Water Drainage Scheme
- 36 Infiltration of Surface Water
- 37 Piling and Boreholes
- 38 Foul Water Drainage Scheme
- 39 Materials Management Plan
- 40 Travel Plan
- 41 Car park
- 42 Fire Hydrants
- 43 Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
- 44 Tree Protection
- 45 Soft Landscaping
- 46 Maintenance of Soft Landscaping
- 47 Landscape and Environment Management Plan

48	External Lighting
49	Ecology Mitigation
50	Construction and delivery times
51	Plant and Machinery
52	Times of Use
53	BREEAM

## **2.0 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION**

- 2.1 This is a Hybrid planning application (part outline, part full) for demolition, alteration and extension of Blocks B, C and D, falling within Use Class B1 offices/laboratory (submitted in full), outline planning permission sought for the erection of an Amenities Block/Incubator Hub, Use Classes A1 and/or A3 and/or D2, offices/laboratory, Use Class B1, a Gateway Building, Use Class B1 offices/laboratory, and Mid Tech Buildings 1 and 2, Use Classes B2 and/or B8, with associated site access, circulation, car parking, sub stations, landscaping and site assembly works (including retaining walls).
- 2.2 Phases 1 and 2 are submitted in full and comprise a total of 4,680 sq m gross new B1 floorspace, for office and laboratory use, together with, a total of 157 car parking spaces to the north western part of the site in accordance with the Council's standards.
- 2.3 As part of Phase 1, it is proposed to ban the right turn out of the site and amend the existing traffic island at the site access junction to provide a physical restriction requiring all vehicles to turn left out of the Site.
- 2.4 Phase 3, submitted in outline, will comprise a Gateway building of 4,728 sq m for B1 use and an amenities block of 1,116 sq m gross, incubator hub (1,116 sq m) and offices B1a (584 sq m). This Phase will also provide for an additional 214 parking spaces. Completion anticipated Aug 2020 to Oct 2021.
- 2.5 Phase 4, in outline, will comprise the Mid Tech 1 building to be a flexible space for use as B2 and /or B8 and providing for a maximum of 6,556 sq m gross floorspace. 131 car parking spaces will accompany this building construction. Completion anticipated May 2021 to March 2022.
- 2.6 Phase 5, in outline, will comprise the Mid Tech 2 building with potential to provide three buildings within industrial or storage use B1/B8, providing a maximum of 13,087 sq m gross floorspace. 262 car parking spaces will accompany this building construction. Completion anticipated Nov 2021 to Sept 2022.
- 2.7 A total of 764 car parking spaces are proposed for the five phases of development, which includes 38 disabled car parking spaces.
- 2.8 In addition, a total of 133 cycle spaces which will be delivered proportionally and commensurate with each phase of development.

- 2.9 When all phases are complete and operational, the development will provide for 918 full time equivalent jobs with an estimated Gross Value Added for the economy of £53 million, of which £31.4 million could be local to East Cambridgeshire.
- 2.10 The application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment.
- 2.11 The full planning application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online via East Cambridgeshire District Council's Public Access online service, via the following link <http://pa.eastcambs.gov.uk/online-applications/>. **Alternatively a paper copy is available to view at the East Cambridgeshire District Council offices, in the application file.**
- 2.12 The application has been called to Planning Committee by Councillor Schunmann due to the scale of the growth as it could result in a significant impact on local infrastructure and road networks.

### **3.0 PLANNING HISTORY**

#### **3.1**

16/00974/FUM	Construction of new office building and covered link with associated car parking and landscaping	Approved	21.09.2016
16/01657/FUL	Temporary permission for three years for a two storey portakabin for use as offices and packaging for LGC	Approved	19.01.2017
17/00942/FUL	Temporary permission for three years for a two storey modular building for use as an office for LGC	Approved	26.07.2017
17/00516/SCOPE	Scoping opinion setting out the scope and content of an Environmental Statement for this hybrid planning application	Issued	10.05.2017

### **4.0 THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONMENT**

- 4.1 The LGC site is just over 1 mile south of Fordham and 3.5 miles north of Newmarket on the A142. Cambridge is approx 15 miles to the south west and accessed south of the site at Junction onto the A14. The site is approx 14.22 ha or 35.14 acres. To the west of the site is the large warehouse site at Turners and DS Smith packaging and further south the Snailwell Industrial estate, The Pines industrial estate and Lynx Business Park. To the east, north and immediately south of the site is open land and the River Snail and a number of sites of SSSI's. The site itself is occupied by LGC Ltd, a company specialising in life sciences measurement and testing, with the site having historical connections with horseracing forensic testing, which is highlighted by the layout and configuration of

the Site, comprising as it does, a mixture of building blocks associated with LGC's current operations, including Blocks A, B, C and D, all of which are clustered to the centre of the northern part of the Site. These blocks are in use as a mixture of laboratory, industrial and office, falling within B1 business and B2 General Industrial Use and total 7,377 sq m of floorspace (GEA).

4.2 To the north west of the Site entrance are residential dwellings.

## **5.0 RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES**

5.1 Responses were received from the following consultees and these are summarised below. The full responses are available on the Council's web site.

### **5.2 Design Out Crime Officers**

This office has previously consulted with Scott Brownrigg and submitted a Breeam Security Needs Assessment which is noted in the Breeam Report within this application. I have no further comment at this time and support this application.

### **5.3 Parish**

23 November 2017 - Fordham Parish Council totally support this application - it is hoped that the Lay-bys and Bus Stops will be provided in phase 1 and 2.

5.4 **Parish** - Newmarket Town Council raise no objections.

### **5.5 Ward Councillors**

Councillor Schunmann wishes to call the application to planning committee due to the scale of the growth, as it could result in a significant impact on local infrastructure.

### **5.6 Planning Casework Unit**

No comments to make on the environmental statement

### **5.7 Highways England**

#### **5.7.1 24 November 2017**

Notice is hereby given that Highways England formal recommendation is that we offer no objection.

#### **5.7.2 30 October 2018**

Notice is hereby given that Highways England formal recommendation is that we offer no objection. With this hybrid planning application, for the proposed demotion, alternation, extension works: and with the proposed associated site access, circulation, car parking, sub stations, landscaping and site assembly works (including retaining walls), would not have any traffic impact on our strategic road network.

5.8 **Highways Transport Team**

5.8.1 13/11/17 - The document reviewed is the transport assessment dated September 2017, to accompany a planning application for A1, A3, B1, B2, B8, D2 uses.

1.3

It is acknowledged that the existing building GEA is 7377sqm and has 202 parking spaces.

1.7

The TA indicated that the proposed development fully constructed by 2022.

2.12

Study Area

Junction 1 – Soham Road with B1102 mini roundabout

Junction 2 – A142 with Newmarket Road roundabout

Junction 3 – Site access

Junction 4 – A142 with Landwade Road / Snailwell Road roundabout

Junction 5 – A142 with A14 junction

2.25

Currently there are 14 cycle parking spaces on site.

2.27

Currently there are no bus stops within vicinity of site, the nearest bus stop is 1.8 km away to the north.

2.30

Nearest train station is a 20 minute bus journey away, plus to 25 minute walk to the bus stop.

2.32

It is acknowledged that the site has very limited public transport opportunities.

The Highway Authority does not take financial contributions to deliver bus stops/crossings. These should be directly delivered by the applicant at its own cost and in accordance with a specification to be approved by the County Council (in consultation with the bus operator) to mitigate development impacts. Note that a commuted sum will be required for the maintenance of the bus stop infrastructure. Confirmation would also need to be provided from the bus operator that they would use these stops prior to approval being given.

Car Parking

It is proposed to provide 764 car parking spaces in total.

5.21

Currently 340 employees.

Proposed 488 employees with phase 1 and 2 (extra 148).

5.26

438 employees phase 3

129 employees phase 4

258 employees phase 5  
Total employees 1313

It is proposed to provide a total of 133 cycle parking spaces, this is acceptable. The provision of the cycle parking would be phased with the build.

#### Conclusion

The application as submitted does not include sufficient information to properly determine the highway impact of the proposed development. Were the above issues addressed the Highway Authority would reconsider the application.

CCC therefore requests that this application not be determined until such time as the additional information above has been submitted and reviewed.

#### 5.8.2 7 June 2018

The modelling work which has been undertaken to support the planning application shows that the proposed development will have a severe impact on the A142 / Landwade Road / Snailwell Road roundabout. Therefore the proposed development needs to provide a mitigation scheme at the roundabout to deal with its impact.

An improvement scheme has been proposed at the roundabout and this has been subject to a safety audit, undertaken by the Cambridge County Council Road Safety Audit Team. The safety audit raised a number of safety concerns regarding the proposed alterations at the roundabout, which the applicant has failed to satisfactorily address.

The applicant has offered to pay a contribution, of unknown amount, to the County Council to mitigate its impact at the roundabout. The Highway Authority cannot accept this as it does not have a scheme to increase capacity at the roundabout, it will be up to developments as they come forward to deal with their impact on the highway network.

#### Conclusion

The Highway Authority wish to object to the planning application for the following reason:

1. The proposal as submitted would have a severe impact on safety and capacity of the highway network to the detriment of highway users.

#### 5.8.3 24 September 2018 - Document reference WIE10174.100.R.14.1.1.CCC Response has been produced to deal with the safety audit comments and overcome the highways object to the planning application.

The Cambridge County Council safety audit team has reviewed the document and have requested a slight amendment to one of the plans. The amendment has been undertaken and resubmitted for review. The safety audit team have confirmed they are happy with the amendment and the proposed scheme as a whole.

The Highway Authority does not wish to object to the planning application subject to the following -

1. Prior to first occupation of the new unit the proposed roundabout alterations as shown in principle on drawing “proposed roundabout improvements revision A03 dated July 2018 shall be provided. Details to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
2. Prior to first occupation of the new unit the site access junction shall be modified as shown in principle on drawing “junction 3 proposed site access junction improvements” revision A05, dated May 2017. Details to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
3. Prior to first occupation of the new unit the two new bus stops on Newmarket Road shall be provided as shown in principle on drawing “bus stop layout” revision A04, dated Feb 2018. The works shall include but not be limited to refuge island, new footway, drop kerbs crossings, shelter, raised kerbs, flag, pole, time table and RTPI. Detailed to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
4. Prior to first occupation of the new unit, the Developer shall be responsible for the provision and implementation of a travel plan to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Such travel plan shall include the provision of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator to give advice. The plan is to be monitored annually, with all measures reviewed to ensure targets are met.

## 5.9 **County Highways Authority**

### 5.9.1 1 December 2017

The highways authority requests a holding objection be placed on this application for the following reason:

The application is not supported by sufficient highways or transport information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not be prejudicial to the satisfactory functioning of the highway or highway safety

Any new or altered road layout requires that a Road Safety Audit to be completed. This road safety audit must be completed by OR reviewed by the CCC RSA team. The cost of this must be met by the applicant and this must be completed prior to the determination of this application. This audit must include but not be limited to the Bus Stops, laybys, pedestrian crossing facilities, the banning of the right turn, the roundabout alterations and the Transport Assessment information.

The proposal seeks to stop right turn of vehicles in to the site from Newmarket Road. This will require a Traffic Regulation Order which in turn requires a public consultation. The outcome of this public consultation cannot be pre-determined and will also require a Grampian Condition. Should the TRO application be unsuccessful this would result in the banning of right turn lane not being able to be completed and therefore any planning approval would be unable to be delivered.

Unless or until such time as the RSA has been completed or reviewed I am unable to comment further or determine this application.



5.9.2 8 October 2018

The proposed access arrangement, bus stop and roundabout improvements have undergone a Road Safety Audit Stage 1, which was completed by CCC RSA team and commissioned by the applicant. I can confirm that the highways authority are satisfied that these alterations to the highway to facilitate this development can be achieved and are acceptable.

Recommended Conditions

The highways improvements to the Snailwell Roundabout will be laid out as per the approved drawing and constructed to CCC specifications

The Bus Stop will be laid out as per the approved drawings and constructed to CCC specifications

Prior to first occupation the access arrangement will be constructed to CCC Specifications

5.10 **Suffolk County Council**

5.10.1 12 January 2018

We do have some provisional costings available for a similar J37 improvement project, and these will be useful in assessing the overall costs of the proposed project. With regard to the specific site impacts on this junction, it looks as if we will need to be guided by CCC, as they are awaiting clarification on the traffic modelling.

Once we have confirmation from CCC that the modelling is fit for purpose we can consider the impacts arising from this site at this junction against the context of the background data, and then start the discussion on what would be a proportionate contribution to the overall scheme.

As this junction design is similar to one we have seen previously, it is broadly acceptable, with the caveats that we would need to consult HE (as their road and highway land is impacted) and we would need to review any Road Safety Audit produced to support the design process. I have just contacted HE's engineer, David Abbott, to get his views on the scheme, I'm aware that they offered no significant comments to the consultation process.

5.10.2 21 November 2018

Thank you for the technical report from Waterman covering the A14/A142 junction. I have reviewed the Technical Notes in conjunction with the Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement, covering the Transport Impacts from the scheme. I am content that the Section 106 contribution proposed, £150,000 split 50/50 over detailed design and a contribution to the works cost, would be sufficient to mitigate the proportional impacts of the proposed development scheme in Suffolk. The scheme proposed is shown in the indicative plan reference WIE-10174-SA-95-0005-A01. A range of potential improvement options exist for this junction, and the final scheme to be implemented will be determined with reference to traffic growth on the A14 and future growth in Forest Heath and East Cambridgeshire, and the related traffic impacts.

I have spoken to David Abbott at Highways England and he is content with this approach too.

