



Planning Committee Date	11 October 2023
Report to	South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee
Lead Officer	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
Reference	22/05549/OUT
Site	TWI, Granta Park, Great Abington, Cambridgeshire
Ward / Parish	Great Abington
Proposal	Outline application for the development of the TWI campus (including means of access) for use by TWI (comprising but not limited to a range of related uses including office and laboratory space, and ancillary facilities including conferencing and non-residential education/training uses) and/or for Research and Development purposes (Use Class E(g)(ii)), following the erection of two new buildings centred off the central service spine (B4 and B5), one building (B6) immediately to the north, and an extension to the existing engineering hall (B3) (with a combined floor area up to 31,500m ² (GEA) excluding plant), the reconfiguration and external works to the Bevan Braithwaite building, central service spine and the servicing yard, and the provision of a decked car park to the north, surface car parking and cycle parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure (following the phased demolition of a number of buildings, namely BBH, Robert Jenkins, Resonance Shed and Trevor Gooch comprising 10,185m ² (GEA)) with all other matters, namely layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved.
Applicant	TWI Limited

Presenting Officer	Michael Hammond
Reason Reported to Committee	Major application, Parish Council Call-in, Wider public interest.
Member Site Visit Date	N/A
Key Issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design (parameters) 2. Landscape Impacts 3. Impact on Heritage Assets 4. Trees 5. Transport/ Car Parking
Recommendation	APPROVE subject to the completion of a S106 agreement and conditions

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The application seeks outline planning permission for the development of the TWI Campus. The TWI Campus is situated immediately to the east of the cricket ground and south-east of the lake in the centre of the Granta Park Campus.
- 1.2 The application site is located on Granta Park, which is designated as an Established Employment Area within the adopted Local Plan.
- 1.3 Granta Park is one of the UK's leading Science Campuses offering state of the art laboratory and office facilities across 14 buildings on a 50-hectare site, established for over 20 years with a scientific population of over 3,700 people.
- 1.4 The proposal includes the erection of two new buildings centred off the central service spine (B4 and B5), one building (B6) immediately to the north, and an extension to the existing engineering hall (B3) (with a combined floor area up to 31,500m² (GEA) excluding plant). The Bevan Braithwaite Building would be reconfigured and there would be a decked car park to the north above part of the existing surface level car park. There would be extensive soft and hard landscaping works to accommodate this development and would necessitate the demolition of several buildings, of note the BBH, Robert Jenkins, Resonance Shed and Trevor Gooch buildings). The net increase in floorspace on the site would be up to 21,315sqm.
- 1.5 The plans submitted are parameter plans which include maximum building footprints and heights. The indicative plans demonstrate that the tallest building these plans would allow for would be B4 which would have a maximum building height of 56.5m AOD which would equate to five storeys given the level change across the site, plus roof top plant. The maximum flue height would be 63.13m AOD. Proposed building B4 would step down to 4 storeys and B6 further to the north would be 3 storeys with roof top

plant. The B3 extension would extend out to the east from the existing B3 building and follow the same roof height and profile. The proposed decked car park would have a maximum height of 37.5m AOD.

- 1.6 All matters are reserved except for access. The application has been referred to Planning Committee as the proposal has been called into Planning Committee by the Parish Council and is also considered to be in the public interest for the application to be discussed at Committee.
- 1.7 Notwithstanding matters such as scale, layout, landscaping and appearance being reserved for submission at a later date, the application has been accompanied by a series of parameter plans to form an envelope within which the detailed design of reserved matters could then proceed if permitted. These are:
 - ‘Proposed Development Zones & Public Realm’ – This defines the maximum development zones for each building and the extent of external landscaping, servicing areas and vehicle drop off.
 - ‘Parameter Plan – Demolition’ – This outlines the extent of demolition proposed.
 - ‘Proposed Access & Connection’ – This identifies vehicle and non-vehicular routes within the proposed development.
 - ‘Proposed Maximum Heights’ – This defines the maximum building heights of proposed buildings and extensions.
 - ‘Proposed Site Levels’ – This sets out the site levels as proposed.
 - ‘Existing Site Levels’ – This sets out the site levels as existing.
 - ‘Existing Site Plan’ – This demarcates the extent of existing buildings in the wider Granta Park context and outlines the land ownership extent of land.
- 1.8 The application has been the subject of pre-application advice with officers, including the advice of the Landscape Officer, Urban Design Officer, Conservation Officer and Tree Officer. The applicant also entered into a Design Review Panel at pre-application stage, the minutes of which are included as an appendix to this report (See Appendix 1).
- 1.9 Additional information has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority during the course of the application. This includes further information regarding the landscape masterplan, landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) and biodiversity net gain. This was submitted in response to comments raised by consultees.
- 1.10 The buildings that would be demolished are not considered to have any architectural merit and the removal of these is considered acceptable. The proposed redevelopment of the TWI campus seeks to deliver high-quality and fit for purpose buildings. The proposed buildings, although noticeable in size, are comparable to those permitted to the south on Phase 2 and would not exceed the height of the existing Illumina building. The proposed layout seeks to incorporate green ‘fingers’ between the proposed buildings,

providing space for circulation and for the development to be read comfortably within its context of the wider business park.

- 1.11 The proposed development would result in the loss of 8no. protected (TPO) oak trees and 2no. protected (TPO) field maple trees at the point where Building B4 would be developed, which as a grouping falls within Category B. Their loss is unfortunate and detracts from the landscape setting of the business park. However, the proposal does include the commitment to the replacement planting of 86no. new trees which will go some way to compensating for this loss. The proposed extension east of building B3 towards the Grade II* Listed Abington Hall has been identified as causing moderate levels of less than substantial harm to this heritage asset. The proposed development has also been found to cause low levels of less than substantial harm to the Great and Little Abington Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II* Listed St Mary's Church.
- 1.12 The level of harm identified above has been weighed against the public benefits of the scheme and other material planning considerations. The proposal would result in significant economic benefit through the uplift and enhancement of employment floorspace at Granta Park, further contributing to the life sciences and technology cluster in Southern Cambridgeshire. There would also be public benefits accruing from the replacement tree planting strategy, sustainability benefits in terms of building performance and electric vehicle charging and financial contributions towards local transport infrastructure.
- 1.13 In terms of the overall planning balance, it is considered that the substantial economic benefits of the development would clearly outweigh the moderate levels of harm identified to heritage assets and the loss of existing TPO oak trees.
- 1.14 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the statutory requirements of section 66(1) and section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for approval.
- 1.15 Taking all factors into consideration, Officers recommend that the Planning Committee approve the application subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement and conditions, the final wording of which is to be delegated to officers.

2.0 Site Description and Context

- 2.1 The application site is located on Granta Park, an Established Employment Area within the parish of Great Abington, although not within its development framework boundary.
- 2.2 Granta Park is a science and research park providing laboratory and office accommodation across a 50-hectare site, established for over 20 years with a scientific population of over 3,700 people.
- 2.3 Buildings are focused on the edge of the Park, centred around a large internal open space that includes a cricket pitch and lake. The buildings are all large in size and scale with varying architectural styles and designed around the delivery of laboratory and office space. Car parking associated with each building is provided and occupies a relatively large footprint across the Park, although it is well integrated into the surroundings through extensive soft landscaping and tree planting that softens the parking areas and internal access roads.
- 2.4 Granta Park is surrounded by an established woodland belt, which is covered by a range of Tree Preservation Orders and plays an important role in integrating the large Park with its wider rural countryside surroundings.
- 2.5 Towards the easternmost boundary of the Park is Abington Hall, a Grade II* Listed Building that is located within the Conservation Area for Great and Little Abington, which incorporates a small eastern portion of the Park.
- 2.6 The River Granta, a County Wildlife Site, runs close to the northern and part of the north-eastern boundaries of the site with areas surrounding the river designated as being in flood zones 2 and 3, which are almost entirely outside of the Granta Park employment designation and where no development is proposed. A lake is located centrally within the Park, functioning as part of the wider drainage solution, which is identified as being in flood zone 2. The area of Flood Zone 2 to the west correlates directly with the extent of historic flooding records for the area, and is not based on modelled data associated with the River Granta. Based on the results from the River Granta modelling, the entire Site lies within Flood Zone 1.
- 2.7 The site itself is the TWI (The Welding Institute) Campus, situated immediately to the east of the cricket pitch and south-east of the lake. There are several buildings across the TWI Campus with buildings BBB, BBH, B1, B2 and B3 forming the main hub of activities on the site and to the north-east known are the Robert Jenkins and Trevor Gooch Buildings. A small cottage is situated immediately adjacent to the Robert Jenkins Building, and this cottage and its external wall are curtilage listed as part of the Grade II*

Listed Abington Hall to the east. There is surface level car parking outside buildings B1, B2 and B3 accessed from the south along with a separate car park immediately to the south-east. To the north is further car parking.

- 2.8 There are small areas of low and medium surface water flood risk immediately to the east of the BBB Building and on and adjacent to the Robert Jenkins Building. There are two narrow group Tree Preservation Order strips running through the centre and northern elements of the site.

3.0 The Proposal

- 3.1 This application seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access for the development of the TWI campus (including means of access) for use by TWI (comprising but not limited to a range of related uses including office and laboratory space, and ancillary facilities including conferencing and non-residential education/training uses) and/or for Research and Development purposes (Use Class E(g)(ii)), following the erection of two new buildings centred off the central service spine (B4 and B5), one building (B6) immediately to the north, and an extension to the existing engineering hall (B3) (with a combined floor area up to 31,500m² (GEA) excluding plant), the reconfiguration and external works to the Bevan Braithwaite building, central service spine and the servicing yard, and the provision of a decked car park to the north, surface car parking and cycle parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure (following the phased demolition of a number of buildings, namely BBH, Robert Jenkins, Resonance Shed and Trevor Gooch comprising 10,185m² (GEA)) with all other matters, namely layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved.
- 3.2 The plans submitted are parameter plans which include maximum building footprints and heights. The indicative plans demonstrate that the tallest building these plans would allow for would be B4 which would have a maximum building height of 56.5m AOD which would equate to five storeys plus roof top plant. The maximum flue height would be 63.13m AOD. Proposed building B5 would step down to 4 storeys and B6 further to the north would be 3 storeys with roof top plant. The B3 extension would extend out to the east from the existing B3 building and follow the same roof height and profile. The proposed decked car park would have a maximum height of 37.5m AOD.
- 3.3 The 'Design and Visual Amenity' of the assessment section of this report provides a detailed breakdown of each of the parameter plans for which permission is sought. In summary these indicative plans demonstrate that the tallest building these plans would allow for would be B4 which would have a maximum building height of 56.5m AOD which would equate to five storeys given the level change across the site, plus roof top plant. The maximum flue height would be 63.13m AOD. Proposed building B4 would step down to 4 storeys and B6 further to the north would be 3 storeys with

roof top plant. The B3 extension would extend out to the east from the existing B3 building and follow the same roof height and profile. The proposed decked car park would have a maximum height of 37.5m AOD

- 3.4 The proposal would require the removal of 25no. trees (of which 10 are TPO trees) and the provision of an additional 107 car parking spaces are proposed.
- 3.5 The application has been amended and further information has been submitted to address specific requests of technical consultees and further consultations have been carried out as appropriate.

4.0 Relevant Site History

Reference	Description	Outcome
23/00329/LBC	Creation of a 4 m opening to the curtilage listed wall to enable the creation of an east-west shared access which forms part of the outline application 22/05549/OUT, together with the general repair of copings and masonry to the wall.	Pending consideration
22/03745/SCRE	EIA screening opinion under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 for the proposed redevelopment of the TWI campus at Granta Park to repurpose and refurbish existing buildings and provide a net increase of up to 22,000sqm Gross External Area (GEA) of research and development office and laboratory space	EIA Not Required.
S/0182/15/NM	Non material amendment to application S/2466/12/OL to allow the retention of Robert Jenkins building (previously identified for demolition).	Permitted
S/0876/14/FL	Proposed extension to existing laboratory to provide a hydraulic pump room.	Permitted
S/1788/14/RM	Reserved matters scheme (Layout Scale Appearance and Landscaping) for the erection of sunken double deck car park cycle parking and associated landscaping pursuant to outline application S/2466/12/OL.	Permitted

S/1052/13/RM	Reserved matters scheme (Layout Scale Appearance and Landscaping) for the erection of three new buildings connected to the main Bevan Braithwaite Building and associated service spine and service yard together with southern car park southern approach road internal link road and landscaping pursuant to Outline Permission S/2466/12/OL.	Permitted
S/2466/12/OL	Outline planning application for the redevelopment of TWI site to create a series of new buildings connected to the main Bevan Braithwaite building and to be occupied for a mix of B1(b) Research and Development purposes comprising but not limited to related office and conferencing facilities laboratory space an engineering hall and D1 space (non-residential institution including education and training) and ancillary facilities with a combined floor area of up to 25000m2 (GEA) together with a central service spine (up to 5960m2) and an associated yard resonance testing building (500m2) car parking to the north and south of the Bevan Braithwaite building strategic landscaping and associated infrastructure (following the phased demolition of a number of existing building on the site comprising 12877m2 (GEA)).	Permitted
S/1680/11	Reserved Matter approval of revised landscape scheme for Site 1 pursuant to Condition 2 of planning permission S/1170/06/F.	Permitted.
S/0447/09/F	Extension to Existing TWI Training Centre	Permitted
S/1281/09/F	Steel framed building	Permitted
S/1359/09/F	Entrance Extension	Permitted
S/1372/08/F	Extensions	Permitted
S/1170/06/O	Variation of Condition 1 of Planning Permission S/1786/95/O (as Varied by S/0714/99/F and	Permitted

	S/0624/04/F) to Allow a Further Additional Period of 5 Years for the Submission of Reserved Matters for Erection of New Buildings and Construction of Access Road	
S/0624/04/F	Variation of Condition 1 of Planning Permission S/1786/95/O (as Varied by S/0714/99/F) to Allow a Further Additional Period of 5 Years for the Submission of Reserved Matters for Erection of New Buildings and Construction of Access Road	Permitted
S/0714/99/F	Variation of Condition 1 of Planning Permission S/1786/95/O to Allow an Additional Period of Three Years for the Submission of the Remaining and Outstanding Reserved Matters	Permitted
S/1786/95/O	ERECTION OF NEW BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF ACCESS ROAD (RENEWAL OF S/0082/91/O)	Permitted

