

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

7 March 2018

AUTHOR/S: Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development

Application Number / type of application:	S/4099/17/OL / Outline
Parish(es):	Hinxton, Whittlesford and Pampisford
Proposal:	Outline application with all matters reserved for development of an AgriTech park comprising 112,000m ² gross employment floor space, supporting infrastructure, amenities and landscape works including publicly accessible informal space, enhancements to parkland vehicle and cycle parking, bus and cycle interchange on land west of A1301/north of A505, infrastructure works including vehicular access, highway improvement works, pedestrian and cycle bridge and primary electricity sub station and associated works.
Recommendation:	Delegated Refusal
Material considerations:	Principle of development , Prematurity, Employment, Principle of proposed transport infrastructure within the Green Belt, Landscape, character and visual harm, Heritage, Transport and access, Flooding and surface water drainage
Site address:	Land to the east of the A1301, south of the A505 near Hinxton and west of the A1301, north of the A505 near Whittlesford
Applicant(s):	Smithson Hill Limited
Date on which application received:	21 November 2017
Site Visit:	6 March 2018
Conservation Area:	No
Departure Application:	Yes
Presenting Officer:	Katie Christodoulides, Senior Planning Officer
Application brought to Committee because:	It is of public interest and is a departure from the policies of the current Local Development Framework and emerging Local Plan.
Date by which decision due:	13 March 2018

A. Update to the report

1. Agenda report paragraph number 47 - Environment Agency

Additional information comprising of an Environmental Statement Addendum including updated Section 8 and revised Appendix G of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy replacing Section 8 and Appendix G of the Technical Appendix E2 of the Environment Statement November 2017 were submitted on the 13th February 2018.

The Environment Agency has no further comment to add to those comments previously made on 05 December 2017.

2. Agenda report paragraph number 48 - Highways England

Additional information comprising of an revised Transport Assessment February 2018 including proposed transport related conditions and detailed Section 106 Heads of Terms (Appendix 11) replacing Technical Appendix J of the Environment Statement November 2017 have been submitted on the 13th February 2018.

Highways England has commented that they have already identified several issues relating to the proposed mitigation measures at M11 J10 in the formal response dated 8 January 2018, referring to applicant's drawing number 1736/01/214 (rev D), namely:

1. The proposed improvements to both M11 off-slip roads on approach to the roundabout indicate widening along their off side edges. We request that the applicant investigate if the likelihood of any effect on the steep embankments between the slip roads and the M11 main carriageway below. This has the potential to affect the technical complexity and thus the cost of those measures.
2. An improvement is shown to the start of the southbound on-slip as it leaves the roundabout yet on the northbound on-slip, which one would intuitively consider more likely to be required of the two, no equivalent is proposed. Furthermore, if this is to facilitate a 2 lane exit from the roundabout onto the slip road there is likely to be an issue of compliance with the design manual for roads and bridges (DMRB). We request that the applicant clarify these issues.
3. The transport assessment submitted with the application does not appear to contain an assessment of the merging between the on-slips and the main M11 carriageways. Given the significant trip increases forecast as a result of the proposed development we request that the applicant undertake this assessment in order either (i) to confirm the adequacy of the current merge arrangements or (ii) to propose mitigation measures to address any shortcomings.

The applicant subsequently provided a designer's response to these points (reference 1736/01/AO, dated 12/2/18) and incorporated associated changes to the revised layout drawing (number 1736/01/214 (rev E)) in the TA issued 13 February

2018. The response satisfactorily addressed points 1 and 3 above but the response to point 2 was not satisfactory, as explained below. Furthermore, detailed scrutiny of the modelling associated with M11 J10 provided in the TA has highlighted several further shortcomings, explanation of which is also given below.

Proposed improvements to J10 on-slip roads (point 2 above)

Drawing number 1736/01/214 (rev E) in the TA now shows proposals to widen both of the M11 on-slips for traffic leaving the roundabout to enter the M11. The traffic flows identified in the TA on the southbound on-slip even in the 2030 scenarios are of the order of 200 vehicles per hour or less during the peak periods. Such flows do not warrant a 2-lane slip road southbound as shown on the TA layout drawing, which suggests the proposed improvement is unnecessary. Furthermore, such a layout would have DMRB compliance issues (explained in further detail below).