However I would also comment that the 5 year payback period currently proposed is insufficient, as this is a relatively small contribution to the overall costs of the project. My view is that at least 10 years will be required to collect sufficient contributions to fund the remainder of the scheme. I also agree that the trigger for the works payment will need to be worded in an unambiguous way in the Section 106 agreement. Subject to this revision I will be happy to accept the proposal included in the Waterman Briefing Note – ‘Highway Works Financial Contributions’.

## 5.11 **Environmental Health**

### 5.11.1 27 November 2017

Volume 5 appendix 9.2 regarding baseline noise monitoring survey; appendix 9.3 Construction Noise Assessment. It shows SR A, B and C. A and B are ok with mitigation but C is still over. Claire has also assessed Appendix 9.4 regarding Road Traffic Noise Assessment Calculations as well as the Acoustic Report entitled LGC Site Newmarket Road, Fordham CB7 reference number 7998/AAR and dated 24<sup>th</sup> August 2017.

SR C with mitigation is still 5 or 6 dB above threshold in the region of 70/71 dBA. This is considered an adverse effect of moderate significance and likely to be tolerable. However ES Vol 1 S.9.20 states that the BS 5228:2009 predicted noise levels are based on assumptions made for the number and type of plant, their location and operating arrangements. It is also based on the assumption that standard good construction practise measures will be applied and that the source noise data is based upon well maintained equipment. Some of the information will remain uncertain even after commencement of the works, is there any information that can be clarified?

The baseline noise survey states monitoring was completed from 4th to 9th May 2017 but the Noise report states 24th to 25th May 2017. Is there an explanation for this?

The Acoustic report relates to phases 1 and 2 of the development (full permission being sought). Section 4 on page 3 specifies the criteria that the cumulative noise emission of plant need to meet.

Section 5.1 on page 4 specifies the plant that the assessment has been based upon. Consideration should therefore be given to utilise a planning condition to restrict the plant to that specified. If alternatives are intended to be used the applicants will need to demonstrate that they will and it is considered reasonable to condition the plant to these proposed. If alternative plant is required this should either be agreed with the LPA or wording utilised to ensure that the criteria is not exceeded.

Section 5.3 states that the plant should only operate within the hours of 08:00 – 20:00, I would ask that this be conditioned.

The conclusion in section 7 states that the plant is within the criteria required providing suitable mitigation measures are employed, I am assuming these are the plant enclosures as nothing else has been highlighted. Would it be possible to confirm that this is the case?

The noise report relates to phases 1 and 2 of the development (full permission being sought). A further noise impact assessment would be required for the outline development at the reserved matters stage to indicate the potential impact and proposed mitigation to ensure no adverse impact is caused (as these also include industrial).

You may wish to limit all development to hours of use (08:00 -20:00). There is a high background impact from the main road so consider it is acceptable but other phases will require more information.

We would want to know where the canteen and additional parking for later phases will be.

Section 5 in the Environmental Statement non-technical summary mentions low level lighting. We would require details of the lighting to be submitted to be approved in writing prior to installation.

Section 6 we agree to the proposed hours of construction and would advise a condition requiring these to be adhered to. We also agree with the CEMP requirement to cover aspects such as dust, noise, lighting, vibration etc.

Section 9 clarifies that phase 3 has the possibility of causing a noise issue during construction and that mitigation will be utilised. Residents work at the site and have links, however a CEMP with further mitigation proposals such as use of plant, location of plant, appropriate measures to be undertaken etc is required prior to this stage of the proposed development. Peter Chisnall agrees with this, particularly as some of the mitigating measures for phase 2, i.e. screening by existing buildings may not occur for phase 3 as those screening buildings may have been demolished.

On viewing the phasing plan in the ES Nontechnical summary I am pleased to see that phase 4 and 5 re industrial/warehouse uses etc are further away from the residential properties. Although we will need a noise impact assessment and this should also cover the property at roundabout.

Finally, Peter Ord will contact you separately (if he has not already done so) regarding the Air Quality Assessment and any contaminated land issues.

#### 5.11.2 05 February 2018

The applicant's latest response does clarify some of their queries raised, however there are still some outstanding from Claire Braybrook's original response, Turley has indicated that these are not related to the RBA plant noise assessment, these are detailed below. Claire notes that she has read Volume 5 appendix 9.2 regarding baseline noise monitoring survey; appendix 9.3 Construction Noise assessment. It shows SR A, B and C. A and B are ok with mitigation but C is still over. Claire has also assessed Appendix 9.4 regarding Road Traffic Noise

assessment calculations as well as the Acoustic Report entitled LGC Site Newmarket Road, Fordham CB7 reference number 7998/AAR and dated 24<sup>th</sup> August 2017.

**5.12 Environmental Health Scientific Officer**

30 November 2017

I have read the Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment and Chapters 10 and 12 of the Environmental Statement prepared by Waterman dated September 2017 which relate to Air Quality and Contamination and I accept the findings. The reports find that the impacts on air quality are likely to be negligible assuming a CEMP is prepared and adhered to and mitigation measures are put in place. I recommend that conditions relating to air quality are not required for any grant of permission. The report finds that widespread ground contamination is unlikely but recommends a targeted intrusive investigation to establish the extent of any contamination. I recommend that standard contaminated land conditions 1 and 4 are attached to any grant of permission.

**5.13 HSE (Planning Advice Team)**

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) is a statutory consultee for certain developments within the Consultation Distance of Major Hazard Sites/ pipelines. HSE does not advise, on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.

**5.14 Natural England**

15 November 2017

Statutory nature conservation sites – no objection. Based upon the information provided, Natural England advises the Council that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes.

Subject to implementation of construction mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Statement prepared by Waterman (September, 2017) we are satisfied that the proposed development is unlikely to have any significant adverse effect on designated sites. Mitigation measures should be secured through appropriately worded planning conditions.

**5.15 Senior Trees Officer**

23 November 2018

This proposal is for a commercial development within an existing commercial site. There are a number of trees internally and on the site boundaries potentially affected. A number of trees are to be removed primarily from tree groups within the site. A full Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement have been submitted to support the application.

I support this application. The indicative landscaping proposal is sufficient to address any concerns I have regarding the impact upon existing trees at the site.

Also the most significant individual trees are to be retained. In consideration of the existing site use I do not perceive any overall negative impact to the landscape.

If the application is to be approved, the Tree Protection Plan within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement dated 26th September 2017 will be required to be implemented under condition of planning approval, to ensure the successful retention of trees at the site (Condition TR9A).

The landscape masterplan is supported although, I advise you refer the assessment of this and the potential landscape impact of the proposal to a relevant consultee. The details within the landscape masterplan are relevant however a final detailed landscaping proposal including precise planting details and establishment procedures are not provided.

## 5.16 **Lead Local Flood Authority**

### 5.16.1 21 November 2017

The site currently relies on pumps to dispose of surface water and it is proposed to maintain this arrangement following development. Pumping of surface water is generally an unsustainable drainage method as pumps require ongoing maintenance and can fail during a storm event. Within the surface water strategy it is acknowledged that there have already been some issues relating to silting up of the pump in Ditch 1, which has required the ditch to be enlarged to increase capacity. It is for this reason that a detailed management plan will need to be provided to demonstrate what maintenance activities will be undertaken and at what frequency. It is absolutely essential that this plan (once approved) is adhered to, to reduce the risk of flooding. Furthermore, we would require that the residual risk of flooding due to the failure of the pumps be investigated. We would require that the flood level be determined under the following conditions:

- The pumps were to fail; and
- The attenuation storage was full; and
- A design storm occurred

A back up system (such as a twin-pump arrangement) will need to be provided to ensure water can continue to discharge in the event of pump failure.

### 5.16.2 12 January 2018

Since our initial letter dated 21 November 2017 we have received clarification over the pump arrangements for the proposed site. The applicant has confirmed that the existing pumping station will be replaced with a new pumping station containing two pumps. This will help ensure that should one pump fail, the other is still available to evacuate water from the site. Given this we can now **remove our objection**.

We recommend a condition.

## 5.17 **Historic England**

### 5.17.1 15 November 2017

On the basis of the information available to date, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

### Summary

The proposed development is located in an area of high archaeological potential, adjacent to a Roman villa, which is designated as a scheduled monument. Historic England considers that insufficient information has been provided to assess the impact of the proposal on the historic environment, including its impact on the setting of the scheduled monument. We advise that the application be withdrawn until the required assessments have been completed, in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF paragraph 128.

### Historic England Advice

The proposed development is located in proximity to the site of a Roman villa, south of Snailwell Farm, which is designated as a scheduled monument (National Heritage List ref 1006868). The scheduled monument is significant for its buried archaeological remains relating to Roman occupation and associated activity. The villa is located on a slight topographic rise above the River Snail. Despite the industrial development to the south of the scheduled monument, the rural setting of Roman villa is appreciable in open views towards Snailwell Fen on the north and east, and this setting contributes to its significance. The hybrid application concerns full permission for the demolition, alteration and extension of blocks B,C and D and outline permission for the erection of a amenities block, gateway building, offices/laboratory and mid tech buildings 1 and 2 and associated site access, car parking and landscaping. The proposed mid tech buildings, which have an elevation some 24-28m in height, are located 140m to the north of the scheduled Roman villa, and will be prominent and urbanising additions within the setting of the scheduled monument.

The proposal is also located in an area of high archaeological potential, on the fenedge and in proximity to the scheduled Roman villa. The full extent of the Roman villa is not known and there is high potential for significant archaeological remains to be located in the development area, which will be damaged or destroyed by the construction works.

The NPPF states that “in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation” (para 128).

Paragraph 132 of NPPF states ‘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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting’. When

considering harm (Para 134) the NPPF notes that 'harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'.

At the time of application the Archaeology chapter in the Environmental Statement had not been completed, and no assessment of the impact of the proposal on undesignated archaeological remains or the setting of the scheduled villa has been provided. Historic England considers that the proposed development will have an intrusive and urbanising impact on the setting of the scheduled monument, and are concerned this may result in loss of significance. In the absence of an archaeological evaluation, we are also concerned that the development may result in unjustified harm to significant buried archaeological remains.

#### Recommendation

Historic England objects to the application on heritage grounds. Insufficient information has been provided to assess the impact of the proposal on the historic environment, including its impact on the adjacent Scheduled Roman villa. We advise that the application be withdrawn until the required assessments have been completed, in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF paragraph 128. Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If, however, you propose to determine the application in its current form, please treat this as a letter of objection, inform us of the date of the committee and send us a copy of your report at the earliest opportunity.

#### 5.17.2 22 May 2018

Thank you for your letter of 2 May 2018 regarding further information on the above application for planning permission. On the basis of this information, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

Paragraph 132 of NPPF states '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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting'. When considering harm (Para 134) the NPPF notes that 'harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'.

Additional information has been provided in the form of an updated Archaeology chapter of the Environmental Statement, which has been informed by a geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation. The evaluation identified archaeological remains in the southern part of the development area, including an early Roman crouched burial located in a natural hollow and floodplain deposits containing late Neolithic or Early Bronze Age flint. We concur with the Environmental Statement that the impact of the development on these remains can be effectively mitigated through a further scheme of archaeological investigation.

However, we do not consider that the Environmental Statement has provided an adequate assessment on the impact of the proposal on the setting of the scheduled Roman villa (chapter 14, para 14.26 - 28). In our previous advice we advised that a fully settings assessment should be undertaken, to understand the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the scheduled monument, and how this setting

will be impacted by the proposed development. The ES concludes, without any supporting evidence or narrative and on the basis of the proposed outline maximum parameters of the development and, that there will be a ‘permanent, local effect of moderate adverse significance on the setting of Scheduled Monument’ (chapter 14, para 14.53). The scheduled Roman villa is located on a slight topographic rise with views over surrounding countryside to the north and east, and this rural setting contributes to its significance. While the mature vegetation along part of the southern boundary will help partially screen the development in views from the south, the new units will be prominent in views from the scheduled villa, and will have any urbanising impact on the setting of the scheduled monument.

#### Recommendation

Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. We are concerned that the proposed development will be an intrusive addition within the setting of the scheduled Roman villa and may result in harm to its significance. We advise that your authority should satisfy itself that the public benefit of the scheme outweighs the harm to designated assets, and that any permission granted should be conditional on securing a further scheme of archaeological work and landscaping mitigation to screen the development in views from the south. Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If there are any material changes to the proposals, or you would like further advice, please contact us.

### **5.18 Cambridgeshire Archaeology**

5.18.1 30 April 2018

The application area has previously been subject to an archaeological evaluation (Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record reference ECB5202) for which a report of results has been received. The northern three fields (1-3) contained limited archaeological remains and were much disturbed by later activity, however along the southern edge of Field 4 two Late Bronze Age pits and an early Roman crouched burial positioned within a natural hollow were identified in the evaluation trenches. Trenches excavated in the south-eastern part of the development area (Field 5) revealed floodplain deposits from which worked flint, dating mostly to the Late Neolithic or Early Bronze Age, was recovered. The edge of the peat deposits was marked by a boundary ditch dug into the sand and gravel deposits that remained dry during its lifetime and contained only animal bone. Given the location of the burial at the floodplain edge and its possible 1<sup>st</sup> C. AD date the results link into local and regional research questions on patterns of early Roman burial practice and the continuation of burial practices within the same area within prehistory.

In light of the results we therefore recommend an additional programme of mitigating works to be carried out within these areas of interest identified during the evaluation in order to off-set the loss of the proven archaeological resource due to development, and consider that this can be secured by condition of planning permission, such as the example condition approved by DCLG:

No demolition/development shall take place until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) for a programme of archaeological works has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within



the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI which shall include:

- a) the statement of significance and research objectives;
- b) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
- c) The programme for post-excavation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material. *This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.*

Developers will wish to ensure that in drawing up their development programme, the timetable for the investigation is included within the details of the agreed scheme. A brief for the archaeological works can be obtained from this office upon request.