5.0 Policy

5.1 National

National Planning Policy Framework 2023
National Planning Practice Guidance
National Design Guide 2021
Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20) Cycle Infrastructure Design
Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)
Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017
Environment Act 2021
ODPM Circular 06/2005 – Protected Species
Equalities Act 2010

5.2 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018

S/1 – Vision
S/2 – Objectives of the Local Plan
S/3 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S/5 – Provision of New Jobs and Homes
S/7 – Development Frameworks
CC/1 – Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change
CC/3 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments
CC/4 – Water Efficiency
CC/6 – Construction Methods

CC/7 – Water Quality
CC/8 – Sustainable Drainage Systems
CC/9 – Managing Flood Risk
HQ/1 – Design Principles
HQ/2 – Public Art and New Development
NH/2 – Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
NH/4 – Biodiversity
NH/6 – Green Infrastructure
NH/14 – Heritage Assets
E/9 – Promotion of Clusters
E/10 – Shared Social Spaces in Employment Areas
E/15 – Established Employment Areas
SC/2 – Health impact Assessment
SC/9 – Lighting Proposals
SC/10 – Noise Pollution
SC/11 – Contaminated Land
SC/12 – Air Quality
TI/2 – Planning for Sustainable Travel
TI/3 – Parking Provision
TI/8 – Infrastructure and New Developments
TI/10 – Broadband

5.3 **Neighbourhood Plan**

None

5.4 **Supplementary Planning Documents**

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020
Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016

- 5.5 The following SPDs were adopted to provide guidance to support previously adopted Development Plan Documents that have now been superseded by the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. These documents are still material considerations when making planning decisions, with the weight in decision making to be determined on a case-by-case basis:

Health Impact Assessment SPD – Adopted March 2011
Development affecting Conservation Areas SPD – Adopted 2009
Landscape in New Developments SPD – Adopted March 2010
District Design Guide SPD – Adopted March 2010
Open Space in New Developments SPD – Adopted January 2009
Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009
Public Art SPD – Adopted January 2009
Listed Buildings: Works to or affecting the setting of SPD – Adopted July 2009

6.0 **Consultations**

- 6.1 **Access Officer – No objection**
- 6.2 Usually with outline plans the access officer is given some idea of how internal layouts will be and it helps to achieve better design if the access officer can make comments earlier. Blue Badge parking spaces are identified as being long ways against the kerb. Often this type of space is not useful and spaces should be set so that the front or rear parks against the kerb.
- 6.3 **Anglian Water – No objection**
- 6.4 The development falls outside of our statutory sewage boundary. No objection.
- 6.5 **Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Designing Out Crime Officer) – No objection.**
- 6.6 While the DAS, HIS and other documents such as the lighting plan are very comprehensive there will be more context to the actual design of the buildings, car park, cycle storage and open space when the Reserved Matters application is received so we will reserve comment until then.
- 6.7 **Cambridgeshire County Council – Historic Environment Team – No objection.**
- 6.8 No further archaeological investigation is necessary.
- 6.9 **Cambridgeshire County Council – Transport Assessment Team – No objection.**
- 6.10 1st comment – Objection:
- 6.11 Insufficient detail has been presented to make a sound assessment. Further information regarding car and cycle parking, trip generation, assessment scenarios and traffic growth, junction modelling and mitigation related to the Transport Assessment will need to be addressed before the transport implications of the development can be fully assessed.
- 6.12 2nd Comment – No objection:
- 6.13 Sufficient detail has been presented to make a sound assessment.
Mitigation Required: The following obligations/conditions are required to make the development acceptable in planning terms:
- Contribute £708,830 to the CSET phases 1 and 2 or Linton Greenway;
 - That the development traffic flows are monitored and a trip budget set for the TWI site; and
 - Travel Plan as a condition.

- 6.14 **Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue – No objection.**
- 6.15 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.
- 6.16 **Conservation Team – Further information required.**
- 6.17 1st Comment – Further information and/or amendments required:
- 6.18 View 22 (Abington Hall) in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) indicates that there would be a considerable increase in built form in close proximity to the grade II* listed building arising from the B3 extension. Some of the trees that provide partial screening of B3 from the Hall would be removed, resulting in greater visibility of the building than at present. The extension would also bring the long, sheer elevation of the building notably closer to the Hall and therefore intruding upon its immediate setting.
- 6.19 The proposed replacement planting and landscape improvements could mitigate this to a modest degree, although the impact and scale of the extension would be difficult to conceal. The LVIA view also shows a mixture of vehicles, trees and features which might include the partially demolished modern structures, and it is therefore anticipated that sightlines to B3 would be clearer than depicted given the substantial scale of the extension.
- 6.20 The Heritage Statement (HS) states that the impact of the proposals, particularly the extension of B3, would result in less than substantial harm (6.1.2), which is agreed. The LVIA assesses the impact on view 22 as substantial / major adverse, which supports the assessment of harm in terms of NPPF paras 199-202.
- 6.21 The new B5 building, while large in scale and clearly changing the setting of the Hall, would be set further away and be seen in the context of an established cluster of buildings. B4 and B6 would be set behind other buildings in relation to the Hall, with minimal direct impact.
- 6.22 Some of the benefits the HS suggests would balance the harm. However, specifically the removal of the unsightly modern buildings south and west of the Hall, should not be considered in relation to the current application. This was implemented in 2022 following approval in 2012 (ref:S/2475/12/CA). It is agreed that improvements to the setting of the curtilage listed wall and cottage provide a modest enhancement in this location. However, the scheme also proposes demolishing a section of the wall, which would be harmful. The details of works and enhancements to both structures are awaiting a future listed building consent application rather than being weighed against the harm. The heritage assessment does not place any particular value on the visual relationship between the Hall and wall/cottage, and it is unlikely there was ever an intention for this to be the case.

- 6.23 There are currently glimpses of the TWI buildings from within the conservation area, including from the river footpath and churchyard of St Mary the Virgin. From these viewpoints, the buildings generally sit below the tree line and have a discreet presence. This largely applies to the Riverside blocks closest to the river.
- 6.24 The HS acknowledges that there will be change to the outlook and setting of the conservation area through the redevelopment but does not take account of the considerable additional height and cumulative impacts of the redevelopment. LVIA view 12 (river footpath) demonstrates that buildings B4, B5, B6 would be visible over the existing built form and tree line due to additional height and bulk. The buildings would merge into a single mass from this angle, with resulting cumulative visual impacts. Flues are not shown on the LVIA images but are expected to be an additional 6-8m based on the illustrative drawings. Notwithstanding the flues, the impact on this view is identified as adverse in the LVIA, and is considered harmful in relation to NPPF paras 199-202.
- 6.25 As described above, the view is sensitive due to the largely rural setting and outlook from the conservation area. NPPF para 206 seeks to preserve those aspects of a heritage asset's setting which contribute to its significance. The upper parts of the building, particularly the flues, are likely to be the most visible over the existing tree and building line, detracting from the rural outlook. The location and form of flues and plant and should be minimised and defined as clearly as possible to limit their impact.
- 6.26 The HS concludes that there would be no harmful impacts on other designated heritage assets within the study area (6.1.2). This can largely be accepted due to the distances and limited intervisibility due to trees and intervening buildings. There are however serious concerns in relation to St Mary's Church, Little Abington, for the same reasons described above. The outlook from the edge of churchyard would include buildings rising above the treeline, forming a dense cluster. The LVIA assesses the impact on this view (view 13), which is also a view from the conservation area, as adverse. This could therefore be considered harmful to the setting and significance to the designated heritage asset, and requires further consideration.
- 6.27 Overall, Moderate less than substantial harm would arise to the setting of Abington Hall due to the extension of B3. The proposed landscape mitigation is unconvincing, and the justification is not clear and convincing as required by NPPF para 200.
- 6.28 Low to moderate less than substantial harm would arise to the Great and Little Abington Conservation Area due to the height, mass and cumulative visual impact of B4, B5 and B6. Further consideration of the location, form and design of plant and flues is needed to minimise these impacts.
- 6.29 Further consideration of the impact on the setting of St Mary's Church is needed as based on the current information this is considered to be harmful.

- 6.30 With respect of NPPF para 202, the overall level of harm is considered moderate less than substantial and should therefore be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals.
- 6.31 2nd comments – Further information and/or amendments required:
- 6.32 An addendum to the heritage statement has been provided. In relation to the setting of Abington Hall, it reiterates earlier arguments that the setting of Abington Hall would be enhanced by the development, while also conceding some less than substantial harm through the extension of B3. It cites the creation of a visual connection to the curtilage listed wall as a heritage benefit but acknowledges that the visual connection did not exist historically and does not contribute to the significance of the heritage asset.
- 6.33 The addendum refers to the benefits accrued as part of other applications, without acknowledging that some aspects of those benefits would be lost through the current proposals, specifically enhancement of the setting between the hall and B3. It refers to the LVIA addendum and states that the less than substantial harm caused to the hall by B3 would be offset by the planting of vegetation.
- 6.34 The LVIA addendum provides a clearer impression of the changes to the setting of Abington Hall through the removal of modern buildings, proposed extension of B3 and compensatory planting. It demonstrates the welcome sense of openness achieved through previously approved changes, and how this would be offset by the addition new development. The images confirm that while new planting beside B3 could slightly diffuse the visual impact of the extension, which is of considerable scale, it cannot be considered to offset the harm as claimed in the heritage report.
- 6.35 The heritage addendum does not develop the earlier assessment of the impact of the Great and Little Abington Conservation Area, and maintains that the impact would be positive. It does not address the harmful impact identified in the main LVIA caused by the increase in height, scale and bulk of the buildings, or suggest how it might be mitigated. The LVIA addendum does not add to the conservation area views.
- 6.36 There is no further assessment of the proposal on the setting of St Mary's, Little Abington, in the heritage or LVIA addenda.
- 6.37 The conclusions and assessment of harm remain as previously set out.
- 6.38 **Contaminated Land Officer – No objection.**
- 6.39 No objection subject to contaminated land condition.
- 6.40 **County Highways Development Management – No objection.**
- 6.41 No objection subject to a traffic management plan condition and informative.

- 6.42 **Ecology Officer – No objection.**
- 6.43 The information submitted is sufficient to show that there is no “in principle” reason that the application should be refused on ecological grounds. There is still a requirement for further surveys to be undertaken and submitted prior to or concurrently with the submission of first reserved matters. These include: reptile surveys, badger surveys, further bat activity survey of the area around the woodland adjacent to the proposed decked car park, detailed design of the lighting of the upper deck of the decked car park as the current proposal may increase vertical illumination of the woodland canopy to unacceptable levels, and finalisation of Biodiversity Net Gain strategy.
- 6.44 Conditions for a Construction Ecological Management Plan, lighting strategy, Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan
- 6.45 **Environment Agency – No objection.**
- 6.46 No objection subject to informatives.
- 6.47 **Environmental Health – No objection.**
- 6.48 The noise report is generally well considered although makes reference to external noise levels which, at the time of the publication of the report, is unknown. Therefore a condition is recommended for a noise assessment and any noise insultation/ mitigation.
- 6.49 The applicant has determined that the site falls within the E3 category for lighting and identifies a number of sensitive receptors, both human and habitat, to protect. The lighting report recognises the different type of lighting which is likely to be considered appropriate for this development. Further information in relating to lighting should be submitted by the applicant in any reserved matters application.
- 6.50 A demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP) should also be secured through condition.
- 6.51 **Great Abington Parish Council – Objection.**
- 6.52 1st Comment: Objection
- 6.53 The Parish Council understands and appreciates the need to replace some of the older buildings at TWI to improve their quality and environmental impact. However it is important to remember that this is a rural area, not an urban location, and what is proposed needs to take account of its location.

- 6.54 The key difference between what the parish councils saw at the 19 October meeting organised by the applicant and what has subsequently been submitted in this application was in relation to buildings B4 and B5. The 19 October documents showed illustrative building B4 as four storeys and illustrative building B5 as three storeys. However, the application document submitted shows building B4 as five storeys and B5 as four-storeys (that is, an additional storey for each building).
- 6.55 The Parish Council considers that the visual impact of buildings B4 and B5 (as illustrated) on this rural location would be enormous and would dominate the visual landscape. Therefore the council recommends that the height of future developments on the TWI site be controlled/limited to a lower level than 56.50m ODN or 53.50m ODN to protect the visual rural landscape for the neighbouring villages.
- 6.56 The Granta Park Phase 1 site 1 building was promoted as a significant Landmark building of greater height than would normally have been allowed on the Granta Park site, and yet buildings B4 and B5 as illustrated would be physically taller at 26.50m and 23.50m respectively.
- 6.57 The Parish Council recommends that the height limit be set at 49.00m ODN for all the new buildings and building extension proposed, which is the same height as the ridge height of the existing B3 building.
- 6.58 In summary, the Parish Council considers the parameter plan height limit of 56.50m ODN for building B4 and 53.50m ODN for building B5 to be set too high, and recommends that these height limits should be reduced to 49.00m ODN. The Parish Council therefore objects to the height limit set out in the applicant's parameter plan.
- 6.59 The Parish Council noted the additional car parking referred to in the documentation. The Parish Council was mindful of the additional 1,300 plus car parking spaces that would be provided under recent planning approvals on Granta Park, and noted that a further 100 plus spaces were included in this application. Though the percentage of single occupancy car journeys to the site might reduce, the overall effect of these recent approvals and the additional car parking spaces in this application could only mean that the actual number of car journeys to and from the site would increase.
- 6.60 There is currently no active travel route that actually goes to the entrance of Granta Park (see figs 2.2 and 2.3 in the Framework Travel Plan). The only nearby such route, the dual use path alongside the A505, ends several

hundred metres short of the Granta Park entrance and there are no active travel routes along Newmarket Road or Pampisford Road.