Conversely, the northbound on-slip is forecast to carry flows in excess of 1200 vehicles per hour, thus a two lane layout arguably may be warranted. The designer's response states that the northbound on-slip will become two lanes (referring to a "two lane exit from the roundabout") but, confusingly, the layout drawing in the TA does not include road markings showing two lanes on this slip road. A two lane layout would need to incorporate a 2-into-1 taper merge within the slip road before the merge with the northbound carriageway of the M11. However, that is no longer permitted in TD 22/06 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) on anything other than urban slip roads. In this case therefore, the applicant would be required to apply for a departure from standard. While a reasonable case may be made to support this, there is no guarantee such a departure would be granted as these are assessed completely independently within HE. We would therefore advise that consideration is given either to the designing out the need for a 2-lane slip road or to developing a DMRB-compliant layout.

Proposed widening of the A505 (east) approach

While this is to address issues on the local road network we need to point out that the proposed dedicated left turn lane would carry negligible volumes of traffic (30 to 40 vehicles per hour according to the TA). As such it would in practice provide negligible additional capacity on this junction approach. The Arcady models do not appear to have taken account of unequal lane usage and thus appear to show significant additional capacity. Unfortunately, however, overestimating the capacity of this arm is likely to have adversely affected the modelled capacity of both the M11 northbound and A505 eastbound approaches. We would advise that this anomaly be corrected and the relevant Arcady models re-run.

A505 (west) approach

Again this is of greater relevance to the local highway network. The current geometry for this arm of the roundabout is shown in the Arcady models in the TA as 10.8m wide, ie 3 lanes. However, the nearside of this approach appears to be kerbed out to restrict the approach to 2 lanes wide. As part of the validation of the

Arcady models a correction factor has been applied on this approach in order to accurately reproduce observed queuing. This would have in many cases been sufficient to manage such a discrepancy to allow the model to then be used for forecasting. However, in this case the applicant has also proposed changes to the layout of this approach which bring it into conflict with that correction. As such we would advise the applicant to make appropriate adjustments to their Arcady model and re-validate it so that subsequent layout changes can then be better reflected within the model.

All of the above comments are based on trip generation and distribution figures in the TA which we have taken as read. It may well be that my colleagues at Cambridgeshire County Council still have some unresolved issues with these. I am happy to defer to them on any such issues as the implications are likely to be more significant on the local highway network than on the SRN. However, any subsequent changes to trip rates and/or distribution could as a consequence require the modelling of M11 J10 to be updated if significant in scale.

3. Agenda report paragraph number 51 – Lead Local Flood Authority

Additional information comprising of an Environmental Statement Addendum including updated Section 8 and revised Appendix G of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy replacing Section 8 and Appendix G of the Technical Appendix E2 of the Environment Statement November 2017 were submitted on the 13th February 2018.

The Lead Local Flood Authority have reviewed the submitted information and have no objection in principle to the proposed development. Requests conditions are imposed in regard to submission of detailed surface water drainage scheme and long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system and informatives in regard to the management and maintenance of SuDs, opportunities for ecological and wider environmental benefits as a result of the use of SuDS and constructions and alterations within an ordinary watercourse requiring consents from the Lead Local Flood Authority under the Land Drainage Act 1991.

4. Agenda report paragraph number 56- Transport Assessment Team, Cambridge County Council

Additional information comprising of a revised Transport Assessment February 2018 including proposed transport related conditions and detailed Section 106 Heads of Terms (Appendix 11) replacing Technical Appendix J of the Environment Statement November 2017 have been submitted on the 13th February 2018.

The Transport Assessment Team at Cambridge County Council have commented that the County Council has had extensive pre-application discussions with the applicant in the lead up to the application submission. It is therefore disappointing that the applicant has not responded to a number of the issues raised by the County Council both at pre-app and from the most recent TA review. The issues are considered to be fundamental to the trip generation and distribution evidence base, and therefore are unable to comment with any certainty what the impacts of the development are on the strategic highway network at this stage. The Transport Assessment Team therefore recommend a holding objection to the Local Planning Authority at this stage, and a need for further information to be submitted.

5. Agenda report paragraph number 181- e) Conclusion to Transport and Access Impacts

Additional information comprising of an Environmental Statement Addendum including a revised Transport Assessment February 2018 including proposed transport related conditions and detailed Section 106 Heads of Terms (Appendix 11) replacing Technical Appendix J of the Environment Statement November 2017 have been submitted on the 13th February 2018. Consultee comments on this additional information are detailed above in points 2 and 4.

6. Agenda report paragraph number 247- Recommendation

Refusal reason 9 Floods and Water is removed; following comments from the Lead Local Flood Authority, see above in point 3.

APPENDIX 1- Application site boundary and outline parameter plans- Land Use

Updated Land Use Plan attached below



Additional Background Papers: the following background papers (additional to those referred to in the agenda report) were used in the preparation of this update:

No additional background papers

Contact Officer: Katie Christodoulides – Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713314