## **5.19 Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue**

### **5.19.1 10 January 2018**

With regard to the above application, should the planning authority be minded to grant approval, the Fire Authority would ask that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants, which may be by way of Section 106 agreement or a planning condition. The position of fire hydrants are generally agreed upon when the Water Authority submits plans to the Waste & Planning Manager. Where a Section 106 or a planning condition has been secured, the cost of Fire Hydrants will be recovered from the developer. The number and location of Fire Hydrants will be determined following Risk Assessment and with reference to guidance contained within the 'National Guidance Document on the provision of Water for Fire Fighting' 3<sup>rd</sup> edition published January 2007. Access and facilities for the fire Service should also be provided in accordance with Building Regulations Approved Document B5, Section 16. If there are any buildings on the development that are over 11 metres in height (excluding blocks of flats) not fitted with fire mains, then Ariel (high reach) appliance access is required, the details of which can be found in the attached document.

## **5.20 Asset Information Definitive Map Team**

No Comments Received

## **5.21 Minerals And Waste Development Control Team**

No Comments Received

## **5.22 Conservation Officer**

No Comments Received

## **5.23 Economic Development**

No Comments Received

**5.24 Forest Heath**  
No Comments Received

**5.25 Anglian Water Services Ltd**

5.25.1 4 November 2018

The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Soham Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows. The sewerage system at present has available capacity for the proposed flows of 2.6l/s for phases 1 and 2. The remaining phases will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. Anglian Water is responsible for off-site mitigation and we will need to plan effectively for the proposed development, if permission is granted. We will need to work with the applicant to ensure any infrastructure improvements are delivered in line with the development. We therefore request conditions requiring an on-site drainage strategy and a phasing plan.

5.25.2 14 February 2018

Anglian Water notes your concerns with capacity at Soham Water Recycling Centre. Currently Soham WRC has capacity to serve the proposed foul flows from the proposed development 17/01838/ESF.

Anglian Water made formal comments on this application on the 26 January 2018 stating in section 2:

“The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Soham Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows”

Anglian Water has a statutory duty to ensure that sufficient sewage treatment capacity is made available to all sites with the benefit of planning permission. We carry out an assessment on planning applications to assess the impact a particular development would have on both the sewerage network and the receiving WRC. If capacity issues are identified at the WRC it is Anglian Waters responsibility to ensure that sufficient capacity is made, not the developers.

In conclusion, there is currently capacity at Soham WRC and Anglian Water have no concerns in relation to the WRC and flows from the proposed development.

In regards to the foul drainage strategy for the remainder of the phase, Anglian Water has advised the Developer that further hydraulic modelling would be required to accommodate proposed flow rates for the site and we are now waiting to hear how they wish to proceed. We can then provide a further timescale and costing for the foul drainage strategy accordingly

5.25.3 26 January 2018

The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Soham Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows. The sewerage system at present has available capacity for the proposed flows of 2.6l/s for phases 1 and 2, however for the remaining phases a drainage strategy will be required so we have suggested a foul condition to reflect this.

**5.26 The Ely Group Of Internal Drainage Board**  
No Comments Received

**5.27 Environment Agency**

5.27.1 14 November 2017

The site is located within a groundwater source protection zone (SPZ), namely SPZ3 (total catchment). According to the preliminary environmental risk assessment (Waterman, 2017) and flood risk assessment (Waterman, 2017), groundwater in the river terrace deposits and alluvium beneath the site is shallow, lying within 5 metres (m) of ground level. The River Snail, located adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site, flows from south to north. In addition, a series of drains are interspersed across the site. Groundwater within the superficial deposits is likely to be in hydraulic continuity with the River Snail and the drains. A significant part of the site is described as greenfield land. However, potentially contaminative activities have been undertaken at the site, including the storage of solvents (in a waste store) and diesel (in above ground fuel tanks) and the presence of electrical sub-stations, a workshop, a forensic laboratory and infilled drains (made ground). There is also a light industrial site and a transport haulage depot located adjacent to the western site boundary. We consider the site to be environmentally sensitive with respect to controlled waters.

Environment Agency Position

We consider that planning permission could be granted to the proposed development as submitted if the following planning conditions are included as set out below. Without these conditions, the proposed development on this site poses an unacceptable risk to the environment and we would wish to object to the application. We welcome the proposed measures, as outlined in Chapter 12 of the environmental statement, to mitigate against the risks of leakages and subsequent potential leaching to controlled waters from the additional contamination sources (fuels, oils, chemicals) that will be introduced and stored on site during the construction works. Piling or any other foundation designs can increase the risks of groundwater contamination by mobilising contamination and creating preferential pathways, which should be recognised in any future works. We therefore welcome the recommendation to undertake a foundation works risks assessment (FWRA). Please confirm the preferred founding technique for the site and whether piling is proposed. Infiltration drainage is proposed as part of the development which could provide a pathway to the underlying groundwater, or mobilise any potential pre-existing contamination. In principle, the proposed surface water drainage scheme as outlined in Chapter 11 of the environmental statement, is acceptable. However, given that groundwater beneath the site is known to be shallow, the use of infiltration drainage would only be acceptable if a risk assessment demonstrates the presence of no significant contamination at the site. Therefore, we will require information to confirm that the design of the surface water drainage system, including the depth and location of any soakaways, satisfies our requirements as outlined in appendix 2.

We understand, from Chapter 12 of the environmental statement and the preliminary environmental risk assessment (Waterman, 2017), that excavated

materials will be reused at the site to adjust ground levels. We welcome the proposed approach to undertake these activities in accordance with the Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments (CL:AIRE) Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice (DoWCoP) and Waste and Resources Action Plan (WRAP) Quality Protocol. Furthermore and to prevent cross-site contamination we recommend the implementation of a materials management plan.

### FLOOD RISK

#### National Planning Policy Framework Flood Risk Sequential Test

The site is within Flood Zone 3 of our flood map for planning. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 101, development should not be permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. It is for the Local Planning Authority to determine if the Sequential Test has to be applied and whether or not there are other sites available at lower flood risk as required by the Sequential Test in the NPPF. Our flood risk standing advice reminds you of this and provides advice on how to do this. By consulting us on this planning application we assume that your Authority has applied and deemed the site to have passed the NPPF Sequential Test. Please be aware that our response to the submitted detail should not be taken to mean that we consider the proposal to have passed the Sequential Test. Review of Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)

We have no objection to this application, but strongly recommend that the mitigation measures proposed in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (WIE10174-100-R-5-1-3-FRA) are adhered to.

With regard to the second part of the Exception Test, your Authority must be satisfied with regards to the safety of people (including those with restricted mobility), the ability of such people to reach places of safety, including safe refuges within buildings, and the ability of the emergency services to access such buildings to rescue and evacuate those people.

In all circumstances where flood warning and evacuation are significant measures in contributing to managing flood risk, we expect local planning authority to formally consider the emergency planning and rescue implications of new development in making their decisions.

### WASTE:

In the initial response in 2012 it was stated:

The applicant has addressed the issues of waste management from the construction to the operational phases. In addressing waste management the applicant will undertake Site Waste Management Plans for the construction phase and in doing so will adhere to the principles of the waste hierarchy.

This should still stand before construction takes place.

### WATER QUALITY/WASTEWATER:

This site does appear to have been assessed, reference site 11/19, in the last (draft) East Cambridgeshire Water Cycle Study. Section 5.2.3 shows the 'RAG' assessment for the site was 'Amber' for Foul Network Capacity – which indicates that “Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required”.

Section 11, 'Foul Drainage', of the application form submitted states that foul sewage is to be disposed of via mains sewer, and that details of foul water proposals are included in the Flood Risk Assessment. We could not find any reference to foul water in the FRA document.

Given the location of this site at the very extremity of the Newmarket WRC sewer network, and the WCS assessment, we would expect to see confirmation from Anglian Water that there is sufficient capacity within the system; or that capacity can be made available to accommodate any extra flows generated by this proposed development.

## 5.28 Neighbours

A site notice was posted and advertisement placed in the Cambridge Evening News. Forty-nine neighbouring properties were notified and one response was received citing neutrality as they live and work on the site. The comment can be read in full the ECDC website.

## 6.0 The Planning Policy Context

### 6.1 East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015

GROWTH 1	Levels of housing, employment and retail growth
GROWTH 2	Locational strategy
GROWTH 3	Infrastructure requirements
GROWTH 4	Delivery of Growth
GROWTH 5	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
FRD 6	Employment allocation, land north of Turners
EMP 1	Retention of existing employment sites and allocations
EMP 2	Extensions to existing businesses in the countryside
EMP 6	Development affecting the horse racing industry
ENV 1	Landscape and settlement character
ENV 2	Design
ENV 12	Listed Buildings
ENV 14	Sites of archaeological interest
ENV 4	Energy efficiency and renewable energy in construction
ENV 7	Biodiversity and geology
ENV 8	Flood risk
ENV 9	Pollution
COM 7	Transport impact
COM 8	Parking provision

### 6.2 Supplementary Planning Documents

6.3 National Planning Policy Framework 2018

- 6 Building a strong, competitive economy
- 12 Achieving well designed places
- 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

6.4 Submitted Local Plan 2018

- LP1 A presumption in favour of sustainable development
- LP2 Level and distribution of growth
- LP3 The settlement hierarchy and the countryside
- LP8 Delivering prosperity and jobs
- LP10 Development affecting the Horse Racing Industry
- LP16 Infrastructure to support growth
- LP17 Creating a Sustainable Transport Network
- LP18 Improving cycle provision
- LP20 Delivering green infrastructure, trees and woodland
- LP22 Achieving Design Excellence
- LP25 Managing water resource and flood risk
- LP26 Pollution and land contamination
- LP27 Conserving and enhancing heritage assets
- LP28 Landscape, treescape, and built environment character, including cathedral views
- LP30 Conserving and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity
- Fordham 6 Employment Cluster, South of Fordham

6.5 Planning Practice Guidance

**7.0 PLANNING COMMENTS**

- 7.1 An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken by the applicant to consider the likely significant environmental effects of the proposal and an Environmental Statement (ES) has been submitted. The ES has been informed by a formal scoping opinion from the Council and is compliant with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.
- 7.2 The ES addresses the likely environmental effects of the proposal each of which will be covered in this report.
- 7.3 The main issues to consider in determining this application are, the principle of development, visual impact, access, parking and impact on the transport network, impact on residential amenity, impact on heritage assets and archaeology, flood risk, impact on ecology, trees and landscaping, socio-economics, vibration, air quality, contamination, cumulative impacts and BREEAM.

## **The proposal**

- 7.4 In addition to providing additional floorspace for LGC Limited requirements, this hybrid application seeks to secure consent for a wider business park, set within the allocated employment area, to provide a range of business floorspace, including start up accommodation.
- 7.5 This hybrid planning application therefore comprises the following elements, broken down into five anticipated development phases. Phases 1 and 2 are the full elements of the application.
- 7.6 The outline elements of this phase will be governed by parameter plans that set the minimum and maximum extent of development in terms of height, layout and footprint, the maximum quantum of floorspace per use class proposed and the internal vehicular access and proposed strategic landscaping for the Site.
- 7.7 These parameters are fully tested by the Environmental Statement submitted in support of this proposed development.
- 7.8 **Phase 1: LGC Expansion (Use Classes B1)**  
This element of the proposed development is submitted in full and will form part of Phase 1 of the development.
- 7.9 **Phase 2: LGC Expansion (Use Classes B1 and B2)**  
This element of the scheme is submitted in full but developed as Phase 2.
- 7.10 **Phase 3: Gateway Building (Use Class B1), Amenities Building and Incubator Hub (Use Classes A1, B1 and D1)**  
This element of the proposed development is submitted in outline (with all matters reserved with the exception of access and strategic planting) and will form Phase 3.
- 7.11 **Phase 4: Mid Tech 1 building (Use Classes B2 and B8)**  
This phase of the proposed development is submitted in outline (with all matters reserved with the exception of access and strategic planting) and will form Phase 4.
- 7.12 **Phase 5: Mid Tech 2 buildings (Use Classes B2 and B8)**  
This element of the proposed development is submitted in outline (with all matters reserved with the exception of access and strategic planting) and will form Phase 5.
- 7.13 **Full Planning Application - Phases 1 and 2**  
Phases 1 and 2 are submitted in order to fulfil the current and future requirements of LGC Limited, including the company's desire to rationalise some of their national accommodation to the Site. A series of temporary permissions have been granted by the Council (16/01657/FUL & 17/00942/FUL) to allow LGC Limited to construct temporary structures on site to accommodate their required growth in the short term.
- 7.14 Full planning permission is therefore sought to provide permanent accommodation through partial demolition, alteration and extension of existing Blocks B.C, B.B and B.D to provide new Blocks C East, B West and D South.

- 7.15 These new Blocks will provide a total of 4,680 sq m (GEA) of new B1 floorspace for office and laboratory use.



## **Outline Planning Application – Phases 3, 4 and 5**

### **Phase 3**

#### **The ‘Gateway’ Building**

- 7.16 The built form of the site sits a distance back from the A142, Newmarket Road frontage, screened as it is by mature planting.
- 7.17 In order to maximise the legibility of the site, historical consents (16/00974/REM, granted on 21st October 2016) have been secured for the construction of an additional building and associated landscaping at the main site access to pronounce the site’s entrance and provide increased legibility.
- 7.18 Phase 3 of the proposed development, seeks to mirror this historical approach by proposing a ‘Gateway’ building towards the main access point to the A142, Newmarket Road.
- 7.19 The Gateway building has been designed to provide modern and flexible accommodation falling within Use Class B1, and will offer 18m deep floor plates and measure approximately 4,728 sq m (GEA).
- 7.20 The design of the Gateway building will harmonise with the existing structures on site and will be set within landscaping, planting and associated car parking (214 spaces).