- 6.61 If the District Council is minded to approve this application, the Parish Council requests that a condition be imposed for the applicant to make a significant financial contribution to be used to improve routes to Granta Park, and benefit the local community, specifically the Parish Council request that the contribution be used to help fund an active travel route along Pampisford Road towards the site's main entrance.
- 6.62 It should be noted that the Greater Cambridge Partnership is now working on the route of the Linton Greenway now being down Newmarket Road to the Granta Park entrance and then along Pampisford Road, and not as indicated in Figs 2.5 and 2.6 of the Framework Travel Plan.
- 6.63 The Parish Council noted that almost all of the data in the Noise Assessment Report was undertaken when the wind was not the main prevailing south-westerly direction, which has the greatest impact on the neighbouring villages. The Parish Council also noted that apart from three locations where noise monitoring had been undertaken for more than 24 hours, noise monitoring in other locations had been for very short periods of time, and questioned whether this was sufficient.
- 6.64 For many years the local community had welcome access to the TWI/Granta Park site with three local foot entrances in addition to the main entrance on Newmarket Road. However, a few years ago the three local accesses were closed to the general community. The only current access available to the community via the main site entrance, which is well away from both villages and is inaccessible without walking along busy roads, without footpaths.
- 6.65 Criterion 10 in the Health Impact Assessment is 'are the open and natural spaces welcoming and safe and accessible for all?' (see HIA page 32). The proposed mitigation suggested in this document is for 'a commitment [by the applicant] to explore how outdoor spaces might be accessed by local residents'. The Parish Council would therefore request a clear commitment for such access, and to know under what terms the open space will be open to the local community. The Parish Council would welcome villagers having access via the entrances within the village, rather than just the distant main site entrance, which requires walking along busy roads.
- 6.66 **Health Impact Assessment Officer – No objection.**

- 6.67 The outcome is that the Health Impact Assessment as submitted has been assessed as grade A which meets the required standard of the HIA SPD policy (only HIA's graded A or B are acceptable).
- 6.68 **Health and Safety Executive – No objection**
- 6.69 From the information you have provided for this planning application it does not appear to fall under the remit of planning gateway one because the purpose of a relevant building is not met. No objection.
- 6.70 **Historic England – No objection**
- 6.71 No comment necessary. The advice of your specialist officers should be sought.
- 6.72 **Landscape Officer – Further Information and/or Amendments Required.**
- 6.73 1st Comment: Further Information and/or Amendments Required:
- 6.74 A significant number of existing trees will be removed to allow for the construction of the new buildings and the decked car park, and these include trees protected by a TPO next to the proposed building B1.
- 6.75 The existing trees are an important part of the existing green infrastructure on site providing habitats, shade, screening, canopy cover and helping integrate the large -scale buildings into their rural context. The trees are a mix of category B and C trees which are expected to thrive for another 30-40 years and so, the loss of the trees is significant. Removal of the trees must be compensated through new planting and a detailed strategy for compensatory planting is required before determination to show how the scheme will address Local Plan Policies NH6 and NH7.
- 6.76 An overview of the planting strategy is provided in the design and access statement section 5.4 (page 74), but more detail is required on the proposed tree species, sizes, the proposals for transplanting trees from the car park area and the rationale behind the strategy. The information on tree removal must also include further explanation of the age of the trees and whether they relate to the 1990s Science Park masterplan or pre-date the masterplan and should identify trees with TPOs. The tree schedule in the JBA report should be updated to clearly identify trees which are to be removed to accommodate new buildings or paving, parking, and roads.
- 6.77 The views and impact on the Listed Hall and the conservation area are the most sensitive views. View 12 from the public footpath and view 13 from the St Marys churchyard show that the proposed buildings, particularly B4 and B5, will be visible from the conservation area and will protrude above the roof line and profiles of the existing buildings on the science park, increasing the impact of the science park on the conservation area. From viewpoints 21 and 22 the extension to building B3 will be highly visible and

close to Abington Hall. The LVIA report concludes that impact on pedestrian users of the footpaths at viewpoints 12 and 13 will be adverse in nature and moderate or negligible in significance. At Viewpoints 21 and 22 the impact is assessed as being adverse and substantial or major.

6.78 The report also concludes that 'Visibility of the development would diminish over time with the growth of the mitigation planting and trees within the site' but the report and the design and access statement are not coordinated to explain how planting or other measures and design features have been designed to mitigate impact on views or how this will be delivered in the future. We recommend that an addendum is provided to show how planting will mitigate the negative impact on views and how this is embedded in the application for outline planning consent.

6.79 The drainage strategy proposes a mixture of below ground attenuation features, infiltration features and an attenuation basin to the southwest of Abington Hall. The attenuation basin will be close to the listed building in an area which was once planted with trees and formed the boundary to the south facing, rear garden in the late 18th century. It is important that the basin is fully integrated with the setting of the Listed Hall and with the proposed reinstatement of the 18th century planting which is described in the design and access statement (pages 69-70), and it is important that the basin is designed sensitively in relation to the historic landscape. An additional statement about the design of the basin is required to explain the design assumptions for the basin capacity and side slope gradients before determination. Full details of the basin and the surrounding planting should be provided through condition.

6.80 The landscape design of the courtyards and the proposed tree planting across the site are indicated in the design and access statement and on the illustrative masterplan but the parameter plans show no detail of the proposed landscape. Before determination we require the following items to be clarified.

- Any areas where no landscape works are proposed should be identified on a plan e.g., it appears no work is proposed between B1 and B2 or in the car park south of B1, B2 and B3. It appears that no work is proposed in the service yard by B5 or in the area north-west of Abington Hall.
- The Tree planting strategy must be submitted before determination to make sure that the scale of tree planting is appropriate to the scale of the new buildings and infrastructure works and to compensate for trees lost to enable the new development.

6.81 We recommend that a specific condition is included to address the design of the courtyards and all the hard and soft landscape should be conditioned.

6.82 2nd Comment: Further information and/or amendments required:

6.83 The proposed tree strategy shows the relocation of trees to be transplanted from the site of the proposed car park and the species and sizes of new tree

planting across the rest of the site. The proposed tree planting has several functions including compensating for loss of the removed, existing trees, creation of new green infrastructure, integration of the new buildings into the existing landscape and creation of new designed, landscape spaces.

- 6.84 In summary 86 new trees are proposed and will be a mix of large growing species such as Oak, Cedar, Maple and Bird Cherry alongside smaller, ornamental and native species such as Alder and Birch. All trees will be planted as mature nursery stock and so will have immediate impact. The species, sizes and quantity of trees is appropriate. However, some of the courtyard spaces and areas between buildings are constrained and the proposed, larger growing species such as Oaks may need to be relocated so that they have enough space to grow and spread to their ultimate size without conflict with building facades.
- 6.85 We recommend that, with each reserved matters application, more detail is provided on the ultimate height and spread of the trees to ensure that the trees have enough space to grow and thrive and to avoid future tree management issues. The overall number of replacement trees and the inclusion of the large growing species should remain consistent so that the loss of the existing trees, particularly G37, is addressed.
- 6.86 The LVIA addendum includes updated versions of view 22 from Abington Hall towards the proposed B3 extension showing the effect of removal of existing buildings west of the hall and the impact of proposed mitigation planting in the green space west of the hall. The visualisations are much clearer and more detailed than previous versions, but the mitigation planting shown does not change the negative impact of the proposed B3 extension on Abington Hall. We note that the addendum does not include any additional information on mitigation for views from the conservation area and so our previous comment has not yet been addressed.
- 6.87 **Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection.**
- 6.88 No objection subject to conditions relating to a surface water drainage scheme and a construction surface water run off and appropriate informatives.
- 6.89 **Little Abington Parish Council - Objection**
- 6.90 1st Comment – Objection:
- 6.91 The proposed buildings will create a very urban environment, and will be visible across the rural surroundings. The height of the buildings would also set a precedent across the Granta Park site. Permissions have been granted for a 5 storey building at the entrance to Granta Park, this has no impact on the surrounding villages, unlike the proposed application. The height is increasing by 11.9M, to be five stories plus additional plant on the roof. This is wholly inappropriate in a rural setting and in proximity to a

historic village. The proposed development would dominate the skyline of a rural village.

- 6.92 The plans show a misrepresentation of the height of the proposed buildings. The application is aiming to reduce the footprint of the buildings, by increasing the height of them. Their aim is to create green spaces between the buildings, however the proposed buildings are so tall all the spaces would be in shadow.
- 6.93 All the site lines for the application are from Granta Park, none are from the south and east, and therefore do not give a representation of how the buildings will impact Great and Little Abington, from historic sites such as the two churches and the High Street.
- 6.94 There is no account of the acoustic surveys that have been carried out. Noise levels from the TWI site experienced by residents in Little Abington particularly those living on West Field have been unbearable. There has been correspondence between TWI and residents for over 5 years regarding noise, with no signs of this concluding. There would also be a considerable increase in light pollution.
- 6.95 The Master Plan for the Granta Park site included agreed walkways and permissive routes for residents. The Master Plan has been lost, and access has been removed since 2018. This had been an asset for those living in Little Abington, as there are few green spaces to walk in, due to having the A11 and A1307 bordering the village.
- 6.96 TWI do not need more space for themselves due to hybrid working etc. It appears that they want to be able to lease out space. The scale of this proposed development would be increasing the floor space by 50% which is a material development in a rural setting increasing by 20,000 square meters. This could create unsustainable levels of traffic.
- 6.97 The Community engagement document was not completely accurate. e.g. The Clerk of Little Abington Parish Council had not been called during August.
- 6.98 Little Abington Parish Council recommend that all planning applications across the Granta Park site are taken into consideration, from Biomed, TWI and other agents.
- 6.99 Second comment – Objection:
- 6.100 The additional materials provided by the applicant assert that the development will have a "positive impact" on the area and surrounding villages without providing any justification for this.
- 6.101 The visual impact assessments submitted continue not to take into account the visual perspective of the proposed development from the viewpoint of

the villages of Little Abington and Great Abington, therefore presenting only an incomplete assessment. This site lines are from within Granta Park.

- 6.102 The Addendum to the Design & Access Statement is similarly misleading. It presupposes that the only relevant height metric to be considered is as against above ordnance datum (AOD). This is an inappropriate measurement and has clearly been selected as it is biased in favour of the application. AOD is irrelevant. Only the actual height of the building (as against physical ground level) is relevant - and by this reference each of B4 and B5 would be materially taller than any of the other buildings referenced in that document. This document also fails to take into account:
- The siting of the reference buildings on Granta Park, and the fact that proposed buildings B4 and B5 would be much more proximate to the Abingtons and therefore much more impactful;
 - The rural setting of Granta Park and the inappropriate nature of buildings of that height;
 - The established understanding (as evidenced in the historic decision notices and design guides submitted) that buildings on the site should be constrained in height.
- 6.103 It remains the case that, even if similar total square footage of the proposed buildings were to be desirable, it could likely instead be achieved with buildings of comparable height to those being replaced and building in the gaps between buildings BBB, B4 and B5.
- 6.104 **National Highways – No objection.**
- 6.105 No objection.
- 6.106 **Natural England – No objection.**
- 6.107 Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on Alder Carr SSSI and has no objection.
- 6.108 **Sustainability Officer – No objection**
- 6.109 In conclusion, the approach to operational energy and carbon management is welcomed and I am reassured to see the use of Energy Use Intensity targets which align with the emerging local plan. Current modelling shows that the use of onsite renewables and low zero carbon technology should meet 10% of the developments total energy needs. Although this achieves compliance with current local plan policy CC/3, I would like to see the developer push for a higher percentage on such an energy intensive site. I would like to see a whole life carbon assessment of the project sooner rather than later, which takes on board both new construction and demolition, along with some industry driven targets rather than aspirations, driving the reuse of demolition materials wherever possible. The same applies to overheating risk analysis as this will be important in ensuring optimum use of the cooling hierarchy.

6.110 Overall, I am more than happy to offer support for this application from a sustainable construction point of view. To ensure the appropriate standards are achieved for this development, I recommend conditions regarding an Energy and Sustainability Strategy and a BREEAM pre-assessment.

6.111 **Tree Officer – Objection**

6.112 The treescape across the site is comprised of mature native species having statutory protection through a TPO, these trees are possibly associated to the original landscape as part of the former Abington Hall grounds. Complementing this, there is a diversity age range of mixed tree species that are integrated within the larger site enhancing character and overall tree canopy cover creating a positive appearance in respect to the natural environment.

6.113 TWI welding institute development plans see a significant amount of the existing trees to be removed including G37 category B2, B3 native Oak trees recognised for their landscape quality's and cultural and conservation value which are protected under the TPO, this is also reflected with the trees east to building B3 for extension. The proposed new carpark also sees B Categorised trees to be removed for the development, however, these are young to early-mature aged trees with consideration to transplant them to be used as part of the landscape plan.

6.114 The proposed development plans will have a negative impact on the tree age range and biodiversity especially the loss of the mature tree species creating an unbalance resulting in a disjointed age class and tree canopy cover which would be irreplaceable.

6.115 Any tree transplant efforts to preserve existing trees and to mitigate against tree losses comes with its own risks and needs to be fully planned and supported by an aftercare package.

6.116 No tree planting commitments will replace the mature trees set to be removed, these trees have matured overtime forming a rich contribution to the site and are irreplaceable, especially G37 native Oaks.

6.117 **Urban Design – Further information/ amendments required**

6.118 1st Comment – Further information/ amendments required:

6.119 Officers are generally supportive of the proposals in urban design terms. The proposal is well-developed during the pre-app process, which includes a Design Review by the Council's Design Review Panel.

6.120 The proposed layout design appears to continue the aspirations for high quality design set out in the approved outline application (ref. S/2466/12/OL) and well-reflect the key principles agreed. The alignment of the building appears logical, and slightly rotating building B 5 to open up the

view towards the listed cottage and to slightly enlarge the space created between buildings B4 & B5 has resulted in a sensible layout solution.

- 6.121 The central landscaped courtyard in between the building, and the way they connect to the existing courtyards to the south and to the wider context has resulted in a good quality pedestrian friendly and green environment development.
- 6.122 Reducing the number of the parking spaces to the centre of the development had helped in enhancing the soft landscaping aspect of the layout. The parking arrangement adjacent to Buildings 4, 5 & 6 is well laid out and incorporates a reasonable amount of landscaping to help break up the hard standing and screen the cars.
- 6.123 The proposed design solution for the external walls of the multi-storey car park to the north, as shown in Page 72 of the DAS, is acceptable. More details of this treatment would be expected in future applications, should the current application be approved.
- 6.124 The proposed approach for the height and massing has been problematic during the pre-app stage. Applicants were advised to produce some CGIs to help officers more practically assess the development scale and massing approach. It was felt at the pre-app stage that as long as the height is within the height framework for Granta Park, Officers view is that this height could be acceptable in Urban Design terms subject to sensitive architectural details, materials, and landscaping to mitigate this visual impact.
- 6.125 The contemporary architectural language proposed for the buildings' elevations along with the proposed palette of materials appear to add a suitable new addition to Granta Park. It would be useful for Officers to receive some sample of materials at a later stage to better understand the materiality aspect of the scheme.
- 6.126 Page 54 of the DAS states that the entrances of the buildings will be celebrated, to give each building its own character. In addition, page 54 of the DAS showed some examples of ways artwork could be integrated into the building design, whether it's sculpture, façade patterns or glass fritting. Such approach is supported by Officers, but how these entrances can be detailed to enrich the space created between the buildings without compromising the relationship with the listed cottage, would need some careful thinking.
- 6.127 Based on the recently submitted CGI, Officers conclude that the form of the buildings is appropriate for the location, as is the scale, and appears to relate well to the surrounding buildings. However, given the sensitive location of the site on the edge of the countryside and adjacent to heritage assets, I defer to the council landscape and conservation officers on assessing the adverse impacts of the proposal on these elements.
- 6.128 There are however specific issues which require further consideration.

- 6.129 For example the service yard which separates between the existing and the proposed courtyards appears unattractive and may compromise the overall quality of the space (see image below). Whilst Officers understand the nature of this service yard and the need to provide a service vehicle access; this area, however, should be seen and detailed as a complementary part for the overall space created by the courtyards. Therefore, the approach should be towards creating a green environment where the access of the service comes tributary in the arrangement. The Design Review Panel suggested exploring the use of a small vehicle for the service. This idea does not seem to be explored and further consideration should be given to improve this area appearance.
- 6.130 The design of the pedestrian routes within the courtyards does not appear very practical and would need further consideration. The submitted drawings (ref. TWI-HBA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-08-0100, Rev P1) show that the pedestrian route between Buildings B2 & B3 is a secondary route for other main routes to access the B2 & B3. Instead, it was expected that this route will be designed as a main pedestrian route with a direct link to the main pedestrian route running south-north as shown in drawing (ref. TWI-HBA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-08-0004, Rev P1). In addition, the layout of the two created routes (between B2 & B3 and B4 & B5) seems contrived and unnecessarily enlengthen. More direct and naturally design routes should be explored in these areas.
- 6.131 2nd Comment – Further Information required
- 6.132 Officers are still supportive of the proposal in Urban Design terms, but issues raised in the previous comments (dated 30/01/2023) still need to be addressed.

7.0 Third Party Representations

- 7.1 9no. representations in objection have been received. These raise the following issues:
- The Proposals Plan approved under S106 was in 8 parts (Parts 1-7 parts listed 13 September 1996 and Part 8 Schedule of Work to restore Abington Hall was added in the S106). The buildings now being offset against the floor area of the new development were to have been removed as part of the original Granta Park outline approval (Schedule of Existing Buildings Part 6 of the Proposals Plan). The works required under the original S106 to benefit the site were not carried out. The proposal is to count them a second time and to redevelop closer to the house within the former restored landscape area, and with larger buildings than before.
 - The proposal does not conform to the original masterplan or design guide for Granta Park.

- The design guide states that any development on the TWI site should be for companies with the same aims as TWI and not speculative.
- The original S106 should be enforced.
- The original C18 East-West tree avenue was to be restored under the original S106.
- The reduction in the curtilage listed wall does not comply with the 1990 Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act or the NPPG.
- The future of the extant of the curtilage listed wall and gardeners cottage are not secured and would be vulnerable to next to the service and turning area.
- Harm to views of Abington Hall from Little Abington Church. Submission has not properly considered the views considered by the Planning Inspector (Windfarm Appeal) and not fully considered the effect on the environment of lighting and opening up of what appears to have been a Council landfill site.
- Harm to setting of Abington Hall.
- Harm to rural setting of Little and great Abington due to physical height of buildings B4 and B5.
- The heights of other buildings on Granta Park should not be taken into account when considering this application.
- Noise and light pollution to residential properties in Little Abington.
- Design of buildings more akin to a City Centre scheme not a village.
- Increase in traffic movements on rural villages.
- Application should be considered along with ongoing developments and potential for future applications in this sensitive rural area.
- This is a speculative development and not all the floorspace is needed by TWI.
- When considering this planning application what measures will be taken by SCDC Planning Department to ensure that any potential tenants do not impact further on the local environment in terms of the points raised above?
- The visual impact assessments submitted continue not to take into account the visual perspective of the proposed development from the viewpoint of the villages of Little Abington and Great Abington, therefore presenting only an incomplete assessment.
- The gaps between BBB, BB4 and B5 should be filled in with similar height buildings to existing, not new taller buildings.
- Over recent years, the actions of TWI on Granta Park has prevented the villagers from benefitting from the Park at all - blocking most of the paths to the Park from the village. The original masterplan / proposals were supported by Gt. and Lt Abington on the basis that access to the park was allowed and welcomed. It is understood that security for some businesses is important but that should not mean the whole park is closed to villagers. The only villagers who are allowed are those who can afford to use the Health Club.
- The EIA consultation was launched during the peak summer holiday and the Parish Councils did not have sufficient time to comment.
- Has the Abington Naturewatch Group been consulted?

- The run-off from the site into the river needs to be considered due to the biodiversity important of the river and the neighbouring Sluice Wood.
- Little benefit to local community.
- Developers should be required to focus their attention on enhancing and increasing biodiversity on the locality of Great and Little Abington and on their own site NOT to purchase a packet of land remote from the area just to tick a box, It makes sense to work with BioMed Realty if joint working would result in an enhanced approach to biodiversity gain and environmental strategies.

8.0 Member Representations

8.1 Not applicable.

9.0 Local Groups / Petition

9.1 Not applicable.

9.2 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

10.0 Assessment

Principle of Development

- 10.1 The site is located outside of a defined development framework boundary. Policy S/7(2) of the Local Plan states that outside development frameworks, only allocations within Neighbourhood Plans that have come into force and development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside or where supported by other policies in the plan will be permitted.
- 10.2 The site is located within Granta Park, which is designated as an Established Employment Area under Policy E/15 of the Local Plan. Policy E/15(1) states that in defined Established Employment Areas, redevelopment of existing buildings and appropriate development for employment use will be permitted.
- 10.3 The application seeks planning permission for erection of a research and development buildings and associated decked car park, landscaping and associated infrastructure.
- 10.4 The principle of development is therefore in accordance with Policy E/15 of the Local Plan.
- 10.5 There are several other local and national policies that have relevance to the principle of development.

- 10.6 Policy S/2 of the Local Plan sets out the six objectives of the Local Plan, one of which is to support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology-based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.
- 10.7 Policy E/9 of the Local Plan deals with the promotion of clusters and details that development proposals in suitable locations will be permitted which support the development of employment clusters, drawing on the specialisms of the Cambridge area in several sectors including biotechnology and biomedical, high-technology manufacturing, research and development, clean technology and other locally driven clusters as they emerge.
- 10.8 The supporting text in paragraph 8.47 of the Local Plan details that Policy E/9 seeks to ensure major sites continue to deliver land and buildings suitable for the future development of the high-tech clusters.
- 10.9 At a national level, chapter 6 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) deals with building a strong, competitive economy.
- 10.10 Paragraph 81 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. 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. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future.
- 10.11 Paragraph 83 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for clusters or networks of knowledge and data-driven, creative or high technology industries; and for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations.
- 10.12 Paragraph 84 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings.
- 10.13 Paragraph 86 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport). The use of previously developed land, and

sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist.

- 10.14 There is no in-principle objection to the proposed development, which would accord with Policies S/2, E/9 and E/15 of the Local Plan (2018) and the NPPF (2023) as noted above.

Design/ Visual Amenity

Background/ Procedural Matters

- 10.15 Policy HQ/1 'Design Principles' provides a comprehensive list of criteria by which development proposals must adhere to, requiring that all new development must be of high-quality design, with a clear vision as to the positive contribution the development will make to its local and wider context.
- 10.16 Policy NH/2 'Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character' states that development will only be permitted where it respects and retains, or enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and of the individual National Character Area in which is it located.
- 10.17 The matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscape are all reserved matters are under this application. This means that the detail of these will need to be provided and assessed by way of future reserved matters application(s) in the event of outline permission being granted. Seven parameter plans (PP's) however are put forward for approval (PP's 1-7) as part of this outline application. The PP's provide a broad framework within which subsequent RM's applications would have to accord. The PP's are summarised in turn below:

Proposed Development Zones & Public Realm (PP1)

- 10.18 This PP stipulates the maximum development zones for each building and the extent of external landscaping, servicing areas and vehicle drop off. It outlines in blue the maximum footprints of the proposed new buildings and extensions. This includes the extent of the proposed B3 extension to the east of this building and the three new buildings (B4, B5 and B6) to the north and north-east of the existing buildings. Similarly, the maximum development zones for the substation adjacent to B5 and the northern decked car park are delineated. A zone for vehicle drop off and car parking immediately north of proposed buildings B4 and B5 is outlined and access from the existing road running through the site. In addition, a hatched area between the southern existing buildings (B1 – B3) and the proposed and refurbished buildings (B4, B5 and BBB) is shown to designate this space for use as a service yard and vehicle service route. The remaining areas of the land within the red-line are marked as external landscape zones or form pre-existing roads and car parking areas. Collectively, these development

zones provide the masterplan strategy for re-development of the site, whereby buildings B1 – B5 follow a somewhat mirroring layout to one another with ‘fingers’ running through the spaces between the buildings north-south. Building B6 would then be positioned to the north of the curtilage listed cottage and with much of the space around this consolidated to remove the cluster of smaller buildings that are presently there.

Parameter Plan – Demolition (PP2)

- 10.19 This specifies the buildings to be demolished, namely buildings BBH, TG, RS and RJ which are all to the north of east of the existing buildings that would be retained. A small substation immediately east of B3 would be demolished too. These demolitions are necessary to allow for the layout of development as described in the preceding paragraph. Two buildings (RMCC and Restaurant) surrounding Abington Hall are also shown as being demolished but this has already been approved through planning permissions S/2466/12/OL and S/2475/12/CA respectively.

Proposed Access & Connection (PP3)

- 10.20 This plan is very similar to PP1 in appearance with the notable difference being the demarcation of pedestrian, cycle and pedestrian, vehicle routes for visitor drop-off and accessible parking, and, vehicle route for delivery and service access being specifically shown on the site. This includes pedestrian routes running east-west along the front of existing buildings B1 – B3 and north-south in the ‘fingers’ between each building. The parameter plans ensure that a minimum gap of 20m is provided between buildings BBB, B4 and B5. Building B5 has been splayed to create a generous space which will support the development of landscaped courtyards and the application is supported by a daylight assessment.

Proposed Maximum Heights (PP4)

- 10.21 This plan stipulates the maximum building heights (above ordnance datum) of each element of the proposed development. The proposed B3 extension would have a maximum boundary edge height, essentially eaves height, of 45m AOD and maximum overall ridge height in the centre, effectively the top of the pitched roof, of 49m AOD. This is to mirror the existing pitched roofs of B3. Proposed building B4 would have the highest maximum building height on the site of 56.5m. Proposed building B5 would have a maximum building height of 53.5m and B6 to the north would have a maximum height of 49m. The northern decked car park would have a maximum height of 37.5m. The substation proposed to adjoin building B5 would have a maximum height of 38.5m. The redeveloped BBB building with new cladding and roof structure with have a maximum height of 45.9m.

Proposed Site Levels (PP5)

- 10.22 PP5 sets out the site levels that would be present across the site, including where works are proposed such as new buildings and landscaping.
- 10.23 Whilst not strictly parameter plans, the application has been accompanied by a series of section drawings showing the maximum building heights and footprints. Importantly, these sections also identify the maximum heights for any flues above the buildings. The B3 extension would have a maximum flue zone height of 52.5m (3.5m above the maximum building height). Proposed building B4 would have a maximum flue height of 63.13m (6.63m above the maximum building height). Proposed building B5 would have a maximum flue height of 59.13m (5.63m above the maximum building height). Proposed building B6 would have a maximum flue height of 53.5m (4.5m above the maximum building height). The redeveloped BBB building would have a maximum flue height of 49.9m (4m above the maximum building height).
- 10.24 The Existing Site Levels (PP6) and Existing Site Plan (PP7) PPs outline the existing site levels and the extent of ownership of the applicant.

Assessment

- 10.25 As mentioned above this application is in outline form with all matters reserved except means of access. At this stage, therefore, considerations fall to whether a satisfactory scheme could be accommodated within the site in terms of design and that would not adversely impact the character of the area.
- 10.26 The proposals have been the subject of extensive pre-application consultation with officers, including specialist inputs, and a Design Review Panel (DRP) (See Appendix 1).
- 10.27 In terms of the overall layout, it is considered that based on the PPs the proposed development could provide a high quality design and would not give the perception of this part of the Granta Park site feeling overdeveloped or cramped when considered in its wider context. The development zones proposed would ensure that there is comfortable breathing space between buildings and the arrangement of development would broadly follow the pattern of development of buildings B1 – B3 by mirroring this relationship. The proposed buildings would have maximum development zones that are akin to other buildings on this science park and therefore, in this context, it is considered that the quantum of development could be accommodated on the site.
- 10.28 The remaining areas that are not identified for proposed works would be dedicated to landscaping and PP1 would ensure that the well-landscaped character of Granta Park would be respected and enhanced. The relevant PPs would provide a framework that could allow for a high-quality landscape scheme and for pedestrian, cycle and other user modes to be integrated successfully. It is noted that the Urban Design Officer has made suggestions regarding the footpath and service yard connections to improve

these elements. However, as these elements are illustrative only, these will instead need to be considered in any future reserved matters application. In principle, the areas dedicated to landscape could accommodate a successful landscaping strategy for the site.