#### **Amenities Block, Incubator Hub and Offices**

- 7.21 A further three Blocks are proposed in outline form within Phase 3 of the proposed development.
- 7.22 Given the growth of LGC Limited and the proposed additional business floorspace on the Site, an Amenities Block (Use Classes A1 and/or A3 and/or D2) is proposed to provide facilities for current and future employees on the site. These facilities may include a canteen and gym and basic convenience facilities for the site. The Incubator Hub (Use Class B1) is proposed as a flexible building capable of use as a research laboratory, office or start up facility for up and coming research companies.
- 7.23 It is proposed that both the Amenities Block and Incubator Hub can either form one block adjacent to the existing LGC campus to the north east or two standalone blocks, within the limits set by Parameter Plans, including, Footprint, Height, Land Use, Layout, Vehicular Access and Strategic Planting.
- 7.24 In terms of proposed floorspace per Use Class, it is proposed that a maximum of 1,116 sq m (GEA) can be provided, split between Use Class A1, A3 or D2, or a combination of these uses.
- 7.25 The Incubator Hub, can provide a maximum of 1,116 sq m (GEA) of Use Class B1 floorspace.
- 7.26 A further Block is proposed to the north east of the Amenities Block/Incubator Hub as offices, falling within Use Class B1a and measuring approximately 584 sq m

(GEA). The intention of this accommodation is to provide space for growth for both LGC and other start-up companies on site.

7.27 Although proposed in outline form, these buildings will be designed to harmonise with the existing buildings on site, whilst ensuring maximum flexibility in terms of floorplate.

7.28 A total of 214 car parking spaces is proposed for Phase 3 in accordance with the Council's standards.

**Phase 4 - Mid Tech 1**

7.29 Also submitted in outline form with all matters reserved apart from access, is the Mid Tech 1 building as either industrial, storage and distribution, falling within Use Classes B2 and/or B8 and providing a maximum of 6,556 sq m (GEA) of floorspace. The height, scale, footprint, layout and quantum of floorspace are governed by the minimum and maximum parameters and maximum floorspace as set out in the Parameter Plan Report (Appendix 1 of the Design and Access Statement).

7.30 A total of 131 car parking spaces is proposed for Phase 4 in accordance with the Council's standards.

**Phase 5 - Mid Tech 2**

7.31 Similar to the Mid Tech 1 building, the Mid Tech 2 buildings are submitted in outline form, providing the potential to provide three buildings falling within industrial or storage and distribution uses (Use Classes B2 and/or B8), providing a maximum of 13,087 sq m (GEA) floorspace. The height, scale, footprint, layout and quantum of floorspace are governed by the minimum and maximum parameters and maximum floorspace as set out in the Parameter Plan Report.

7.32 Although appearance is reserved for future consideration, an example of the anticipated design of the proposed buildings is set out in the Design and Access Statement.

7.33 A total of 262 car parking spaces is proposed for Phase 5 in accordance with the Council's standards.

**Principle of development**

7.34 The NPPF states that planning decisions should "help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt". And that "significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development." (para 80).

7.35 In terms of promoting a successful and competitive economy, the NPPF sets out the Government's commitment to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support economic growth, and that planning decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirement of different sectors. This includes making provision for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations. (para 82).

- 7.36 Policy GROWTH 1 encourages the creation of further employment opportunities within the District including making provision for a deliverable supply of at least 179ha of B1/B2/B8 employment land. Employment uses comprised under B1/B2 and B8 play an important role in the Council's growth strategy and therefore the Council will seek to protect these land uses. Policy EMP2 aims to protect the existing character, scale and amenities of an area where existing businesses are being extended in the countryside. The visual impact will be discussed later in this report but the proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of this Policy.
- 7.37 Policy EMP 6 and emerging Policy LP10 relates to development affecting the horse racing industry, stating that any development which is likely to have an adverse impact on the operational use of an existing site within the horse racing industry, or which would threaten the long term viability of the horse racing industry as a whole will not be permitted. The proposed development will complement the existing use business on the site and enable its further expansion.
- 7.38 The site is allocated in the Local Plan as an Employment Location under Policy FRD 6 for B1 and B2 uses, offering potential for further on-site expansion of the laboratories plus the development of other employment uses on the site. Emerging Policy Fordham 6 incorporates the same provisions for the site.
- 7.39 Adjacent to the site, the Local Plan identifies five other employment allocations, FRD4 (Land south of Snailwell Road), FRD5 (land north of Snailwell Road), FRD7 (land north of Turners) and FRD8 (land south of Landwade Road) all identified for B1/B2/B8 and these provisions are carried forward into Emerging Policy Fordham 6.
- 7.40 The site benefits from extant consent to provide additional office accommodation towards the A142 frontage of the site and there are two temporary consents for additional office accommodation to serve the LGC.
- 7.41 The employment allocation only allows for B1/B2 uses on this site as it is considered that B8 uses can be better accommodated within the other surrounding allocations. It is considered however that the provision of an element of B8 use on this site would not result in material harm in planning terms given the proposals for expansion around it and in the context of existing uses and would complement the character of the employment cluster within which the site sits. The proposal comprises mainly expansion to the LGC business on site and the element of B8 would be included within the Mid tech buildings in Phases 4 and 5 and are designed for flexible use of the space with an element of B2 industrial use.
- 7.42 In addition, and when considered against the Government's aims for securing economic development, and to be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan, the proposals are considered to fully endorse these aims, through the provision of an investment in excess of £54 million during construction, including the provision of 918 Full Time Equivalent jobs when all phases are complete and operational, with an estimated Gross Value Added created for the economy of £53 million, of which £31.4 million could be to East Cambridgeshire once the development is operational.

- 7.43 Given the above, the principle of the proposed development is considered acceptable, including its contribution to the strategic provision of employment land within the District.
- 7.44 Also of relevance in determining the principle of this development is the impact it would have on the nearby European and internationally designated sites. Policy FRD 6 of the Local Plan requires a Habitats Regulations Assessment screening to be undertaken. Where this identifies a likely significant effect an Appropriate Assessment must be undertaken by the Council under the Habitats Regulation Assessment process to ensure there is no adverse effect on European sites.
- 7.45 The site itself does not have any statutory designations, however there are three statutory designated sites located within 2km of the site. Chippenham Fen (Ramsar, National nature Reserve (NNR) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is located immediately adjacent to the east of the site. Brackland Rough SSSI is located immediately adjacent to the north of the site and Snailwell Meadows SSSI is located approx 500m south of the site. The Environmental Statement accompanying the application assesses the likely impact of the development on the designated sites both during construction stage and upon completion of the development. The Report states that construction works are unlikely to have a direct effect on any of the designated sites within 2km of the site. Indirect effects such as dust or pollution through ground water run-off may occur during this phase of development on a small percentage of the adjacent designated site Chippenham Fen SSSI/NNR and Brackland Rough SSSI. The effects of this would be temporary only. The construction works noise increase and increase in footfall would be likely to temporarily disturb certain bird species (for which the Chippenham Fen SSSI/NNR site is designated), and so it is considered there would be a temporary, local, adverse effect of minor significance to these designated sites.
- 7.46 The Report states that the completed development is considered to have no direct impact on any of the designated sites within 2km of the site. In the absence of mitigation indirect effects in the form of light spill from new buildings and parking lots have the potential to be a permanent impact upon a small percentage of the Chippenham Fen SSSI/NNR. It is not anticipated that increase light levels at the completed development would have any direct impacts on Brackland Rough SSSI due to its distance from the site. It is therefore considered that in the absence of mitigation measures, the completed development would have a permanent, local adverse impact of minor significance on one of the designated sites. The CEMP would mitigate impacts from noise, dust, vibration, lighting and surface run-off. A lighting strategy will be implemented as part of the final detailed design of the development. All external lighting would be directional and faced away from the designated sites. Lighting on timers would be implemented across the site so that areas are only lit as and when required. This will mean the impact on the sites would be negligible.
- 7.47 Natural England's Scoping Response requested that the Environmental Statement should identify how the developments effects on the natural environment would be influenced by climate change. The assessment of potential ecological effects presented in this chapter predicts a range of negligible and beneficial effects as a result of the operation of the proposed development. No significant alterations to the operation of the proposed development due to climate change are foreseen.

- 7.48 Natural England accepts these conclusions. Policy FRD 6 requires a Habitats Regulation Assessment screening. Given the above it is considered that an Appropriate Assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is not required.
- 7.49 Given the sites allocation for employment use and the clear support within the NPPF for economic growth, the principle of this development is considered acceptable.

### **Visual impact**

- 7.50 Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 stress the desire to protect important views into and out of settlements, space between settlements and their wider landscape setting, visually sensitive natural and man-made skylines, hillsides and geological features and views of key landmark buildings. This reflects the Government's objectives in terms of protection of the countryside and landscapes more generally, set out in paragraph 170 of the NPPF, which states that the planning system "*should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment*". The need to recognise "*the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside*" is also enshrined as a core planning principle in paragraph 170 of the NPPF.
- 7.51 There is no published guidance establishing a threshold beyond which visual impacts should be deemed unacceptable, and it is for the decision maker in each case to determine how much weight landscape and visual effects should attract in the planning balance.
- 7.52 A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and submitted as part of the ES. The LVIA addresses the landscape effects of the proposal that are caused by physical changes to the landscape and the changes in visual amenity that would arise from, any change in the nature of views experienced. A study area of approximately 2km radius from the site has been adopted. The site consists of a series of vacant grass fields and the surroundings of a mixture of one and two storey, late 20<sup>th</sup> century buildings with associated car parking. The buildings are situated in the centre of the northern area of the Site. There are two residential properties associated with the facility located to the northwest of the site.
- 7.53 Biggin Farm is sited to the west and to the south two properties face the site from the other side of the roundabout. Further south along Snailwell Road is a further residential property at Number 115.
- 7.54 Phases 1, 2 and 3 are all set within and around the confines of the existing LGC building complex. The most visible building will be the Gateway building to the front of the existing buildings where permission already exists for a modest office building rising to some 8.6 metres in height. The existing LGC collection of buildings sits well within the landscape setting of the site and are barely visible from the road frontage which has the benefit of substantial mature hedging. The proposed gateway building will sit on higher land to the front of the site although use will be made of the change in ground levels to set the building within this sloping ground.

- 7.55 The design of the extensions in Phases 1 and 2 would take into account the existing buildings on the site. The lower storey would be clad in Eternit or similar fibre concrete rain screen panels. The upper storey would be clad with a slatted timber or high pressure laminate lattice over the rain screen. The buildings would be 7.83 m above ground level with the plant enclosure on the roof to a height of 10.8 metres.
- 7.56 The designs and scale of the buildings in Phases 3, 4 and 5 will be determined at reserved matters stage. The proposed Gateway building would be located near the entrance of the site in front of the existing buildings. The site vision is for it to be a landmark building for the site providing a max of 4,728 sq m of B1 flexible office/laboratory space. The parameter plans for the site show that the height of this building would be between 11.6m and 13.5m above ground level. Although scale is not being considered a building of this height would serve as a statement building upon entry to the site.
- 7.57 The other elements of Phase 3 are situated at the rear of the site and in principle are acceptable at an indicative height of a maximum of 11.2 metres above ground level.
- 7.58 The applicant has shown provision for fairly large scale buildings in the indicative masterplan for the site, with the Mid Tech buildings being some 30 – 40 metres wide with a common delivery yard and carpark. The indicative heights are 14 metres but not under consideration as part of this planning application. The applicant has provided a parameters plan and report stating what the respective heights of the buildings are likely to be in comparison to the existing buildings.
- 7.59 The Mid Tech 1 and 2 buildings will be constructed on land which will be levelled with cut and fill. This means that the overall height of the Mid Tech 1 building will be some 6 metres higher (AOD), than existing Building D on the site and Mid Tech 2 will be some 4 metres higher (AOD). It is accepted that buildings of the indicative size proposed will be prominent when viewed from the Snailwell Road and on approaching the site from the south. The applicant proposes to keep the existing vegetation along the southern boundaries and to enhance this with additional boundary planting as the boundary is very open in places. Views of the new development from the south will be the most prominent as the vast majority of the development will be screened by the existing site frontage vegetation.
- 7.60 The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment acknowledges that the impact of the development from the A142, Snailwell Road and 115 Snailwell Road, will have the greatest impact having a moderate adverse effect during construction and the first year of operation. During the fifteenth year of operation, this reduces to moderate to minor, following establishment of the landscape masterplan to mitigate the visual impact and introduce a greater species diversity.
- 7.61 The LVIA states “Overall, the Site and Development would be well contained in the wider landscape. In views from the key visual receptors, due to the scale and massing of the built form and with; the presence of existing industrial development within surrounding views; the retention of existing mature vegetation; and, the carefully positioned mitigation planting, the visual prominence of the development is limited. The proposed development will be set within a mature landscape

framework that softens views of the built form and responds to or enhances features of the existing landscape”.

- 7.62 The LVIA states that the site is currently visible for a small number of residential properties and commercial premises, public highways and local public rights of way. Otherwise views to the site are prevented by dense woodland blocks and the cumulative effect of surrounding field hedgerows. This is also set against the context of surrounding industrial development and the large scale impact of the Turners site.

### **Construction effect**

- 7.63 During the construction phase of the development associated plant and cranes will be brought into the area, clearance and land regrading will occur and site hoarding will be erected. To accommodate the development a small amount of existing vegetation will also be removed. The construction plant will be an incongruous feature in the landscape and it is considered that the hoarding and potential cranes used for the construction of the development are likely to be visible within a number of the identified visual receptor's views and this is likely to create a temporary, direct, adverse significance of effect that will range from major to moderate to negligible, subject to the visibility.

- 7.64 In considering the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development it is important to take into account any measures that mitigate the scale of the effects. These measures can, if sufficient, reduce or improve the predicted effect. Mitigation measures are an integral part of the development and therefore 'designed in'. For the purposes of the assessment, those items which would be considered 'mitigation' are described below.