- 10.29 The proposed building B6 situated further to the north would be deliberately stepped down in scale and this, coupled with the fact it would not project further north than the building line of the Riverside buildings immediately to the east, is considered to not appear at odds with the prevailing character of the area. The demolition of the cluster of smaller, lower quality architectural buildings and consolidation with a more formal arrangement of buildings is considered to represent a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The layout of this building has been amended significantly during the pre-application process, largely in response to comments raised by the Design Review Panel (DRP), who recommended that the building be reduced in footprint where it used to wrap around the curtilage listed cottage in a L-shaped arrangement. The scheme has been modified significantly reducing the footprint of B6 and opening up the area around the curtilage listed wall and cottage.
- 10.30 The proposed B3 extension would logically extend off the east elevation. The development footprint would retain a degree of separation from the access road running through the site north-to-south. The PP would ensure that the extension matches at maximum the building height of the existing building which would ensure it responds successfully to its context subject to its detailed design. It is acknowledged that the Conservation Officer has identified that the B3 extension towards Abington Hall does cause a degree of less than substantial harm to this heritage asset. This will be assessed in the heritage assessment section of this report.
- 10.31 The PPs proposed would provide a strict development framework for any future reserved matters application(s) if outline permission were approved. In addition to demarcating the specific development zones as explained above, buildings would have maximum building heights. The tallest building proposed would be building B4 in the centre of the site layout, with a maximum building height of 56.5m (AOD). Buildings B5 and B6 would have slightly lower maximum building heights of 53.5m (AOD) and 49m (AOD) respectively. Buildings of these heights would clearly be of significant scales and it is therefore necessary to consider whether in principle buildings of these heights could be accommodated on this site without harming the character and appearance of the area.
- 10.32 To identify whether these building scales could reasonably be accommodated, it is necessary to consider the proposed development within its wider Granta Park context. Granta Park has been the subject of recent and ongoing developments where larger buildings have broadly been acceptable in this area subject to their design considerations. For example, Site 1 to the west has an overall height of 57.1m (AOD) (0.6m higher than B4 as proposed) and the Illumina building to the south has a height of 56.65m (AOD) (0.15m higher). The building heights of the 5 buildings

approved on Phase 2 immediately to the south-east of the TWI campus have building heights ranging from 51.25m – 55.5m (AOD). Site 6 to the north-west across the lake on Granta Park has a building height of 49.25m (AOD).

- 10.33 The maximum building heights of proposed buildings B4 – B6, redeveloped BBB building and the B3 extension would range from 56.5m at the highest point (B4) to 45.9m (BBB) at the lowest. Therefore, whilst the tallest building (B4) would be of a comparable scale to the higher ends of what has been approved across Granta Park, the remaining aspects would be lower and this would ensure that, as a whole, the scale of buildings would not appear overly dominant in this science park context given the variety in scales and forms that the maximum building height PP would stipulate.
- 10.34 The proposed northern sunken decked car park would be situated over part of the existing north car park. With a maximum height of 37.5m and the limited visibility of this element due to the extensive tree belt adjacent to the River Granta, it is considered that a decked car park within these parameters could be accommodated within this part of the site without causing harm to the character and appearance of the area. Similarly the substation adjoining B5, based off the maximum development zone and height allocated to this, would appear ancillary to the main buildings and not at odds with the character of the area, subject to its detailed design.
- 10.35 Overall, officers acknowledge that the parameter plans submitted would accommodate a considerable scale and quantum of built form onto the site. However, whilst notable in size, the maximum thresholds that would be allowed by the parameter plans would not appear at odds with the character and appearance of Granta Park where these types of developments are either present or have been permitted. The maximum scale and massing proposed would offer the opportunity for contemporary forms of architecture and the final detail of how these buildings would appear would be presented and assessed accordingly at the appropriate reserved matters submission stages.
- 10.36 The indicative visual contained within the Design and Access Statement provide confidence that the development could be successfully accommodated on the site that assimilate successfully within the science park context. The masterplan will provide a cohesive character for the TWI estate as part of the Granta Park campus. The new buildings intend to respond and relate to the existing high- quality buildings, surrounded by improved landscaping, and the refurbishment and reclad of the existing BBB will improve its quality and building performance. The proposed development parameter plans are considered to be capable of accommodating a high-quality design that would contribute positively to its surroundings, in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and E/15(3) of the Local Plan and NPPF guidance. The impact on the wider landscape and heritage will be considered in the next sections of this report.

Wider Landscape Impact and Impact on Heritage Assets

- 10.37 The application is supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (David Jarvis Associates, December 2022) and a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal - Addendum (David Jarvis Associates, March 2023). The Appraisal seeks to identify the likely landscape and visual effects of the proposed development and to assess the significance of those effects. Several appendices / figures accompany the Appraisal and provide a visual guide to the assessment undertaken.
- 10.38 The Appraisal describes the site topography as gently sloping sitting at approximately 30m (AOD). It is defined along its north eastern edge by a Sluice Wood, by the Riverside development and Abington Hall on the eastern boundary, the decked car park to the south and the central cricket field and lake to the west and north west. There are areas of tree planting within the site, including the tree line west of the Robert Jenkins Building and north of BBH, and between B3 and Abington Hall. The northern car park also benefits from a high degree of recent tree planting.
- 10.39 In terms of the wider Granta Park itself, the Appraisal explains that it is largely enclosed by areas of woodland along the River Granta on its northern edge, with well developed tree and hedge-lines around the remainder of the periphery. The Park contains a number of office / laboratory buildings in a well landscaped parkland setting. Areas of car parking have a high degree of tree cover. The Park centres on a green space and lake.
- 10.40 The Appraisal summarises the landscape value of the site as being of medium landscape value, as is Granta Park. The Abingtons and their environs are considered to be relatively uniform and intact and possessing some heritage assets is therefore considered to be of medium-high value.
- 10.41 The Appraisal included findings of a field survey which surveyed 28no. potential views from the wider area and some localised views within Granta Park to determine the sensitivity of these views and identify which receptors are anticipated to be affected by the proposed development. These included anticipated views from the nearest residential properties (circa 400 – 530m east), users of public rights of way/ public spaces, local roads and users of Granta Park itself.
- 10.42 Based on these results, the Appraisal selected 8no. representative viewpoints to undertake baseline (existing), wireframe and proposed development views from these locations. The selection of these 8no. representative views for the Appraisal has not been contested by the Landscape Team or any other consultees and as such officers consider these views to be appropriate to determine wider landscape visual impacts. Each of the 8no. views will be assessed in turn below.
- 10.43 Viewpoint (VP) 1 is taken from the vehicular entrance point into Granta Park, approximately 460m to the west of the application site. At present, Building BBB is visible across the cricket pitch from this view. The proposal

would introduce additional massing above this in the form of the upper-most level and rooftop plant of Building B4 as this would be visible above the re-profiled BBB building which it would sit behind. The rooftop plant level of Building B6 would be visible but the main bulk of this building would be obscured to an extent by existing tree planting. The remaining elements of the development would not be readily visible given their respective scales or being obscured by existing buildings on the site.

- 10.44 In assessment of the above VP, it is considered that the insertion of the proposed development would not cause harm to visual amenity. The viewpoint forms the gateway into a science park where large commercial buildings are common, as demonstrated by the building much closer to this view in the foreground. The Landscape Team have not raised any objection to this VP. The proposed development is a considerable distance from this VP and given this separation distance and the context of this view, it is considered that no harm arises to this VP.
- 10.45 VP 2 is taken from the south of the site along Pampisford Road, close to South Lodge, approximately 420m from the application site. The northern stretch of this part of Pampisford Road is bounded by a dense hedgerow, as well as with extensive tree planting both within and south of Granta Park itself. It is evident from this VP that there would be no harmful impact as the proposed development is obscured entirely by the extensive planting.
- 10.46 VP 12 is taken from Footpath 4/5 at the River Granta, approximately 405m to the east of the application site and within the Conservation Area. At present, there is limited visibility of the existing buildings on the application site. This is due partially to existing tree planting on the wider Granta Park, but also due to the Riverside buildings immediately to the east of the application site blocking views of the TWI buildings. The existing 'saw-tooth' roof profile of Building B3 is visible in-between the gap between trees and the Riverside buildings. A small section of Building BBH is also visible between the southern-most and central of the three Riverside Buildings but this is not a prominent feature as it's set a considerable distance behind (west) of the Riverside buildings).
- 10.47 From this VP, the proposed development, particularly Buildings B4 and B5, would rise above the adjacent Riverside buildings by circa 2 storeys with rooftop plant above and would clearly impact this view when compared to existing. Part of the re-profiled BBB building would be visible but this would be predominantly obscured by a combination of the existing Riverside buildings and the proposed B4 Building. Building B6 further to the north would be partially visible but not as prominent as Building B4 and B5 as a result of a combination of existing trees and the lower scale compared to these other proposed buildings.
- 10.48 VP 13 is taken from the churchyard of the Church of St Mary the Virgin which is a Grade II Star Listed Building and within the Conservation Area.

10.49 At this juncture it's important to note comments from the Conservation Officer and the Landscape Officer regarding VPs 12 and 13. The Conservation Officer has stated that:

“The Heritage Statement acknowledges that there will be change to the outlook and setting of the conservation area through the redevelopment but does not take account of the considerable additional height and cumulative impacts of the redevelopment. LVIA view 12 (river footpath) demonstrates that buildings B4, B5, B6 would be visible over the existing built form and tree line due to additional height and bulk. The buildings would merge into a single mass from this angle, with resulting cumulative visual impacts. Flues are not shown on the LVIA images but are expected to be an additional 6-8m based on the illustrative drawings. Notwithstanding the flues, the impact on this view is identified as adverse in the LVIA, and is considered harmful in relation to NPPF paras 199-202...

The outlook from the edge of churchyard would include buildings rising above the treeline, forming a dense cluster. The LVIA assesses the impact on this view (view 13), which is also a view from the conservation area, as adverse. This could therefore be considered harmful to the setting and significance to the designated heritage asset, and requires further consideration...

Low to moderate less than substantial harm would arise to the Great and Little Abington Conservation Area due to the height, mass and cumulative visual impact of B4, B5 and B6.

Further consideration of the location, form and design of plant and flues is needed to minimise these impacts. Further consideration of the impact on the setting of St Mary's Church is needed as based on the current information this is considered to be harmful.”

10.50 The Landscape Officer has stated that:

“View 12 from the public footpath and view 13 from the St Marys churchyard show that the proposed buildings, particularly B4 and B5, will be visible from the conservation area and will protrude above the roof line and profiles of the existing buildings on the science park, increasing the impact of the science park on the conservation area... The LVIA report concludes that impact on pedestrian users of the footpaths at viewpoints 12 and 13 will be adverse in nature and moderate or negligible in significance... The report also concludes that ‘Visibility of the development would diminish over time with the growth of the mitigation planting and trees within the site’ but the report and the design and access statement are not coordinated to explain how planting or other measures and design features have been designed to mitigate impact on views or how this will be delivered in the future. We

recommend that an addendum is provided to show how planting will mitigate the negative impact on views and how this is embedded in the application for outline planning consent.”

- 10.51 As described above, predominantly through the massing of buildings B4 and B5, there would be an impact from this view within the Conservation Area. It is noted that the applicant's Heritage Statement states that the proposal would have a positive impact on the Conservation Area. However, this is not agreed with, and it is considered that the proposal would cause a degree of harm to the heritage asset of the Conservation Area as explained below.
- 10.52 The Conservation Officer has identified that the impact of this would cause low-moderate less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area. The level of harm to the setting of the Grade II* Listed St Mary's Church is not explicitly stated in the Conservation Officer's comments. However, given that VP 13 is taken from within the churchyard, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the level of harm would also amount to low-moderate less than substantial harm to its setting.
- 10.53 Officers do not dispute that the proposals would cause a degree of less than substantial harm to these heritage assets, and, by virtue of this, some harm to the wider landscape character from these views. However, it is considered that the level of less than substantial harm to these heritage assets falls on the lower end of the spectrum of harm.
- 10.54 The principal reason for this assessment of harm is because the proposed development must be viewed within its site context. In this case, the development proposals would be situated on an established science park where there are a variety of large, similar scaled and proportioned buildings, either consented or already built. Whilst this does not mean that the impacts on the wider landscape and heritage assets should be disregarded, it needs to be considered how the development would be perceived visually within its surroundings.
- 10.55 Furthermore, as this application is at outline stage, the LVIA views have to consider the maximum development parameters from the set viewpoints. Therefore, design mitigation measures such as the buildings materials, articulation, elevation strategy etc have not been presented at this time and, as and when future reserved matters applications come in, these details will likely help in softening the impact from these views.
- 10.56 It is noted that the Landscape Team have requested a further addendum to show how planting could mitigate the negative impact on views. The Conservation Team also raised a similar request with respect to view 13 only. The applicant had produced an addendum but not for views 12 and 13. This was because there was no prospect of meaningful additional planting between the development and these views based on the site layout and existing building at Riverside.

- 10.57 The above harm to heritage assets will be balanced against the public benefits of the scheme in the 'Impact on Heritage Assets' section of this report. Similarly, the harm to the landscape character will be balanced against the material planning consideration in the concluding section of this report.
- 10.58 VP 16 is taken from the junction of Bourn Bridge Road east of Newmarket Road. This part of Bourn Bridge Road benefits from roadside hedgerow and tree planting. There is also extensive tree planting within Granta Park itself. The LVIA shows that the upper part of Building B4 would be partially visible. However, this would be a long distance view as the TWI site is set into the eastern section of the wider Granta Park site. The proposal is not considered to cause harm to this VP.
- 10.59 VP 19 is taken from within Granta Park, immediately to the south-east of the TWI site. There is a row of slender spruce trees which partially obscure the TWI buildings. Only the very upper-element of Building B5 and the B3 extension would be visible from this VP. Building B5 would be largely obscured by the existing TWI building on-site and the additional height of B5 above this is considered not to be prominent. The proposed B3 extension would be obscured partially by the row of tree planting further to the south-east and given that the form and scale of this element is a continuation of the existing TWI building, this additional footprint is not considered to result in any substantial change to the landscape character from this perspective.
- 10.60 VP 22 is taken from the approach to Abington Hall, immediately east of the application site. From this VP, the eastern edge of the existing B3 building is partially obscured by tree planting, much of which would be removed as a result of the proposed B3 extension. The proposed B3 extension and B5 building would be visible from this VP.
- 10.61 The Conservation Officer has considered the impact of this view on the setting of the Grade II* Listed Abington Hall. In terms of the impact of the proposed B5 building, the Conservation Officer has stated that:
- “The new B5 building, while large in scale and clearly changing the setting of the Hall, would be set further away and be seen in the context of an established cluster of buildings. B4 and B6 would be set behind other buildings in relation to the Hall, with minimal direct impact.”*
- 10.62 This is agreed and it is considered that in the context of the site, the proposed new buildings would not have a harmful impact on the setting of the listed building.
- 10.63 The Conservation Officer is of the view however that the proposed B3 extension would cause moderate levels of less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building. The extension to B3 is approximately 70m from Abington Hall:

“View 22 (Abington Hall) in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) indicates that there would be a considerable increase in built form in close proximity to the grade II listed building arising from the B3 extension. Some of the trees that provide partial screening of B3 from the Hall would be removed, resulting in greater visibility of the building than at present. The extension would also bring the long, sheer elevation of the building notably closer to the Hall and therefore intruding upon its immediate setting.*

The proposed replacement planting and landscape improvements could mitigate this to a modest degree, although the impact and scale of the extension would be difficult to conceal. The LVIA view also shows a mixture of vehicles, trees and features which might include the partially demolished modern structures, and it is therefore anticipated that sightlines to B3 would be clearer than depicted given the substantial scale of the extension.

Moderate less than substantial harm would arise to the setting of Abington Hall due to the extension of B3. The proposed landscape mitigation is unconvincing, and the justification is not clear and convincing as required by NPPF para 200.”

- 10.64 Officers consider this to be a reasonable assessment and agree that the proposed development would cause a moderate level of less than substantial harm to the setting of this heritage asset. Again, this harm will need to be balanced against the public benefits in the ‘Impact on Heritage Assets’ section of this report.
- 10.65 The final viewpoint is VP 26 which is taken from within Granta Park from the north-west of the application site across the lake. The proposed development would be clearly prominent from this VP and a fairly dramatic change compared to the existing situation. However, this is an internal VP from within the established science park of Granta Park. There are a multitude of various large scale buildings visible from within Granta Park and consequently, within this context, the presence of the proposed new buildings would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
- 10.66 Overall, the proposed development is considered to pose less than substantial harm to identified heritage assets from VPs 12, 13 and 22 and a degree of landscape character harm to the east from VPs 12 and 13, contrary to Policy NH/2 of the Local Plan (2018). This harm will need to be weighed against the benefits of the proposal in the relevant sections of this report.
- 10.67 Abington Hall, a Grade II* Listed Building, is the nearest listed building to the site, located immediately to the east of the site application boundary, and approximately 70m away from the proposed B3 extension at its nearest point. Abington Hall is located within the Conservation Area of Great and Little Abington, the western boundary of which straddles the application site.

- 10.68 To the north-east of the site is the Grade II* Listed Parish Church of St Mary the Virgin. This is located approximately 350m from the north-eastern boundary of the site. Pampisford Hall which is a Grade II Listed Building is situated over 1,400m to the west of the site.
- 10.69 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
- 10.70 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving the (listed) building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
- 10.71 Policy NH/14 of the Local Plan sets out support for development proposals when they sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as appropriate to their significance and in accordance with the NPPF. Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan also requires development to conserve or enhance important natural and historic assets and their settings.
- 10.72 Paragraph 199 of the NPPF (2023) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
- 10.73 Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
- 10.74 For the reasons set out in the preceding section of this report, the proposal is considered to cause less than substantial harm to identified heritage assets. This consists of moderate levels of less than substantial harm to the setting of the Grade II* Listed Abington Hall by way of the proposed B3 extension, and low levels of less than substantial harm to the setting of the Grade II* Listed Church of St Mary and the Great and Little Abington Conservation Area.
- 10.75 It is acknowledged that the overall setting of Abington Hall has been enhanced somewhat due to the recent demolitions of the Ramsey Moon Conference Centre immediately to the west and the Canteen Building to the south. In addition, Abington Hall has been extensively refurbished. However, these enhancements were assessed through previous separate applications and do not therefore form part of the assessment for this outline application.

- 10.76 In accordance with Paragraph 202 of the NPPF, this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The benefits that are considered to be afforded weight are set out below.
- 10.77 The NPPF at Paragraph 81 states 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. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. This is particularly important where Britain can be a global leader in driving innovation (industrial strategy), and in areas with high levels of productivity, which should be able to capitalise on their performance and potential.
- 10.78 Paragraph 83 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for clusters or networks of knowledge and data-driven, creative or high technology industries; and for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations.
- 10.79 The Government's Industrial Strategy (2018) and 'Build Back Better' plan for growth (2021) both place significant emphasis on the importance of Life Sciences to the economy and the need to expand this sector.
- 10.80 Granta Park is one of the UK's leading Science Campuses offering state of the art laboratory and office facilities across 14 buildings on a 50-hectare site, established for over 20 years with a scientific population of over 3,700 people. Local Plan (2018) Policy E/9, as set out in the 'principle of development' section of this report, supports the growth of economic clusters.
- 10.81 The Greater Cambridge Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Study 2020 identifies Granta Park as being a key component of the Life sciences. This report acknowledges that there are some local challenges to keeping up with demand for both wet and dry lab space.
- 10.82 The proposed development would result in a net uplift of up to circa 21,350 sqm of research and development floorspace. It would allow for the continued growth of TWI, as well as the opportunity for new research and development based industries to develop at Granta Park.
- 10.83 The demand and need to expand research and development opportunities in and around Cambridge is clearly significant and as such it is considered that there are public economic benefits. As part of the application submission, the applicant has highlighted that the scheme will enable TWI to retain its headquarters on site; consolidate their operational requirements and provide much needed additional life science accommodation. This is key to their core business plan, and also affords opportunities to support Life Sciences as part of the Established R&D park.

- 10.84 The organisation cannot afford to carry inefficient or dead space, which will fundamentally compromise the efficiencies of their operation, and thereby impact on their operating costs and ultimately the sustainability of the business. The scheme is fundamental to TWI's aim to be carbon neutral by 2035 through a combination of efficiency measures, on-site generation and off – site procurement.
- 10.85 It is intended that the masterplan set out in the outline application will be delivered by TWI over the next 10 years, operational requirements and market conditions permitting. The existing buildings to be removed are outdated, of low architectural value and have very poor environmental performance. The applicant is seeking to repurpose and redevelop the estate to meet their changing requirements and to provide for science park R&D uses. New lab/offices will support the core business and encourage new occupiers onto the park.
- 10.86 The proposed development would facilitate the extensive refurbishment of existing buildings and replacement of poor condition buildings with new high specification floorspace. The proposal seeks to deliver BREEAM excellent buildings and support TWI's aim to be carbon neutral by 2035 for its scope 1 & 2 emissions. It would also enable to move away from centralised gas heating to electric air source heat pumps and include roof-mounted PV panels designed to meet 10% of the baseline energy requirements. The Sustainability Officer is supportive of the sustainability approach to development. In addition, the proposal would include 10% electric vehicle charging points. The proposed uplift in sustainability credentials of the site is considered to be a public benefit in the context of responding positively to climate change.
- 10.87 Substantial levels of tree planting would arise from the proposed development if permitted. The proposal does involve the removal of 25no. existing trees but seeks to plant 86no. new trees across the site, a replacement planting ratio of just under 4:1. This is a significant level of tree planting that, when balanced against the proposed tree removals, is considered to result in a public benefit through additional tree coverage which responds positively to climate change.
- 10.88 The proposal would require financial contributions towards the highway projects of Cambridge South Eastern Transport (CSET) phases 1 and 2 or Linton Greenway, but principally to be used for the improvement of the cycle route between High Street Babraham and Granta Park, including the upgrade of the Public Right of Way and a cycle route along Newmarket Road. The proposal would therefore help to deliver sustainable transport infrastructure that would be of benefit beyond the site more widely which is a public benefit.
- 10.89 The proposal seeks to deliver a biodiversity net gain uplift of at least 10%, with an aspiration to deliver 20%. There are however uncertainties regarding the precise amount of uplift and the location of this uplift as it is

not clear at this stage if this would be on-site or off-site. Nevertheless, a net gain in biodiversity is considered to result in a public benefit.

- 10.90 In applying the test set out in paragraph 202 of the NPPF, the public benefits identified above are considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm to heritage assets.
- 10.91 As less than substantial harm is identified to the Conservation Area and setting of listed buildings, the proposal would conflict with policy NH/14 of the Local Plan which requires new development to sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets. However, in applying the NPPF test in relation to less than substantial harm identified, the public benefits are considered to outweigh the harm identified.

Trees

- 10.92 Granta Park is bordered by a series of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) which form important perimeter landscaping around the site. In addition, there is a group TPO avenue which runs north-south and effectively dissects the application site of TWI in half. This is a historic TPO which dates back to 1961 and some of the trees have since been built over due to historic developments on the application site. Nevertheless, some trees within this historic TPO grouping remain.
- 10.93 The application is supported by an Arboricultural Method Statement (James Blake Associates 2023). The information provides a preliminary consideration of the arboricultural implications arising from the proposed development. The proposed development would necessitate the removal of 25no. trees in four areas across the site, although only.
- 10.94 Firstly, 26no. category B, C and U trees (G18, G19, G21, G25, G28, G52 and T22) would be removed within the existing northern car park to accommodate the proposed decked car park. It's pertinent to note though that the 22no. category B of these have been earmarked to be translocated to the immediate area adjacent to this northern decked car park. There is also a category U tree (T4) that would be removed but this has limited value. Given that the majority and highest value of these trees would be translocated within the immediate vicinity, these tree works are not considered to give rise to harm to the character and appearance of the area.
- 10.95 Secondly, the north-eastern most of a group of 4no. category B trees (G51) immediately to the south of proposed building B6 would require removal. In consideration of the fact that there would still be three trees in this grouping and the Tree Officer has not specifically highlighted this removal as being of concern, it is not considered that the removal of this tree would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.

- 10.96 Thirdly, to accommodate the proposed B3 extension, 11no. (T46, G45, G47, G49 and G50) of the 13no. existing category B and C trees present on the grassed area immediately east of the existing B3 building would be required to be removed. T48 and one of the two trees of G49 would be retained, both of which are category B. The proposal does demonstrate that 4no. replacement trees would be inserted into this affected area. In addition, there would be 12no. trees planted directly opposite (east) of the site, providing a tree lined avenue along the main access road into the site and within the setting of Abington Hall, as part of the 83no. proposed new trees on the site more widely. Whilst it would be desirable for these trees to be retained, it is not considered that their removal causes significant harm, particularly when considered in the context of the substantial level of tree planting in the immediate vicinity and more widely.
- 10.97 Finally, the proposed development of building B4 would require the removal of a tree preservation order (TPO) category B group of 8no. oak trees and 2no. field maple trees (G37). The removal of these trees was flagged as a constraint during pre-application stages by officers and an option study was undertaken by the applicant. The results of this option study did not find a way to feasibly accommodate the retention of these trees without significantly compromising the overall design strategy and layout of development. The trees are too mature and large to be translocated.
- 10.98 The Tree Officer has described this group of trees as being irreplaceable and forming a rich contribution to the site. The categorisation as a category B group of trees is not contested by the Tree Officer. Regardless, it is clear that the removal of these trees would have a negative impact on the landscape setting of the science park as they make a positive contribution to the context of the site. Consequently the removal of these trees is considered to cause some harm to the character of this part of the science park. However, the proposed tree planting strategy would compensate for this harm by way of substantial levels of replacement tree planting at a ratio of approximately 4no. new trees for every 1no. tree removed. This is weighed in the overall planning balance.

Carbon Reduction, Sustainable Design and Water Consumption

- 10.99 The application is supported by a Sustainability and Energy Statement (Envision, 2022) and a Water Conservation Statement (Envision, 2022). The documents state that the following sustainability targets are proposed for the development:
- Carbon neutral by 2035;
 - All electric approach for new and refurbished buildings using heat pumps (both ground and air currently under consideration) and solar PV;
 - BREEAM 'Excellent' for both new and refurbished buildings;
 - Passive /fabric first approach to new development with an Energy Use Intensity target (EUI) of 150kWh/m²/annum;
 - Initial modelling demonstrates the potential of the site to accommodate enough solar PV to generate 345mWh/annum;

- Embodied carbon of new construction will be reduced as far as possible - using assessment method supported by BREEAM Mat 01
- Materials from demolition of buildings to be reused wherever possible - no formal embodied carbon target but 'aspirational best practice target can be drawn from industry guidance'; and
- Passive design to promote natural cooling and overheating analysis to be undertaken at further design stage.

- 10.100 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Sustainability Officer who raises no objection to the proposed development subject to a compliance condition for the above recommendations to be implemented prior to use, and, a condition requiring BREEAM pre-assessments to be submitted with each reserved matters application, demonstrating that BREEAM 'Excellent' will be achieved.
- 10.101 An Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Opinion request (22/03745/SCRE) was submitted to the local planning authority on 12 August 2022. The Environment Agency were consulted as part of this request and raised no objection. The local planning authority then determined on 29 September 2022 that the development was not considered to be EIA development and that an Environmental Statement was therefore not required.
- 10.102 During the course of the application, officers requested further information regarding forecast water demand and water supply levels for the proposed development. Although no objection was received on this outline application specifically, this was requested by officers in response to recent comments raised by the Environment Agency on other major developments in the Cambridgeshire area regarding concerns with potable water supply and potential impacts on chalk water aquifers.
- 10.103 The additional water information demonstrates that the proposed development, with the existing site having an audited 2019 baseline water consumption level of 14,779m³, will only result in a modest increase in water consumption within the latter phases of development by approximately 8% (16,116m³). These elements of the scheme (Phase 3) would be first occupied around 2031/32. The earlier phases of development will actually have a moderately beneficial impact. This is deliverable through adopting significant water resource conservation measures. For example, Building B4 could achieve a 50% saving in water (as measured against BREEAM), equivalent to 6.56 m³ per person per annum.
- 10.104 As the scheme is presented in outline, with all matters reserved except for access, design principles such as a 50% improvement under the Wat01 method for buildings B4, B5, B6 & BBB, rainwater harvesting, water metering etc can be secured through further reserved matters applications and into operation of the site to align with the sustainability strategy. The Environment Agency have been re-consulted on this additional information and have not objected.

- 10.105 Officers consider the conditions, as noted above, to be reasonable and necessary as part of any consent to secure relevant appropriate detailing for an energy efficient and sustainable development in line with relevant policy.
- 10.106 Subject to the recommended conditions, the proposal is considered to accord with Policies CC/3 and CC/4 of the Local Plan.