- Existing vegetation will be retained and protected in accordance with BS5837:2012.
- New areas of native and ornamental planting within the development to provide a mature setting to the built form and infrastructure as set out in the Landscape Parameter Plan and Landscape Masterplan.
- The design of the new building elevations, materials, roof profiles and colour to reflect the existing buildings within the Site and to reduce the massing of built form when viewed in the wider landscape as set out in the detailed design for phases 1-2 and the principles and parameters for phases 3-5 as provided in the Design and Access Statement.

- 7.65 The measures identified have been identified as representing industry best practice. No negative effects as a result of the mitigation are identified.

### **Construction mitigation**

- 7.66 Effects will be mitigated within the development during demolition and construction through site hoardings which will mask many construction operations. The potential use of cranes, associated with construction will be visible, but these are temporary.

### **Operational effects – once completed**

- 7.67 With the construction of the development complete, the LVIA states it would have a local, direct, permanent, moderate magnitude of change on the Landscape Character of the 'Medium to Large Agricultural Fields', leading to a moderate adverse significance of effect. This is due to the change in land use which will affect a restricted extent of the overall Landscape Character area and the loss of some vegetation with the mitigation planting not yet matured. However, it is noted that the change in land use from vacant fields to employment uses reflects the allocation of the site within the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan and the development follows suggested guideline associated with this allocation. Due to the scale of the Mid-Tech buildings there will be an indirect effect on the wider extent of the LCA due to the presence of a greater amount of large scale built form in views.
- 7.68 The LVIA states that from the south facing windows of properties associated with Biggin Farm the Gateway Building and the Mid Tech 1 building (phases 3 and 4) are likely to be visible. Views of the associated car parks and vehicles parking in these immediate areas will also be possible. The mature vegetation located to the south of these properties and associated with the existing LGC Ltd laboratories and office buildings will provide some screening to the new built form and infrastructure. It is recognised that the planting proposed to soften the views of the Mid Tech 1 building and car park, will have yet to mature. The built form will however be seen in context with the existing laboratories and office blocks.
- 7.69 The LVIA does acknowledge that a greater extent of visibility, which varies in relation to the intactness of the roadside hedgerow, will be possible from Snailwell Road as it leads southeast from the roundabout. In these views, the Mid Tech 1 and Mid Tech 2 buildings (phases 4-5) will be visible above and behind the existing boundary vegetation. Views of the southern part of the development are likely to be possible from 115 Snailwell Road and the Industrial and Business Park. The upper levels of the Mid Tech 1 building also likely to be glimpsed from the upper storey windows of the Industrial Park to the west during winter.
- 7.70 At year 1, the LVIA accepts that the Mid Tech buildings would be a prominent urbanising feature in the views from the south. However, the new built form will be seen in context with the existing industrial and business parks in the local area and which will be developed in the future employment allocations directly adjoining this site along its southern boundary and beyond to the west, between Snailwell road and the A142. In the long term it will therefore become part of a much larger employment area.
- 7.71 In addition, where the topography rises to the southeast, there would be glimpsed views towards the development from Chippenham Road and public right of way 204/5 where the Mid Tech 2 buildings; the roofline of extensions to Buildings C, B and D; Amenities building; and, Incubator Hub will be seen the amongst intervening vegetation. Public right of way 204/1 running parallel to this will also have limited glimpsed views of the Development roofline, although, the existing dense vegetation largely screens the development. These views of the development are likely to increase in winter months where the intervening vegetation will provide less of a screen. Available views of the development from these receptors to the east will



predominantly be set within the existing mature tree line and at a lower level to the existing industrial buildings that are glimpsed and more distant within the views.

- 7.72 In winter, limited views of the extended car park to the northeast of the development and the extension to Building C would be glimpsed through the existing vegetation associated with the River Snail and Chippenham Fen from public rights of way 92/16 and 49/3. However, due to this intervening vegetation, the difference between the existing and new built form would be barely discernible. Glimpsed views of the Development's built form are also expected from Phantom Cottages and Park Farm but views will be screened from Hare Hall. From these receptors, the discernible glimpses of built form will be seen in context with the existing Site features and the surrounding industrial buildings to the west and south of the Site.

### **Completed development mitigation**

- 7.73 Effects on identified landscape and visual receptors have been mitigated through the design and materials of the development, as outlined in the material submitted for approval and illustrated for the detailed design in the Design and Access Statement. This new built form and infrastructure takes into account the scale and form of existing offices and laboratories within the site and within the wider context. The details of the design for the outline aspects of the development would be secured through the agreement of reserved matters with this assessment based on the submitted parameters plans.
- 7.74 In regard to planting, the majority of the mitigation measures will be associated with the boundary of the development and these measures have been considered as part of the Landscape Masterplan and are set out in Parameter Plan 7. Within the development, trees will also be planted using a range of sizes from small to medium-sized specimens to provide amenity benefits for workers. On the basis of other similar developments it is considered that the trees planted as standards along the boundary would grow to approximately 8-10m in height after 15 years growth (with optimal planting conditions and regular maintenance) and soften the visual effect of the proposed development. The Landscape Masterplan and additional native tree, shrub and meadow grass planting would bring additional benefits through enhancing external social and recreation opportunities and increasing the habitat value of the Site through increasing species diversity and management.

### **Long term effects – 15th year**

- 7.75 In the long term, following fifteen years of operation, the implementation of the Development will have a minor beneficial effect on account of: the new built form that reflects the existing character of buildings within the site; the increase species diversity of planting; and the enhanced facilities and areas of communal open space for employees. There would be a moderate to minor adverse effect on views from Snailwell Road and 115 Snailwell Road. The development is considered to have minor adverse or minor adverse to negligible or no effect on the remaining residential properties, commercial farms, public highways and public rights of way visual receptors and the identified Landscape Character Areas due to the overall containment of the Site in the wider landscape by mature vegetation and large scale built form, and the existing and future industrial context of the wider area.

- 7.76 The Landscape Masterplan considers the careful retention and enhancement of the boundary planting, mature trees within the site, drainage ditches and the River Snail corridor. The new buildings have been considered in terms of materials and form to respect existing site characteristics and reduce the visual prominence in views from the wider landscape.
- 7.77 The proposed new tree planting to the southern and eastern boundaries would break up the facades of the large scale warehouses and soften their appearance. The Landscape Masterplan has been carefully designed to ensure the new planting responds to the local character and enhances the ecological value of the landscape framework. Following establishment, this structure will provide a mature setting to the development helping to integrate it into the immediate surroundings.

### **Monitoring**

- 7.78 Monitoring of the development will seek to ensure that the design achieves the highest quality and minimises the landscape and visual effects. Monitoring of the landscape elements will fall within the remit of the management team of the employment facility relating to the soft landscaping in particular the boundary planting. The long term maintenance will be secured by condition.
- 7.79 Overall the visual impact of the buildings proposed as part of the full application are considered acceptable and the scale of the elements proposed in outline will be assessed at reserved matters stage. However the sites sensitive southern boundary aspect must be noted and any future built form in the MID Tech buildings must incorporate clever design solutions to satisfactorily assimilate buildings of this indicative scale, into the surroundings, so as not to harm the landscape and visual character of the area. This is acknowledged within the LVIA.
- 7.80 Historic England have raised concerns that the proposed mid tech buildings 1 and 2 will have an urbanising intrusive addition within the setting of the Scheduled Monument, which is situated 140 metres to the south of the site. The designated Scheduled Monument is the site of a Roman villa. They do not consider that the Environmental Statement has provided an adequate assessment on the impact of the proposal on the setting of the scheduled Roman villa and request a full settings assessment be undertaken, to understand the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the scheduled monument, and how this setting will be impacted by the proposed development. They state “The ES concludes, without any supporting evidence or narrative and on the basis of the proposed outline maximum parameters of the development and, that there will be a ‘permanent, local effect of moderate adverse significance on the setting of Scheduled Monument”.
- 7.81 Historic England are of the view that the development may result in harm to its significance. They advise that we should be satisfied that the public benefit of the scheme outweighs the harm to designated assets, and that any permission granted should be conditional on securing a further scheme of archaeological work and landscaping mitigation to screen the development in views from the south.
- 7.82 In response to this the applicant states;

*“This section makes clear that the assessment is based on the maximum parameters of the proposed Mid-Tech Buildings, as these buildings are being applied for in outline. In line with EIA best practice, we must assess the maximum parameters being applied for in order to provide a robust and defensible assessment and to provide regulators with the confidence that a ‘worst-case’ assessment has been undertaken. The assessment reported in this section also takes no account of any possible mitigation measures at this stage. The potential magnitude of change is explained at paragraph 14.42, i.e. moderate adverse, and again notes that this is based on an assessment of maximum parameters.*

*A moderate adverse magnitude of change is defined as: “The proposed changes will negatively alter the setting or overall character of the heritage asset. It will likely disturb key features and detract from the overall heritage significance. Change of this magnitude should be avoided where possible, but can be minimised or neutralised through positive mitigation.”*

*“.....due to the distance separating the Scheduled Monument from the proposed Mid Tech Buildings, a substantial adverse effect would not be reasonable, hence a conclusion of “permanent, local, adverse effects of moderate significance”.*

*“.....the assessment has considered the maximum parameters of the proposed Mid Tech Buildings. Given the relatively early stage of the design process for these buildings there are no mitigation measures in the form of detailed design of the buildings that can be considered at this stage. Careful consideration of mitigation on the future detailed design of the Mid-Tech Buildings ... may afford the opportunity to reduce the potential adverse effects to the setting of this asset”.*

- 7.83 Given that the assessment was based on worst case scenario, this matter can be reviewed at reserved matters stage, however it is necessary to be confident that the principle of large scale buildings on the site will not harm the significance of the heritage asset. Whilst the applicant has advised that any harm can be mitigated, it is unlikely that this can be achieved to any great degree in this case given the sheer size of the buildings proposed. The scale of the development is such that it would not be possible to screen the built-form in its entirety.
- 7.84 Innovative design can go some way to reducing the appearance of bulk but weight must also be given to the fact that the land immediately to the south which lies between the site and the boundary of the Scheduled Monument is allocated within the Local Plan FRD5 and the Submitted Local Plan, for further employment development FRD.E1(E). The expectation is therefore that further development will take place in even closer proximity to the Monument.
- 7.85 Paragraph 132 of NPPF states ‘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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting’. When considering harm (Para 134) the NPPF notes that ‘harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal’.

- 7.86 Taking into account the LVIA statement that the harm to the heritage asset should be avoided where possible, the fact that the site itself is allocated, as is the site closer to the monument, and weighing this harm against the public benefits, it is considered that the public benefits are significant in the delivery of large scale employment and some 750 to 867 jobs to the benefit of the local economy.
- 7.87 In conclusion, the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm being caused to the significance of the heritage asset and the public benefits of this employment development would outweigh this harm as required by Chapter 16 of the NPPF relating to heritage assets. As such, the proposed development would not comply with the NPPF, Policy ENV11 of the Local Plan and LP27 of the 2018 Submitted Local Plan.

### **Access, parking and impact on the transport network**

- 7.88 The proposed development will use the existing vehicular access. Before occupation of Phase 1, anticipated in 2019, this access will be improved and a ban placed on right hand turns out of the site. This will be secured by condition.
- 7.89 To enhance the use of public transport links and in accordance with Policy FRD 6, the applicant also proposes to provide two bus stops with shelters, lay-bys and a pedestrian crossing on Newmarket Road, north of the Fordham roundabout. This will be delivered to completion of Phase 1 to be secured by s106 agreement.
- 7.90 Prior to occupation of a Phase 3 building, alterations will be made to improve the roundabout to the south of the site, at the junction with Snailwell Road. This will involve the introduction of two traffic lanes on the approach and exit arms of the roundabout. This will be secured by S106 legal agreement to be delivered when needed prior to the completion of Phase 3.
- 7.91 Also secured by S106 agreement is a financial contribution of £ 150,000 towards junction improvement at the A14 junction 37, half will be provided upon commencement of the development at the site to fund a detailed study into an acceptable scheme. The remainder to be paid on award of a contract for the highway works. It is currently envisaged that a new dumbbell roundabout design would be constructed with two roundabouts provided on the A142 either side of the A14. Suffolk CC are satisfied that this contribution is commensurate the impact that this development would have on the junction, following a costing exercise for the improvement works required.
- 7.92 These improvements are to mitigate the likely transport impacts of the predicted increase in traffic flows as a result of the proposed development to be delivered by financial contributions and secured by S106 obligation. The applicant has agreed to the Suffolk CC request that any unspent money is returned to the applicant after 10 years. Suffolk CC have also advised that if the works are not completed in time to mitigate the impacts of Phase 3 onwards, then this contribution would be used to fund a relatively low cost solution to mitigate the impacts of this development.
- 7.93 Suffolk CC have raised no objections and advise that “The risk will be on SCC and HE if there is some short term localised traffic impacts on this junction, before a more comprehensive junction improvement is funded from other sources. At the

moment there are a lot of unknowns, but in the next few months we will get a much clearer picture of what is going to happen here.”

- 7.94 The proposed development would provide a total of 764 new parking spaces over the five phases, linked to each phase, in addition to the 202 spaces currently provided on site. A total of 133 new cycle spaces will also be provided. This accords with the Councils parking standards.
- 7.95 During construction, a CEMP would be implemented to control construction traffic movements and reduce potential adverse environmental effects. Nevertheless, occasional disruption to the local road network and to pedestrians and cyclists using the footway and cycleway adjacent to the local road network cannot be ruled out. There would be insignificant effects to off-road pedestrian and cycle routes during construction.
- 7.96 It is considered that subject to conditions and S106 agreement the development would not have an adverse impact on highway safety and complies with Policy.