Biodiversity

- 10.107 The National Planning Policy Framework (2023) and the Councils' Biodiversity SPD (2022) require development proposals to deliver a net gain in biodiversity following a mitigation hierarchy which is focused on avoiding ecological harm over minimising, rectifying, reducing and then off-setting. This approach accords with policy NH/4 which outlines a primary objective for biodiversity to be conserved or enhanced and provides for the protection of Protected Species, Priority Species and Priority Habitat.
- 10.108 The application has been accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment (Logika 2022). The site lies adjacent to the River Granta which is a County Wildlife Site. The site is also within the Impact Risk Zone of the Alder Carr SSSI but is not considered to have an impact on this as no abstraction for potable water is proposed and the discharge of surface water run off into the River Granta would be managed in a way that ensures water quality and rate of discharge is such that it would not change the condition of the river itself or the SSSI downstream.
- 10.109 The impact assessment has identified foraging and commuting bats, badgers, reptiles, and breeding birds, as potential constraints to works; however, with embedded mitigation these impacts can be positive. This will be through increased opportunities for roosting and foraging, and possible increase in semi-natural habitats if Biodiversity Net Gain is delivered either within the redline boundary or within the blue line boundary. A third option of delivery off site through a third-party provider would be unlikely to provide such benefits to species found within the development site. Further surveys will be required and submitted prior to or concurrently with first reserved matters, which will include reptile and badger surveys around the woodland to the northeast.
- 10.110 The Ecology Officer has reviewed the impact assessment and has stated that the information submitted is sufficient to show that there is no "in principle" reason that the application should be refused on ecological grounds. There is still a requirement for further surveys to be undertaken and submitted prior to or concurrently with the submission of first reserved matters. Conditions have been recommended in terms of a Construction

Ecological Management Plan, Lighting Design Strategy, and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.

- 10.111 In terms of biodiversity net gain, a Biodiversity Gain Information Report accompanied the application (Logika, 2022), with a supplementary update in March 2022. This has been assessed by the Ecology Officer and it has been agreed in line with the report that the development would incur a net loss of -1.70 habitat units. To achieve a biodiversity net gain of 10%, 7.03 habitat units would need to be provided. To achieve 20%, 12.36 habitat units would need to be provided.
- 10.112 To address this, the Biodiversity Gain Information Report suggests two potential options to provide suitable biodiversity net gain. These are:
- Enhance existing TWI landholdings within the estate; and/ or
 - Purchase the required units in the evolving BNG trading market.
- 10.113 The first option is to potentially enhance existing TWI landholdings within the estate. This would consist primarily of enhancements to a parcel of land of circa 0.7ha to the east of Abington Hall referred to as 'Plot 9'. The Biodiversity Gain Information Report identifies that this may be capable of providing a net uplift of 3.65 habitat units. In addition, as the reserved matters details relating to landscape are formed later, there may also be more opportunities within the red-line of the application site to enhance biodiversity further. This may not in of itself be sufficient to meet the minimum 10% requirement of 7.03 habitat units and so may need to be done in coordination with other potential options.
- 10.114 The other option available would be to purchase the required units on the commercial market. The Report does state though that this should only be pursued if the previous options are not viable or if not all the units could be gained through these options. It is likely that if this option had to be pursued, habitat units would be purchased at Lower Valley Farm. In the worst-case, whereby no biodiversity net gain could be secured on-site or partially or completely through the previous two options, 8.73 units would need to be purchased off site. The purchase of such units allows for habitat creation and accounts for all costs associated with infrastructure, physical creation, ongoing long-term management, and monitoring.
- 10.115 The Ecology Officer has not objected to this approach to delivering biodiversity net gain whereby it should be sought to be delivered on-site in the first instance, and then each of the two options are explored in turn until the minimum 10% is met. As the non on-site options described above are outside of the red-line of the application, appropriate wording is required

within the Section 106 to ensure that off-site enhancements are delivered if necessary.

- 10.116 The applicants have suitably addressed the matter of biodiversity, and subject to conditions and a legal agreement, the proposal is in accordance with Local Plan policy NH/4 and relevant national guidance.

Water Management and Flood Risk

- 10.117 Detailed hydraulic modelling provided by the EA shows that the Site is fully located within Flood Zone 1 (please refer to paragraph 2.6 above). There are isolated pockets of surface water flood risk ranging from low, medium and high in the centre of the site.
- 10.118 The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (Logika Group, December 2022). The Assessment concludes that, in line with national guidance, the proposed development is an appropriate proposed land use for this location.
- 10.119 The application has been subject to formal consultation with Anglian Water, the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority, with no objection raised to the proposed development, subject to conditions requiring details of surface water drainage.
- 10.120 The Lead Local Flood Authority confirm that the information submitted demonstrates that surface water from the proposed development can be managed through the use of geo-cellular infiltration tanks and an infiltration basin. Positive discharge from the basin will restrict the surface water discharge to 1 litre per second. The outline drainage strategy provided indicates that surface water runoff can be effectively managed through unlined based SUDs and discharge to the River Granta.
- 10.121 In consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority and other relevant technical consultees, officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition requiring a detailed design of the surface water drainage scheme for the site to ensure the development can be adequately drained and that there is no increase flood risk on or off site. The condition will include the requirement to provide details of maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system.
- 10.122 A condition requiring details of how additional surface water run-off from the site will be avoided during the construction phase is also considered necessary to ensure surface water is managed appropriately during construction.
- 10.123 In terms of foul water drainage, no objection has been raised by Anglian Water.

- 10.124 Officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition requiring the submission of a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage to reduce the risk of pollution to the water environment and to ensure a satisfactory method of foul water drainage for the site.
- 10.125 Subject to the recommended conditions, officers are satisfied that the proposal would accord with Policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 of the Local Plan which requires developments to have appropriate sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems and minimise flood risk.

Highway Network, Highway Safety and Parking

- 10.126 Policy HQ/1 states that proposals must provide safe and convenient access for all users and abilities to public buildings and spaces, including those with limited mobility or those with impairment such as sight or hearing.
- 10.127 Policy TI/2 requires developers to demonstrate adequate provision will be made to mitigate the likely impacts of the proposed development and, for larger developments, to demonstrate they have maximised opportunities for sustainable travel, and provided a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.
- 10.128 Para. 111 of the NPPF advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Highway Network

- 10.129 Vehicular access to Granta Park is provided from a five-arm roundabout to the west of the Park, which connects to the A11, A505 and local road network (Newmarket Road, Bourn Bridge Road and Pampisford Road). Pedestrian and cycle access to the site is also taken via the Granta Park roundabout. The TWI site has two egresses from the main Granta Park entrance. One is from the south by way of the spine road running east-west adjacent to the large surface level car park and near to the Astra Zeneca and Illumina Centre buildings. The other is from the north by way of a road which wraps around the lake.
- 10.130 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment (Vectos, December 2022), a Travel Plan (Vectos, December) and a Transport Assessment Addendum (Vectos, March 2023).
- 10.131 The Assessment and Addendum sets out baseline conditions, undertaking an analysis of the accessibility of the site and the means of travel available to access Granta Park, acknowledging that a site wide Travel Plan (2017-2022) has been prepared for Granta Park, seeking a reduction in single car occupancy to approximately 53%. Traffic modelling has also been

undertaken and various scenarios tested. The Transport Assessment Team agrees that the results of scenario no.3 are applicable whereby traffic flows at Granta Park are settling at circa 75% of pre-Covid levels. These trip rates indicate that across the AM peak (7am – 10am), the TWI site would generate just under 1,000 trips, with approximately 517 vehicles arriving between 8am and 9am.

- 10.132 In terms of the Granta Park entrance, the Transport Assessment Team have explained that one of the key concerns with all developments at Granta Park is to keep the queue length on the A505 slip road to within 400m so as to not cause any queue on the A505 itself. The AM two way entrance limit at the nodal point of the Granta Park entrance is 1,481 trips. The Transport Assessment has tested various scenarios, only one of which showed a slight breach of this entrance limit. All other scenarios demonstrated that the entrance limit wouldn't be breached and the Transport Assessment Team has therefore advised that it is reasonable to assume that there is a low probability that the entrance limit would be breached as a result of the proposed development.
- 10.133 The Transport Assessment Team is content that in terms of future forecasting at the year 2033 that the probability of slip road queuing and queue lengths to the site being problematic is very small. In addition, they point to future significant transport investment in the area in the form of the Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) Phase 1 as well as the future CSET Phase 2 high quality public transport corridor between Addenbrookes in Cambridge to a new transport hub at the A11 opposite Granta Park. The Linton Greenway works are also cited as a future form of sustainable transport infrastructure that will help reduce car trips.
- 10.134 The Transport Assessment Team has recommended contributions of £642,340 towards CSET Phases 1 and 2 or the Linton Greenway. Principally though, these contributions would be used for the improvement of the cycle route between High Street Babraham and Granta Park, including the upgrade of the PROW between Babraham High Street and Newmarket Road, an improved crossing over the A11m and a new cycle route along Newmarket Road. A trip budget of 517 vehicles arriving in the AM peak between 8 and 9am is also recommended to ensure that traffic flows are monitored. In the event these are breached, additional travel plan measures will be put in place to encourage fewer peak hour vehicles trips. These will be secured by way of a Section 106 Agreement. A travel plan condition is also recommended.

Highway Safety

- 10.135 The proposed development does not result in any alteration to the existing access to Granta Park, nor is any alteration required as a direct consequence of the proposal.

- 10.136 The proposals demonstrate that larger goods vehicles are capable of turning within the service yard area proposed. Where pedestrian/ cyclist movements traverse any internal roads, it has been demonstrated that given the nature of these internal roads there would not be a harmful threat to the safety of non-motorised users.
- 10.137 The Local Highways Authority raise no objection to the proposal, recommending a condition to secure a traffic management plan. Officers consider a construction traffic management plan condition reasonable as part of any consent in the interests of highway safety.
- 10.138 Subject to the recommended conditions the proposal would accord with Policies HQ/1 and TI/2 of the Local Plan.

Parking Provision

- 10.139 Policy TI/3 of the Local Plan sets out that car and cycle parking provision should be provided through a design-led approach in accordance with the indicative standards set out in Figure 11 of the Plan. For B1 business use car parking provision should be made at 1 space per 30sqm (for development over 2,500sqm) and 1 cycle parking space per 30sqm.
- 10.140 The site currently provides 1,114 spaces in total, although 277 of these are leased to others within Granta Park leaving 837 spaces within the red line boundary, which equates to one space per 43sqm. An additional 107 spaces are proposed, equating to a parking ratio for the additional spaces of one space per 200sqm for the additional development quantum. For the area within the red line boundary this results in a provision of 944 spaces for 63,997sqm, giving a ratio of one space per 68sqm.
- 10.141 Overall there would be a provision of 1,221 spaces for the site including the area outside of the red line for 71,000sqm, giving a parking ratio of one space per 58sqm.
- 10.142 The applicant has detailed how this relates to the anticipated number of staff within the site. This analysis shows that there could be approximately 2,218 being on TWI site at any one time, and 2,843 staff within the wider TWI site (including existing Riverside buildings), and assuming home working and leave. The level of parking to be provided is representative of the car driver mode share recorded for Granta Park in 2021. This is supported by the Transport Assessment Team.
- 10.143 Therefore, whilst the proposed parking levels are below the standards set out in Policy TI/3, the proposed car parking provision is reflective of the current car driver mode share at Granta Park. The travel plan condition and mitigation measures to the wider strategic transport infrastructure will also aid in further reducing car vehicle movements.

- 10.144 The proposal includes 10% active electric vehicle charging bays across the existing and proposed parking areas which equates to 122 electric vehicle charging spaces. A further 40% of spaces across the site would be passive electric vehicle charging spaces to be safeguarded for future conversion if demand warrants it.
- 10.145 Policy TI/3(3) of the Local Plan sets out that the Council will encourage innovative solutions to car parking, including incorporation of measures such as electric charging points. However, there is no set figure or minimum level of provision of charging points set out within the adopted Local Plan.
- 10.146 Therefore, notwithstanding the absence of a currently adopted standard, the proposed provision of the infrastructure for 122 electric vehicle charging points is considered to represent a positive and forward-thinking approach and considered acceptable in this instance. The number of electric vehicle charging points and associated infrastructure to be provided can be secured by condition, a condition which officers consider reasonable and necessary as part of any permission.
- 10.147 Disabled car parking will be provided at 5% of the total parking provision, equating to at least 61 spaces which accords with local parking standards. The transport assessment identifies that the majority of these spaces will be located within the surface parking areas south of Buildings B1, B2, B3 and the Riverside East parking area as per existing. 18no. new spaces are proposed along the proposed shared surface route drop-off route to the north of Buildings B4 and B5. In order to ensure that this quantum and layout is met, a prior to occupation condition is recommended to ensure that the layout of these are agreed prior to first occupation of the development.
- 10.148 Cycle parking on-site is currently limited to just two external areas, one adjacent to building B3 containing 18 Sheffield stands (36 spaces) and one adjacent to the Trevor Gooch building containing 3 Sheffield stands (6 spaces).
- 10.149 New cycle parking is to be provided for the existing buildings with 120 spaces. This is a large increase on the small amount of existing cycle parking for these buildings and will allow 19% of staff to cycle in the future. It is noted that these cycle stores will be secure and that there is also room to increase this provision should it be required. This will need to be monitored as part of the travel plan. It is pertinent to note that the latest Granta Park Travel Plan suggests an existing baseline of 13% cycle use and so the proposal would allow for an uplift compared to existing levels.
- 10.150 In addition to the above, the Transport Assessment Addendum confirms that although internal building layouts are not considered as part of this outline planning application, it would be feasible to accommodate around 180 cycle parking spaces for the new buildings internally across the three

new buildings. Facilities for showering, changing and lockers would also be provided. In order to secure this level of cycle parking, a prior to occupation condition has been recommended.

- 10.151 The quantum of cycle parking would provide an allowance for a 19% cycle mode share on the site which mirrors that which was accepted on the Site 1 building to the west. Overall, the number of cycle parking spaces is considered acceptable.
- 10.152 Subject to conditions for electric vehicle charging points, cycle parking, disabled car parking and a Travel Plan, the proposal is considered to accord with the objectives of Policy TI/3 of the Local Plan.