#### **Residential amenity**

- 7.97 There are residential properties within the site which are site properties. The only other residential property near the site is immediately to the north west, Biggen Stud Farmhouse which is Grade II Listed. It is considered that no demonstrable harm to the residential amenity will occur as a result of this development. The site will experience a greater level of activity but not of such a level to likely cause harm to residential amenity. The nature of fixed building services plant will be controlled by condition and the proposed B2 uses are in the Mid Tech buildings to the other end of the site.
- 7.98 Noise monitoring was undertaken within the site and the dominant noise source at present is road traffic noise. The proposed development is predicted to result in increases of less than three decibels on all modelled road links once it is complete and operational. This would give rise to imperceptible impacts. Measures to control construction noise and vibration effects would be incorporated into the CEMP by way of condition. No adverse effects are predicted at the two on site residential properties in the west of the site during the construction phase of Phases 1, 2, 4 or 5. However relatively high levels of construction noise are likely during construction of the Gateway building. Mitigation measures are proposed to alleviate this noise impact and consideration should be given to the fact that both residences are occupied by employees of the current on site operations. The Environmental Health Officer is satisfied with the proposal subject to conditions and further noise survey work for the outline proposals.

#### **Impact on heritage assets and archaeology**

- 7.99 The ES states that the proposed development would indirectly affect the heritage significance of the Listed Building Biggen Stud Farm located immediately to the north of the site. The heritage significance of this designated asset and the contribution of its setting to that significance has been assessed.

- 7.100 It is accepted that there would be a permanent change to the character and appearance of part of the wider setting of the Listed Building in particular the introduction of additional built form of a larger scale. Mitigation in the form of the integration of a new and comprehensive landscape design and planting would be an important feature. This would serve to soften the intervention of additional built form on the site. There would be no direct impact on the heritage significance of the farmstead. The existing prominence of the farmhouse would be maintained. The site itself does not contribute positively to the significance of the farmstead, and the established character of its setting to the south and west is defined to a significant degree by the urbanising features of major road infrastructure and grouping of large scale commercial/industrial buildings.
- 7.101 To the south of the site the impact on the Roman Villa Scheduled Ancient Monument has been discussed in detail elsewhere in this report.
- 7.102 It is considered that the development would result in less than substantial harm being caused to the significance of both these heritage assets and the public benefits of this employment development would outweigh this harm as required by Chapter 16 of the NPPF relating to heritage assets. As such, the proposed development would comply with the NPPF, Policy ENV11 of the Local Plan and LP27 of the 2018 Submitted Local Plan.
- 7.103 Archaeology - Trial trenching has recently been completed. The Cambridgeshire Historic Environment team do not object to development from proceeding in this location but consider that the site should be subject to a further programme of archaeological investigation secured through condition.

#### **Flood risk and drainage**

- 7.104 Policy ENV8 of the adopted Local Plan 2015 requires that all developments and re-developments should contribute to an overall flood risk reduction. All applications for new development must demonstrate that appropriate surface water drainage arrangements for dealing with surface water run-off can be accommodated within the site. Policy LP25 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017 requires all development proposals to be considered against the NPPF.
- 7.105 A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy has been prepared and consultation taken place with Environment Agency as the River Snail is located adjacent to the site and the site is located within Flood Zones 1,2 and 3. However the site benefits from a flood defence (earth bund). The Environment Agency are satisfied with the development proposals subject to various conditions and adherence to the mitigation measures proposed within the FRA dated Sept 2017. As the site is an allocation the sequential test has already been completed.
- 7.106 The ES demonstrates that the development also meets the exceptions test, the site is allocated for employment use and will be safe for its lifetime.
- 7.107 The site currently relies on pumps to dispose of surface water and it is proposed to maintain this arrangement following development. The applicant has confirmed that the existing pumping station will be replaced with a new pumping station containing two pumps. This will help ensure that should one pump fail, the other is still

available to evacuate water from the site. The Lead Local Flood Authority are therefore satisfied subject to a condition.

- 7.108 The foul water drainage will be dealt with via the public sewer and Anglian Water have confirmed there is capacity in the existing network at present. The sewerage system at present has available capacity for the proposed flows of 2.6l/s for phases 1 and 2. They advise that the remaining phases will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream and that off-site mitigation will need to be provided. They are therefore satisfied with the proposal subject to a condition.
- 7.109 The ES states that during the construction works, the CEMP should include temporary measures to control surface water runoff from the Site. Such measures would include the provision of adequate drainage to manage surface water runoff. The CEMP should also set out measures to ensure that the existing sewers and ditches are adequately protected and / or disconnected and altered in line with best practice.
- 7.110 It is considered that the impact of the development on water quality/resources would not significantly alter from that which currently occurs on the site and that the imposition of conditions would adequately address these matters.
- 7.111 The proposal therefore complies with Policy ENV 8 of the Local plan and Policy LP25 of the Submitted Local Plan.

#### **Ecology, biodiversity and archaeology**

- 7.112 Policy ENV 7 of the Local Plan, seeks to ensure that the impact on wildlife is minimised and that opportunities for biodiversity enhancement are taken.
- 7.113 Impacts on ecology has been assessed within the Environmental Statement, informed by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Protected Species Surveys and a Botanical Survey.
- 7.114 Given that the application site lies within a close proximity of a number of International / European designated sites, a detailed assessment of these sites (including any underpinning sites of national importance) has been undertaken and the conclusions have been drawn elsewhere in this report. This assessment concluded that, subject to the adoption of appropriate mitigation and avoidance measures, no significant adverse impacts would result on these sites, either as a result of the development proposals alone, or in combination with any other plans or projects.
- 7.115 The surveys recommended a number of measures to enhance biodiversity to include retention of existing vegetation and planting principles, the use of peat free composts and avoidance of pesticides. Much of the existing perimeter vegetation and as much as possible of the vegetation within the site will be retained thus ensuring less disturbance to habitats. The site also supports a number of plants species which are uncommon or declining in two groups and areas for which mitigation is proposed. With the implementation of the mitigation measures contained within the Environmental Statement the following residual effects are expected:

- 7.116 During site preparation and construction works, the implementation of a CEMP would reduce the risk of pollution, including dust, noise, vibration and lighting. Minimising night working would reduce disturbance to bats and otters and the inclusion of buffer zones around ditch D3 and trees with bat potential would reduce disturbance to these species. These measures would result in negligible effects to designated site, bats and otters and water voles. The inclusion of bat boxes as part of mitigation to destroy the bat roosts during this phase would have a permanent, local, effect of minor beneficial significance for bats.
- 7.117 Once completed, the development would incorporate bat boxes which would provide alternate roosting features to bats and would replace bat roosts. The lighting strategy would prevent light spill on to habitats suitable for bats and otters and a Landscape Environment Management Plan would significantly increase the value of the habitats on site for notable flora, bats and water voles. The inclusion of this mitigation would have a permanent, local, effect of minor beneficial significance on bats and water voles. There would be negligible effects to otters and designated sites.
- 7.118 In conclusion, on the evidence of the ecological surveys undertaken it is considered that the proposal complies with Policy ENV 7 of the Local Plan.
- 7.119 Policies ENV14 of the adopted Local Plan 2015 and LP27 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018 require all new development to have regard to their impacts upon the historic environment and protect, enhance and heritage assets and their settings.
- 7.120 The archaeological characteristics of the site have been established via a number of assessments with the geophysical survey of parts of the site with the highest archaeological potential. A number of archaeological remains were identified. However, as the site has been subject to varying degrees of disturbance, a number of scattered artefacts were found but were not considered to be of archaeological significance. That said the location of the Snailwell Roman Villa to the south of the site is a significant designated heritage asset. A watching brief over ground intrusive works is to be agreed with the County Archaeologist along with associated hard and soft landscaping to the setting of the buried Roman Villa. It is considered that provided the mitigation measures proposed are followed that there would be no significant harm to the setting of this significant designated heritage asset.
- 7.121 On balance the scheme would provide adequate protection to both the archaeology and cultural heritage assets present on the site and their setting which is in compliance with both national and local planning policies. A further programme of archaeological investigation will be secured through condition.

### **Trees and landscaping**

- 7.122 An Arboricultural impact assessment and method statement has been submitted. Whilst the vast majority of the existing boundary screening will be retained, pockets of tree loss will be necessary to accommodate the development and the Trees Officer has advised that the losses proposed are acceptable and is supportive of the overall landscape strategy for the site, which will be delivered with each phase of development. For the outline proposal full details will be considered at reserved



matters stage but the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment makes it clear that substantial screen planting is proposed around the perimeter of the site.

- 7.123 Alongside the Gateway building the group of mature trees are to be retained and trees and underplanting is proposed to form part of the treatment to the road boundaries and building peripheries and specimen lime tree planting is proposed to the approach to Biggen farm to enhance the character of the setting of the Listed Building and provide additional visual separation. At the Mid Tech buildings given the site levels, the surrounding ground will bank down and the planting on the southern boundary would be slightly elevated on a gentle bank. Hedges will be retained to the southern and western boundaries with additional native planting providing additional screening from Snailwell Road.
- 7.124 For the full elements of the application, the landscaping will enhance the existing position within the main campus through the provision of tree planting to divide and soften the appearance of the proposed parking zones and to highlight a central pedestrian route that leads from the building complex to the running track and embankment and river. A new courtyard will be created.
- 7.125 Additional landscaping will also help to achieve a net gain in biodiversity.

### **Socio-Economics**

- 7.126 Policy EMP2 of the adopted Local Plan 2015 and Policy LP8 of the Submitted Local Plan supports future economic growth in the district which uses land in the right locations. The availability of local employment opportunities is particularly important given the high levels of out-commuting from the district. As mentioned earlier in the report, the site is an allocated employment site in both the adopted Local Plan 2015 (FRD6) and the Submitted Local Plan (FRD.E1) refers.
- 7.127 According to the Environmental Statement submitted with the application, the applicants estimate that the construction of the scheme would support the equivalent of around 28 permanent construction jobs during the 4-5 year construction programme, creating GVA to the economy of around £19.2m. Once completed, the development is predicted to generate between 750 and 867 net additional full time jobs generating GVA to the local economy of between £40.3 - £46.6m annually.
- 7.128 Given that the site is already allocated for employment purposes in both the adopted Local Plan 2015 and the Submitted Local Plan 2018, it is considered the scheme would not significantly alter the balance of uses already agreed within both development plans and therefore in terms of socio-economic impacts these would not necessarily be affected by the proposal.

### **Vibration**

- 7.129 In terms of vibration, the site is in a rural location adjacent to a main road where noise from the road is dominant. Control measures to mitigate the impact of construction noise and vibration effects would be incorporated in the CEMP and construction vibration limits would be set to ensure compliance with national

standards. Again these limits would be mitigated through the implementation of the CEMP.

### **Air Quality**

- 7.130 Policy ENV9 of the adopted Local Plan 2015 requires that all development proposals should minimise and where possible, reduce all emissions and other forms of pollution, and ensure no deterioration in air and water quality. In terms of air quality the main likely effect on local air quality during construction would occur from dust. Mitigation measures to minimise or prevent dust generated from construction activities would be incorporated in the CEMP and implemented throughout the works. Emission from construction vehicles and plant is anticipated to be small in comparison to the existing emissions emanating from the main road adjacent to the site.
- 7.131 The applicants have modelled the likely changes in local air quality after completion of the development for sensitive receptors surrounding the site. These changes relate to the effect of future traffic related exhaust emissions which are predicted to have an insignificant effect on concentrations of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter with the overall effect of the development on air quality considered to be insignificant.
- 7.132 The Environmental Health Officer is satisfied that the impacts on air quality are likely to be negligible assuming a CEMP is prepared and adhered to and mitigation measures are put in place. A CEMP will be secured by condition.

### **Ground Conditions and contamination**

- 7.133 Policy ENV9 of the adopted Local Plan 2015 requires that all development proposals should minimise and where possible, reduce all emissions and other forms of pollution, and ensure no deterioration in air and water quality. Policy LP26 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018 requires that all development proposals must contain sufficient information to assess the potential hazards and impact especially relating to land quality.
- 7.134 A desk based assessment for the site has been undertaken to identify the likely effects from ground contamination to identified receptors. However, an intrusive ground investigation would need to be undertaken to determine the current contamination levels at the site and where there may be significant quantities of ground gas and vapour present.
- 7.135 The scheme would incorporate a higher proportion of hardstanding, thus reducing rain water infiltration through potentially contaminated soil. The removal of unforeseen contamination and reduction in soil mobilisation once the development is completed would also have a beneficial effect on ecological receptors.
- 7.136 It is acknowledged that the overall contamination risk was no greater than moderate/low and further intrusive investigations to help determine the contamination status at the site is recommended. These findings are accepted by the Environmental health Officer who has recommended conditions.

### **Cumulative effects**

- 7.137 Two types of cumulative effects have been identified as a result of the development and these relate to:
- 1) The interaction of the individual effects during construction upon a set of defined sensitive receptors, ie noise, traffic and visual intrusion; and
  - 2) The combined effects arising from other reasonably foreseeable schemes
- 7.138 In terms of Type 1 effects, these have been dealt with in other sections of the report to Committee and the applicant has provided a programme of mitigation measures which would adequately alleviate the temporary cumulative effects during construction of the development.
- 7.139 Turning to the Type 2 effects, four foreseeable schemes were considered as part of the assessment, these relate to schemes on land adj to 67 Milenhall Road, Fordham, land rear of 98 to 118 Mildenhall Road, Fordham, the Scotsdale Garden Centre and the New Sake brewery.
- 7.140 The ES concludes that due to the large distances and lack of inter-visibility or interconnection between the site and each of the four cumulative schemes there are very few identified Type 2 cumulative effects.
- 7.141 Again, appropriate mitigation measures be covered by the CEMP and other controls imposed by conditions of the consent.

### **BREEAM**

- 7.142 Policy ENV 4 requires all new development to aim for reduced or zero carbon in accordance with the zero carbon hierarchy. The applicant is aware of the need to reduce the ongoing impact of the development on equivalent carbon emissions through well designed, well-constructed and thermally efficient buildings as well as through good site practices through construction.
- 7.143 The applicant has submitted a BREEAM report which states that the aim is to meet a Very Good rating. The strategy outlined in the report shows that this will be met. A condition will be attached to the permission to ensure that this is achieved.

### **Planning Balance**

- 7.144 The matter of assessing the benefits of a proposal against the harm caused is one for the decision maker and there are no set limits or thresholds, which must be met or passed in order for a decision to be made either in favour of or against a proposal. Where a proposal comes into conflict with the Development Plan and government policy, in the form of the NPPF, this must weigh significantly against the development when reaching a planning judgement.
- 7.145 The conclusions within the Environmental Statement are agreed. Recommended conditions will secure mitigation measures and are set out within this report.

- 7.146 Policy ENV1 requires landscape and settlement character to be protected, conserved and where possible enhanced. The proposed development is significant and will have an impact on the character and appearance of the area. The LVIA concludes that with mitigation the impact of the development will be moderate adverse upon completion reducing to minor adverse after 15 years and will sit within the context of existing large scale industrial development. It will not be possible to entirely screen the development within the landscape but the additional planting proposed will go some way to soften views of the development.
- 7.147 The proposal has been thoroughly assessed in relation to its traffic and transportation effects. The County Highway Authority, Transport Planning Team and Suffolk County Highways raise no objection to the proposal, subject to appropriate financial contributions and other mitigation measures to mitigate the impacts of the development. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policies COM7 and COM8 in relation to traffic and transportation (including parking provision) and any impacts from the development will be suitably mitigated.
- 7.148 Policies ENV12 and ENV14 seek to protect Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings and their setting, together with sites of archaeological interest. The applicant has demonstrated that no significant harm will be caused to the setting of any heritage assets and a suitably worded planning condition can be imposed requiring an archaeological investigation to be carried out. It is considered that the historic environment will be adequately preserved and that any minor adverse effect attracts limited weight against the proposal.
- 7.149 There are limited opportunities to locate the proposed development at areas at low risk of flooding and it is considered that the sequential and exceptions test has been passed. The applicant has demonstrated that flood risk can be minimised and that the development will operate alongside the existing flood defences. Subject to a condition requiring a detailed surface water drainage strategy to be imposed it is considered that the proposal complies with Policy ENV8 in relation to flood risk. Similarly, subject to the recommended mitigation measures, the proposal adequately addresses ecology and biodiversity and is in accordance with Policy ENV7. Further contamination investigation will be carried out prior to development commencing, in accordance with Policy ENV9. The noise assessment submitted demonstrates that any perceptible noise will not be significant and the necessary mitigation can be secured by condition. As these matters can be adequately addressed by condition it is considered that they carry very limited weight against the proposal.
- 7.150 The applicant has outlined the significant benefits to the economy through delivery of this development which weighs heavily in its favour.
- 7.151 The proposed development will provide for employment development on an existing allocation for employment use and although it will include some B8 uses, which is not allowed for in the Policy, it is considered that there would be no material harm in planning terms, given the existing site context and the extent of the surrounding allocations. As such the proposal is considered to largely comply with the development plan and there are no other material planning considerations which would cause demonstrable harm in planning terms which would warrant the refusal of planning permission.

7.152 There are not considered to be any significant effects on the environment.

## **8.0 COSTS**

- 8.1 An appeal can be lodged against a refusal of planning permission or a condition imposed upon a planning permission. If a local planning authority is found to have acted unreasonably and this has incurred costs for the applicant (referred to as appellant through the appeal process) then a cost award can be made against the Council.
- 8.2 Unreasonable behaviour can be either procedural ie relating to the way a matter has been dealt with or substantive ie relating to the issues at appeal and whether a local planning authority has been able to provide evidence to justify a refusal reason or a condition.
- 8.3 Members do not have to follow an officer recommendation indeed they can legitimately decide to give a different weight to a material consideration than officers. However, it is often these cases where an appellant submits a claim for costs. The Committee therefore needs to consider and document its reasons for going against an officer recommendation very carefully.
- 8.4 In this case Members' attention is particularly drawn to the following points:
- The site is allocated in both the local Plan 2015 and the Submitted Local Plan 2018 for employment use.

## **9.0 APPENDICES**

- 9.1 Appendix 1 - Conditions

<b><u>Background Documents</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>	<b><u>Contact Officer(s)</u></b>
17/01838/ESF	Barbara Greengrass Room No. 011 The Grange	Barbara Greengrass Senior Planning Officer
16/00974/FUM	Ely	01353 665555 barbara.greengrass @eastcambs.gov.uk

National Planning Policy Framework -

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 -

<http://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Local%20Plan%20April%202015%20-%20front%20cover%20and%20inside%20front%20cover.pdf>

## APPENDIX 1

### FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEMOLITION, ALTERATION AND EXTENSION OF BLOCKS B,C AND D, WITHIN USE CLASS B1 OFFICES/LABORATORY.

#### Approved plans

1. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the drawings and documents listed below

<b>Plan Reference</b>	<b>Version No</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
10174 0003	A05	11th October 2018
10174 0004	A03	11th October 2018
10174 0006	A04	11th October 2018
WATERMAN RESPONSE TO CCC COMMENTS		9th October 2018
BREEAM REPORT		11th October 2017
10174 SA 04 0004	A03	11th October 2018
10174 0006	A04	11th October 2018
10174 SA 95 0003	A05	11th October 2018
TP012	Parameter Plan 3 Height	16th February 2018
ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT		11th October 2017
STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT		11th October 2017
ENERGY STRATEGY REPORT		11th October 2017
ACOUSTIC REPORT		11th October 2017
RIBA 2 REPORT FOR BUILDING SERVICE		11th October 2017
17413-TLP-PA05	Section CC	11th October 2017
17413-TLP-PA04	Section BB	11th October 2017
17413-TLP-PA03	Section AA	11th October 2017
17413-TLP-PA02	Layout Phase 1 and 2	11th October 2017
17413-TLP-601	Tree Survey	11th October 2017
17413-TLP-602	Tree Protection	11th October 2017
TP(10) 303 REV 4	Building D	11th October 2017
TP(10) 302 REV 4	Building D	11th October 2017
TP(12) 301 REV 5	Building D	11th October 2017
TP(11) 301 REV 6	Building D	11th October 2017
TP(10)301 REV 4	Building D	11th October 2017
TP(10) 203 REV 4	Building C	11th October 2017
TP(12)201 REV 4	Building C	11th October 2017
TP(11) 201 REV 5	Building C	11th October 2017
TP(10) 201 REV 3	Building C	11th October 2017
TP(10) 202 REV 3	Building C	11th October 2017
TP(10) 103 REV 4	Building B	11th October 2017
TP(12) 101 REV 4	Building B	11th October 2017
TP(11) 101 REV 5	Building B	11th October 2017
TP(10) 101 REV 3	Building B	11th October 2017
TP(10) 102 REV 3	Building B	11th October 2017
TP(50) 001 REV B	Health and safety site plan	11th October 2017

TP(00) 003 REV 3		11th October 2017
82001 P05		11th October 2017
82002 P05		11th October 2017
75002 P03		11th October 2017
75001 P03		11th October 2017
71004 P02		11th October 2017
71003 P02		11th October 2017
71002 P02		11th October 2017
71001 P02		11th October 2017
70004 P04		11th October 2017
70003 P04		11th October 2017
70002 P04		11th October 2017
70001 P04		11th October 2017
SK 111 REV 2		11th October 2017
SK 112 REV 1		11th October 2017
SK 113 REV 2	P7	11th October 2017
SK 111 REV 2	D	11th October 2017
SK 100 REV 4		11th October 2017
SK 112 REV 1	D	11th October 2017
SK 101 REV 2	A	11th October 2017
SK 113 REV 2	D	11th October 2017
SK 102 REV 3	A	11th October 2017
APPENDICES	ES V5 part 2	11th October 2017
CHAPTER 2		14th March 2018
TRIAL TRENCH		14th March 2018
GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY		14th March 2018
CHAPTER 14		14th March 2018
HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT		14th March 2018
BASELINE		
NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY		14th March 2018
DESIGN & ACCESS		14th March 2018
LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT	ES V3 Appendix 1	11th October 2017
PLANNING STATEMENT		11th October 2017
ABORICULTURAL IMPACT		11th October 2017
ASSESSMENT		
NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY	ES	11th October 2017
LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT	ES V3	11th October 2017
FIGURES	ES V2	11th October 2017
MAIN TEXT	ES V1	11th October 2017
TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT	ES V4	11th October 2017
APPENDICES	ES V5	11th October 2017

- 1 Reason: To define the scope and extent of this permission.
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within 3 years of the date of this permission.
- 2 Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

- 3 The Development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Phasing Plan (Appendix 3 Phasing Plan), unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- 3 Reason: To accord with the terms of the planning permission.
- 4 No demolition/development shall take place until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) for a programme of archaeological works has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing for the relevant phase of development. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI which shall include:
- a) the statement of significance and research objectives;
  - b) the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person (s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;
  - c) the programme for post excavation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication and dissemination, and disposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.
- 4 Reason: To ensure that any archaeological remains are suitably recorded in accordance with policy ENV14 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP27 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted.
- 5 No development approved by this planning permission for each phase or group of phases of development shall take place until a remediation strategy for the relevant phase of development, that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.
- 1. A Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) including a Conceptual Site Model (CSM) of the site indicating potential sources, pathways and receptors, including those off site
  - 2. The results of a site investigation based on (1) and a detailed risk assessment, including a revised CSM.
  - 3. Based on the risk assessment in (2) an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken. The strategy shall include a plan providing details of how the remediation works shall be judged to be complete and arrangements for contingency actions. The plan shall also detail a long term monitoring and maintenance plan as necessary.
- 5 Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors, in accordance with policy ENV9 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP26 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018. The condition is pre-



commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted.

- 6 If during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.
- 6 Reason; To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors, in accordance with policy ENV9 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP26 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 7 No development shall take place for each phase or group of phases, until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Infiltration systems shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before development in that phase is completed.

The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Drainage Strategy prepared by Waterman Infrastructure & Environment *Ltd* (ref: *WIE10174-100-R-9-1-3-DMP*) dated September 2017 and shall also include:

- a) Full calculations detailing the existing surface water runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events
- b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements, together with an assessment of system performance;
- c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers
- d) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures
- e) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site;
- f) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system including a back-up system for pump failure;
- g) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water;
- h) A timetable for implementation

The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG

- 7 Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve and protect water quality, in accordance with policies ENV2 and ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP25 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018. The condition is

pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted and the details need to be agreed before construction begins.

- 8 No drainage systems for infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 8 Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve and protect water quality, in accordance with policies ENV2 and ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP25 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 9 Piling or any other foundation designs and investigation boreholes using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 9 Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve and protect water quality, in accordance with policies ENV2 and ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP25 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 10 No development shall commence for each phase or group of phases of development until a scheme for on-site foul water drainage works, to include connection point and discharge rate, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No buildings on that phase shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the foul water strategy approved unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 10 Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve and protect water quality, in accordance with policies ENV2 and ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP25 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted and the details need to be agreed before construction begins.
- 11 Prior to the commencement of each phase or group of phases of development approved by this planning permission (or such other date or stage agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority), a Materials Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The plan will include:
  1. An inspection and sampling strategy for the testing of excavation formations;
  2. A procedure for screening contamination discovered in the development phase to be screened against criteria outlined in the remediation strategy;
  3. A stockpile validation strategy;
  4. Detailed material re-use criteria;
  5. Details of arisings processing; and
  6. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in a) to e) are complete and identifying any

requirements for longer term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

- 11 Reason: To prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with the NPPF and policies ENV2 and ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP25 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted and the details need to be agreed before construction begins.
- 12 Prior to first occupation of a phase 1 building, the Developer shall be responsible for the provision and implementation of a travel plan to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Such travel plan shall include the provision of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator to give advice. The plan is to be monitored annually, with all measures reviewed to ensure targets are met.
- 12 Reason: In the interests of sustainable transport, in accordance with COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP17 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 13 Prior to the first occupation of a phase 1 building the site access junction shall be modified as shown in principle on drawing "junction 3 proposed site access junction improvements" revision A05, dated May 2017. Details to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- 13 Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP17 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 14 Prior to first occupation of Phase 1, space shall be laid out within the site for 157 cars to park. This area shall be levelled, surfaced and drained and thereafter retained for that specific use.
- 14 Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP17 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 15 No above ground construction shall take place until a scheme for the provision and location of fire hydrants to serve the development to a standard recommended by the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service or alternative scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hydrants or alternative scheme shall be installed and completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development.
- 15 Reason: To ensure the appropriate infrastructure is in place to ensure adequate public safety in accordance with Policies Growth 3 and ENV 2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 16 Prior to any work commencing on the site a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority regarding mitigation measures for noise, dust, vibration and lighting during the construction phase. These shall include, but not be limited to, other aspects such

as access points for deliveries and site vehicles, and proposed phasing/timescales of development etc. The CEMP shall be adhered to at all times during all phases.

- 16 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted.
- 17 The tree protection measures as shown within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement dated 26th September 2017 shall be implemented prior to the commencement of development, site works or clearance in accordance with the approved details, and shall be maintained and retained until the development is completed. Within the root protection areas the existing ground level shall be neither raised nor lowered and no materials, temporary buildings, plant, machinery or surplus soil shall be placed or stored thereon. If any trenches for services are required within the fenced areas they shall be excavated and backfilled by hand and any tree roots encountered with a diameter of 25mm or more shall be left unsevered.
- 17 Reason: To ensure that the trees on site are adequately protected, to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP28 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 18 Notwithstanding the Landscape Masterplan, prior to first occupation of Phase 1, a full schedule of all soft landscape works, to include the mitigation measures identified within the Ecology reports and to accord with the Landscape and Environment Management Plan, (to be agreed), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The schedule shall include, planting plans, a written specification; schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes, proposed numbers/densities; and a detailed implementation programme. It shall also indicate all existing trees and hedgerows on the land and details of any to be retained. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the end of the first planting season following occupation of the development. If within a period of ten years from the date of the planting, or replacement planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.
- 18 Reason: To assimilate the development into its surroundings and to safeguard the heritage assets, in accordance with policies ENV2 and ENV11 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP27 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 19 Prior to any occupation of the development, a scheme for the maintenance of the soft landscaping for a minimum period of 10 years from last occupation, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works shall be maintained in accordance with the agreed scheme. The scheme shall include the following:
  - i) methods for the proposed maintenance regime;

- ii) detailed schedule;
  - iii) details of who will be responsible for the continuing implementation
  - iv) details of any phasing arrangements.
- 19 Reason: To ensure the longevity of the landscaping scheme, in accordance with policy ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP28 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 20 Notwithstanding the Landscape Masterplan, prior to first occupation, a Landscape and Environment Management Plan, to include the mitigation required within the preliminary Ecological Appraisal, April 2017, Protected Species Report, September 2017, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to accord with the recommendations of the Environmental Statement. The approved Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the recommendations of the Plan.
20. Reason: To protect and enhance species in accordance with policies ENV1, ENV2 and ENV7 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP28, LP22 and LP30 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 21 Prior to occupation of any Phase 1 building, an external lighting plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the LPA, to take account of any requirements of protect species and ecology. This shall include, but not be limited to, details of external lighting specifications, locations, proposed times of use (i.e if any security lighting) and a lighting plan to show light levels off and on site. (For information we would expect the design to comply with the Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance notes for the reduction of obtrusive light available at: <https://www.theilp.org.uk/documents/obtrusive-light/>).
- 21 Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, residential amenity and ecology in accordance with policy ENV2, ENV7 and ENV9 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22, LP26 and LP30 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 22 The ecology mitigation measures as specified in the recommendations/mitigation measures within the Protected Species Report September 2017 and the Invertebrate Survey July 2017 shall be adhered to before, during and after construction. Any post construction mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with the recommendations of the reports or prior to the occupation of any building in Phase 1.
- 22 Reason: To protect and enhance species in accordance with policies ENV1, ENV2 and ENV7 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP28, LP22 and LP30 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 23 Construction times and deliveries, with the exception of fit-out, shall be limited to the following hours: 07:30 to 18:00 each day Monday-Friday, 07:30 to 13:00 Saturdays and none on Sundays or Bank/Public Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- 23 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.

- 24 No external plant or machinery shall be brought onto the site other than that expressly authorised by this permission, as detailed within Section 5.1, page 4 of the acoustic Report, prepared 24 August 2017. No additional plant shall be installed without the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority. Plant and machinery operation shall be limited to between the hours of 08:00 to 20:00.
- 24 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 25 Times of use of the site shall be limited to within the following hours:  
07:00 - 19:00 each day Monday to Saturday  
None on Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays.
- For the avoidance of doubt this means no working on site, including (but not limited to) operation of plant, machinery, deliveries or maintenance activities etc outside of these times.
- 25 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 26 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces, including walls and roofs, shall be as specified in the application. All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 26 Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with Policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 27 The development hereby approved shall meet BREEAM Very Good standard or equivalent. If this standard cannot be achieved by virtue of the site's location then prior to above floor slab construction works it must be demonstrated by a BRE Licensed Assessor how all other BREEAM standards have been fully explored in order to meet the highest standard of BREEAM Good or equivalent and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- A certificate, following post construction review, shall be issued by a BRE Licensed Assessor to the Local Planning Authority, indicating that the relevant BREEAM standard has been achieved or its equivalent within six months of first occupation of the site for written agreement by the Local Planning Authority.
- 27 Reason: To ensure that the proposal meets with the requirements of sustainability as stated in policy ENV4 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP23 and LP24 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 28 Prior to first occupation of each phase, full details of hard landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include hard surfacing materials. The works shall be carried out in accordance

with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

- 28 Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.

**OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE ERECTION OF AN AMENITIES BLOCK/INCUBATOR HUB, USE CLASSES A1,A3 AND D2 OFFICES/LABORATORY, USE CLASS B1, A GATEWAY BUILDING,USE CLASS B1, OFFICES/LABORATORY, MID TECH BUILDINGS 1 AND 2, USE CLASSES B2 AND B8, WITH ASSOCIATED SITE ACCESS, CIRCULATION,CAR PARKING, SUB STATIONS, LANDSCAPING AND SITE ASSEMBLY WORKS INCLUDING (RETAINING WALLS).**

- 29 Approval of the details of the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced, and shall be carried out as approved. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made within 3 years of the date of this permission.
- 29 Reason; The application is for outline permission only and gives insufficient details of the proposed development, and to comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 30 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within 2 years of the date of the approval of the last of the reserved matters.
- 30 Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.
- 31 The Development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Phasing Plan (Appendix 3 Phasing Plan), unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- 31 Reason: To accord with the terms of the planning permission.
- 32 No demolition/development shall take place within each phase, until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) for a programme of archaeological works has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing for the relevant phase of development. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI which shall include:
- a) the statement of significance and research objectives;
  - b) the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;
  - c) the programme for post excavation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication and dissemination, and disposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

- 32 Reason: To ensure that any archaeological remains are suitably recorded in accordance with policy ENV14 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP27 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted.
- 33 No development approved by this planning permission, for each phase or group of phases of development, shall take place until a remediation strategy for the relevant phase of development that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.
1. A Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) including a Conceptual Site Model (CSM) of the site indicating potential sources, pathways and receptors, including those off site
  2. The results of a site investigation based on (1) and a detailed risk assessment, including a revised CSM.
  3. Based on the risk assessment in (2) an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken. The strategy shall include a plan providing details of how the remediation works shall be judged to be complete and arrangements for contingency actions. The plan shall also detail a long term monitoring and maintenance plan as necessary.
- 33 Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors, in accordance with policy ENV9 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP26 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted.
- 34 If during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.
- 34 Reason; To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors, in accordance with policy ENV9 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP26 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 35 No development shall take place for each phase or group of phases, until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Infiltration systems shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk



to groundwater quality. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before development in that phase is completed.

The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Drainage Strategy prepared by Waterman Infrastructure & Environment *Ltd* (ref: WIE10174-100-R-9-1-3-DMP) dated September 2017 and shall also include:

- a) Full calculations detailing the existing surface water runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events
- b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements, together with an assessment of system performance;
- c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers
- d) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures
- e) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site;
- f) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system including a back-up system for pump failure;
- g) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water;
- h) A timetable for implementation

The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG

- 35 Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve and protect water quality, in accordance with policies ENV2 and ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP25 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted and the details need to be agreed before construction begins.
- 36 No drainage systems for infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 36 Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve and protect water quality, in accordance with policies ENV2 and ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP25 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 37 Piling or any other foundation designs and investigation boreholes using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 37 Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve and protect water quality, in accordance with policies ENV2 and ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP25 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 38 No development shall commence for each phase or group of phases of development, until a scheme for on-site foul water drainage works, to include connection point and discharge rate, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No buildings on that phase shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the foul water strategy so approved unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 38 Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve and protect water quality, in accordance with policies ENV2 and ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP25 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted and the details need to be agreed before construction begins.
- 39 Prior to the commencement of each phase or group of phases of development, approved by this planning permission (or such other date or stage agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority), a Materials Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The plan will include:
1. An inspection and sampling strategy for the testing of excavation formations;
  2. A procedure for screening contamination discovered in the development phase to be screened against criteria outlined in the remediation strategy;
  3. A stockpile validation strategy;
  4. Detailed material re-use criteria;
  5. Details of arisings processing; and
  6. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in a) to e) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.
- 39 Reason: To prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with the NPPF and policies ENV2 and ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP25 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted and the details need to be agreed before construction begins.
- 40 Prior to first occupation of a building, within each phase, the Developer shall be responsible for the provision and implementation of a travel plan to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Such travel plan shall include the provision of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator to give advice. The plan is to be monitored annually, with all measures reviewed to ensure targets are met.
- 40 Reason: In the interests of sustainable transport, in accordance with COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP17 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.

- 41 Prior to first occupation of each Phase, space shall be laid out within the site for the required number of car parking spaces for that Phase as specified within the Phasing arrangements within the application. This area shall be levelled, surfaced and drained and thereafter retained for that specific use.
- 41 Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP17 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 42 No above ground construction shall take place until a scheme for the provision and location of fire hydrants to serve the development to a standard recommended by the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service or alternative scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hydrants or alternative scheme shall be installed and completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development.
- 42 Reason: To ensure the appropriate infrastructure is in place to ensure adequate public safety in accordance with Policies Growth 3 and ENV 2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 43 Prior to any work commencing on each Phase a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), for that Phase, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority regarding mitigation measures for noise, dust, vibration and lighting during the construction phase. These shall include, but not be limited to, other aspects such as access points for deliveries and site vehicles, and proposed phasing/timescales of development etc. The CEMP shall be adhered to at all times during all phases.
- 43 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted.
- 44 The tree protection measures as shown within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement dated 26th September 2017 shall be implemented prior to the commencement of development, site works or clearance in accordance with the approved details, and shall be maintained and retained until the development is completed. Within the root protection areas the existing ground level shall be neither raised nor lowered and no materials, temporary buildings, plant, machinery or surplus soil shall be placed or stored thereon. If any trenches for services are required within the fenced areas they shall be excavated and backfilled by hand and any tree roots encountered with a diameter of 25mm or more shall be left unsevered.
- 44 Reason: To ensure that the trees on site are adequately protected, to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP28 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 45 Notwithstanding the Landscape Masterplan and pursuant of Condition 28, a full schedule of all soft landscape works, to include the mitigation measures identified

within the Ecology reports and to accord with the Landscape and Environment Management Plan, (to be agreed), shall be submitted as part of the reserved matters. The schedule shall include, planting plans, a written specification; schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes, proposed numbers/densities; and a detailed implementation programme. It shall also indicate all existing trees and hedgerows on the land and details of any to be retained. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the end of the first planting season following occupation of the development. If within a period of ten years from the date of the planting, or replacement planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

- 45 Reason: To assimilate the development into its surroundings and to safeguard the heritage assets, in accordance with policies ENV2 and ENV11 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP27 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 46 Prior to any occupation of each development, a scheme for the maintenance of the soft landscaping for a minimum period of 10 years from last occupation, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works shall be maintained in accordance with the agreed scheme. The scheme shall include the following:
- i) methods for the proposed maintenance regime;
  - ii) detailed schedule;
  - iii) details of who will be responsible for the continuing implementation;
  - iv) details of any phasing arrangements.
- 46 Reason: To ensure the longevity of the landscaping scheme, in accordance with policy ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP28 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 47 Notwithstanding the Landscape Masterplan, prior to first occupation of each Phase, a Landscape and Environment Management Plan, to include the mitigation required within the preliminary Ecological Appraisal, April 2017, Protected Species Report, September 2017, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to accord with the recommendations of the Environmental Statement. The approved Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the recommendations of the Plan.
- 47 Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP17 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 48 Prior to occupation of a building in each Phase, an external lighting plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the LPA, to take account of any requirements of protect species and ecology. This shall include, but not be limited to, details of external lighting specifications, locations, proposed times of use (i.e if any security lighting) and a lighting plan to show light levels off and on site. (For information we would expect the design to comply with the Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance

notes for the reduction of obtrusive light available at:  
<https://www.theilp.org.uk/documents/obtrusive-light/>).

- 48 Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, residential amenity and ecology in accordance with policy ENV2, ENV7 and ENV9 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22, LP26 and LP30 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 49 The ecology mitigation measures as specified in the recommendations/mitigation measures within the Protected Species Report September 2017 and the Invertebrate Survey July 2017 shall be adhered to before, during and after construction. Any post construction mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with the recommendations of the reports or prior to the occupation of any building in each Phase.
- 49 Reason: To protect and enhance species in accordance with policies ENV1, ENV2 and ENV7 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP28, LP22 and LP30 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 50 Construction times and deliveries, with the exception of fit-out, shall be limited to the following hours: 07:30 to 18:00 each day Monday-Friday, 07:30 to 13:00 Saturdays and none on Sundays or Bank/Public Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- 50 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 51 As part of any reserved matters application or prior to commencement of each Phase, details of any external plant and machinery shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to include a noise impact assessment. No additional plant shall be installed without the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority. Plant and machinery operation shall be limited to between the hours of 08:00 to 20:00.
- 51 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.
- 52 Times of use of the buildings within each Phase shall be limited to within the following hours:

07:00 - 19:00 each day Monday to Saturday

None on Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays.

For the avoidance of doubt this means no working on site, including (but not limited to) operation of plant, machinery, deliveries or maintenance activities etc outside of these times.

52 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.

53 The development hereby approved shall meet BREEAM Very Good standard or equivalent. If this standard cannot be achieved by virtue of the site's location then prior to above floor slab construction works it must be demonstrated by a BRE Licensed Assessor how all other BREEAM standards have been fully explored in order to meet the highest standard of BREEAM Good or equivalent and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

A certificate, following post construction review, shall be issued by a BRE Licensed Assessor to the Local Planning Authority, indicating that the relevant BREEAM standard has been achieved or its equivalent within six months of first occupation of the site for written agreement by the Local Planning Authority.

53 Reason: To ensure that the proposal meets with the requirements of sustainability as stated in policy ENV4 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP23 and LP24 of the Submitted Local Plan 2018.