Noise

- 10.153 The application is supported by a Noise Assessment Report (Anderson Acoustics, December 2022). The main area of concern for this report in this regard is any additional buildings services plant. Details are not known at this stage, and so the main purpose of this noise assessment has been to establish the baseline sound conditions and determine suitable noise emission limits applicable to any new plant associated with the future operation of the Proposed Development.
- 10.154 The assessment found that the typical background existing sound levels across the site fell within the range of 37 – 42dB which is considered to be representative of the conditions typically near the site, such as the noise-sensitive receptors of the residential properties to the north and east. The Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (2020) states that the noise associated with the proposed development should be at least 5db below this background noise level.
- 10.155 The Noise Assessment considers that sound associated with plant can realistically be kept 5db below this background noise level although this will in part be based on the detailed design (reserved matters) stage. This is in part due to the extensive distance between neighbouring properties and the proposed development which would be around 200m away at the closest point. The Environmental Health Team is content that this can be dealt with by way of condition and this is recommended accordingly.
- 10.156 The assessment also considers other noise impacts such as increases in road traffic and coming and goings associated with the proposed decked car park to the north. Vehicle movements are only anticipated to represent a 1dB increase compared to existing and therefore this is acceptable. The loudest noise associated with the proposed decked car park would be the slamming of car doors but given the separation distance to any nearby receptors, this would only equate to a 30dB noise and is naturally a momentary noise only.

10.157 Subject to the recommended condition, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy SC/10 of the Local Plan.

Lighting

10.158 The application is supported by a Lighting Statement (Buro Happold, December 2022). The applicant has determined that the site falls within the E3 category for lighting and identifies a number of sensitive receptors, both human and habitat, to protect. The lighting report recognises the different type of lighting which is likely to be considered appropriate for this development.

10.159 The Environmental Health Team is content that the lighting strategy is acceptable in principle although further information in relation to lighting will need to be submitted with future reserved matters application. The Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan condition will require artificial lighting associated with the construction and demolition to be considered.

10.160 As noted above, in consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer, a condition requiring the submission of a lighting design strategy for biodiversity is to be attached as part of any consent. Such a condition would contribute towards ensuring that the proposed development does not give rise to adverse impact on the local amenity of the area or surrounding countryside, as well as restricting the addition of any further external lighting without formal agreement.

10.161 Subject to the recommended condition, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy SC/9 of the Local Plan.

Residential Amenity

10.162 The nearest residential curtilages are the properties to the north of the site on West Field in Little Abington. These are approximately 200m away from the application site. Given this separation distance, it is considered feasible that a development of the scale and size proposed under this outline application could reasonably be accommodated without having an adverse impact on the residential amenity of nearby properties in terms of loss of privacy, loss of light or overbearing impact. This would however require further assessment at the relevant reserved matters application stages where the detailed design will be assessed.

10.163 The proposal would accord with Policy HQ/1(n) of the Local Plan in respect of impact on residential amenity.

Contamination

- 10.164 The application is accompanied by a Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study (EPS, June 2022). The site has a potentially contaminative historical usage comprising use as a welding research and design institute. The submitted desk study has highlighted a number of plausible contaminant linkages and made recommendations for further investigation by way of intrusive investigation. The Contaminated Land Officer has reviewed this study and is content with the findings of it. They have recommended a contaminated land condition which has been recommended accordingly.
- 10.165 The Environment Agency has also been consulted and have considered the impacts of contamination on water resources. No objection has been raised in relation to these impacts.
- 10.166 Subject to the recommended conditions, officers are satisfied that the proposal would accord with Policy SC/11 of the Local Plan to ensure that contamination of the site is identified, and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety.

Developer Contributions

- 10.167 Policy TI/8 of the Local Plan states that planning permission will only be granted for proposals that have made suitable arrangements towards the provision of infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.
- 10.168 Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations states that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is –
- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - b) directly related to the development; and
 - c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 10.169 The Heads of Terms as identified are to be secured within a Section 106 Agreement and are set out in the summary table below:

Obligation	Contribution / Term	Trigger
Transport	£642,340	100% prior to occupation
Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy and/or BNG Credits	Biodiversity Net Gain Credits (dependent on amount of off-site BNG necessary)	100% prior to commencement

- 10.170 Cambridgeshire County Council's Transport Assessment Team has commented that having reviewed the relative impacts of the development on the surrounding area and the A1307 and A505 corridors, there is a need for Granta Park to be connected to the surrounding public transport and cycling infrastructure, to ensure that Granta Park can reduce its car driver mode share further.

- 10.171 The Transport Assessment Team has set out that a financial contribution is required as part of the proposed development. The contribution comprises £642,320 to the Cambridge South Eastern Transport (CSET) phases 1 and 2 or Linton Greenway, but principally to be used for the improvement of the cycle route between High Street Babraham and Granta Park, including the upgrade of the Public Right of Way and a cycle route along Newmarket Road.
- 10.172 As set out in the ecology section of this report, it may be necessary for the applicant to purchase Biodiversity Net Gain Credits in the event that on-site or Granta Park wide biodiversity net gain cannot be achieved and off-site biodiversity net gain is the only feasible option. The amount of credits necessary will be dependent on the outcomes of the biodiversity net gain strategy which the Section 106 Agreement will secure.
- 10.173 The contributions have been agreed by the applicant.
- 10.174 The contributions will ensure compliance with relevant planning policy and will be secured through a Section 106 Agreement attached to any consent for the development.
- 10.175 The planning obligations are necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the required planning obligation(s) passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and are in accordance with Policy TI/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018).

Third Party Representations

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

Third Party Comment	Officer Response
The Proposals Plan approved under S106 was in 8 parts (Parts 1-7 parts listed 13 September 1996 and Part 8 Schedule of Work to restore Abington Hall was added in the S106). The buildings now being offset against the floor area of the new development were to have been removed as part of the original Granta Park	The Section 106 Agreement was approved in an entirely different local and national planning policy. The benefits and material planning considerations of the proposal must be considered when determining applications in accordance with (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF (2023).

<p>outline approval (Schedule of Existing Buildings Part 6 of the Proposals Plan). The works required under the original S106 to benefit the site were not carried out. The proposal is to count them a second time and to redevelop closer to the house within the former restored landscape area, and with larger buildings than before.</p>	
<p>The proposal does not conform to the original masterplan or design guide for Granta Park.</p>	<p>Officers are unable to identify any masterplan and / or legal agreement(s) in the planning history for Granta Park that would result in direct conflict such that the application cannot be considered and determined by the Planning Committee.</p>
<p>The design guide states that any development on the TWI site should be for companies with the same aims as TWI and not speculative.</p> <p>This is a speculative development and not all the floorspace is needed by TWI.</p>	<p>The Design Guide for the Park is not referenced by policies of the adopted Local Plan, nor is it formally adopted as supplementary planning guidance. As a material planning consideration, it therefore carries very limited weight. Neither Local Plan Policies E/9 or E/15 require developments to have a named end user.</p>
<p>The original Section 106 should be enforced.</p> <p>The original C18 East-West tree avenue was to be restored under the original S106.</p>	<p>The enforcement of the original Section 106 Agreement is a matter for the Planning Compliance Team and should be raised with them accordingly.</p>
<p>The reduction in the curtilage listed wall does not comply with the 1990 Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act or the NPPG.</p>	<p>An assessment of the reduction in the curtilage listed wall has been completed in accordance with the relevant acts and policies. There is also an accompanying listed building consent application which has assessed this impact.</p>

<p>The future of the extent of the curtilage listed wall and gardeners cottage are not secured and would be vulnerable to next to the service and turning area.</p>	<p>The application seeks to retain these two listed structures other than the works expressed by the listed building consent. Any future proposals for these would require separate listed building consent(s). The service area is not considered to pose a threat to these curtilage listed structures.</p>
<p>Harm to views of Abington Hall from Little Abington Church. Submission has not properly considered the views considered by the Planning Inspector (Windfarm Appeal) and not fully considered the effect on the environment of lighting and opening up of what appears to have been a Council landfill site.</p> <p>Harm to setting of Abington Hall. Harm to rural setting of Little and great Abington due to physical height of buildings B4 and B5. The visual impact assessments submitted continue not to take into account the visual perspective of the proposed development from the viewpoint of the villages of Little Abington and Great Abington, therefore presenting only an incomplete assessment.</p>	<p>An assessment of the heritage impact and wider views has been carried out in the main body of this report. The views set out in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment are considered sufficient for officers to make an informed assessment.</p>
<p>The heights of other buildings on Granta Park should not be taken into account</p>	<p>The heights of other extant and completed developments in the surrounding context should be taken into account when considering any planning application.</p>

when considering this application.	
Noise and light pollution to residential properties in Little Abington.	Noise and Light Assessments have been conducted and subject to conditions the development is not considered to harm the amenity of neighbours.
Design of buildings more akin to a City Centre scheme not a village.	The design of the proposed development is considered acceptable for the reasons stated in the main body of this report.
Increase in traffic movements on rural villages.	The increase in traffic movements is not considered to have an adverse impact on the local road network and the Transport Assessment Team have raised no objection subject to conditions and mitigation.
Application should be considered along with ongoing developments and potential for future applications in this sensitive rural area.	The cumulative impact of approved and proposed developments has been taken into consideration in the relevant assessment sections of this report.
When considering this planning application what measures will be taken by SCDC Planning Department to ensure that any potential tenants do not impact further on the local environment in terms of the points raised above?	Appropriate conditions have been recommended which will need to be complied with irrespective of the future tenant unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.
The EIA consultation was launched during the peak summer holiday and the Parish Councils did not have sufficient time to comment.	The Local Planning Authority consulted the Parish Councils on the EIA Screening Opinion application as per the EIA Regulations (2017). The timing of submission cannot be controlled by the LPA and the LPA are obliged to determine within the statutory time frames.
Has the Abington Naturewatch Group been consulted?	Site and press notices were published and the group has had the opportunity to comment on the application.
The gaps between BBB, BB4 and B5 should be filled in with similar height buildings to existing, not new taller buildings.	The LPA has to assess and determine the application based on what has been submitted. The application as proposed is considered to provide a suitable design response to the site constraints and context.
Over recent years, the actions of TWI on	Access arrangements have evolved over the years as Granta Park has developed. TWI's

<p>Granta Park has prevented the villagers from benefitting from the Park at all - blocking most of the paths to the Park from the village. The original masterplan / proposals were supported by Gt. and Lt Abington on the basis that access to the park was allowed and welcomed. It is understood that security for some businesses is important but that should not mean the whole park is closed to villagers. The only villagers who are allowed are those who can afford to use the Health Club.</p> <p>Little benefit to local community.</p>	<p>primary duty is to ensure a safe and secure environment for employees, occupiers and visitors. TWI state that as a result unrestricted access is not reasonably permissible. Visitors are allowed access on a managed basis.</p> <p>Access is not something which is determined by TWI alone. BioMed, who jointly own and manage Granta Park with TWI, as well as the owners of the various parcels of land which about the Park, have a significant influence too. TWI are presently engaging with these landowners, along with representatives from the Parish Councils, to explore what opportunities might exist to extend the current access arrangements to address the concerns raised.</p> <p>A condition regarding a public access plan and strategy has been recommended to ensure a safe and secure R&D campus with clearly defined public and private areas and consider how outdoor spaces might be best accessed by local residents' as an amenity resource whilst respecting the needs of existing and future park users.</p>
<p>The run-off from the site into the river needs to be considered due to the biodiversity important of the river and the neighbouring Sluice Wood.</p>	<p>This has been considered by the relevant statutory consultees and subject to conditions the proposals are not considered to pose harm to biodiversity from surface water run off.</p>
<p>Developers should be required to focus their attention on enhancing and increasing biodiversity on the locality of Great and Little Abington and on their own site NOT to purchase a packet of land remote from the area just to tick a box, It makes sense to work with BioMed Realty if joint working</p>	<p>The approach to biodiversity net gain does seek to enhance biodiversity on-site at the first instance. The Environment Act (2021) and the Council's Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (2022) allow for off-site biodiversity net gain where on-site is not possible.</p>

would result in an enhanced approach to biodiversity gain and environmental strategies.	
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Planning Balance

- 10.177 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
- 10.178 As outlined in the relevant sections of this officer report above, the proposal is considered to result in less than substantial harm to the heritage assets of the Grade II* Listed Abington Hall, Grade II* Listed St Mary's Church and the Great and Little Abington Conservation Area. Some long-distance views of the proposal would also result in an increased visual prominence of the Science Park from the wider landscape. This is considered to detract from the visual quality of the landscape which is characterised by low scale dwellings and heritage assets associated with the Abingtons and overall verdant quality. However, these are isolated views and therefore, the level of harm in the context of the overall landscape is considered to be low. In addition, the loss of the TPO group of oak trees would detract from the visual quality of the landscape parkland setting of the site. These factors weigh against the scheme, although the less than substantial harm to heritage assets is considered to be outweighed by public benefits.
- 10.179 The proposed development would deliver a net increase of circa 21,315m² of research and development floorspace, to be used partly by TWI with remaining areas of floorspace to be occupied by other research and development provider(s). Although dependent on the final occupiers, the job density of this level of floorspace could reasonably accommodate 2,218 jobs, circa 1,500 additional jobs more than at present on the existing application site. The economic benefits of the proposal are considered to be afforded significant weight.
- 10.180 There would also be moderate benefits in the form of the sustainability performance of the new and refurbished buildings being BREEAM excellent, electric vehicle charging points and extensive levels of replacement tree planting across the site. Financial contributions towards local sustainable transport infrastructure are also moderate benefits of the proposal. Biodiversity net gain would also provide a low benefit.
- 10.181 In weighing the overall planning balance, it is considered that the benefits of development clearly outweigh the levels of harm identified.

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

Recommendation

10.183 **Approve** subject to:

- The planning conditions and informatives as set out below, with minor amendments to the conditions and informative as drafted delegated to officers.
- Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement as set out in the report, with minor amendments delegated to officers.

11.0 Planning Conditions

- 1 Application(s) for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of six years from the date of this permission. The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of six years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 3 As part of or prior to the determination of the first Reserved Matters applications, a Site-wide Phasing Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Site-wide Phasing Plan shall provide broad details of the intended phasing of development across the entire area; and be updated alongside any future reserved matters submissions in the event that an update is required. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Site-wide Phasing Plan, or any subsequent amended plan pursuant to this condition.

Reason: To ensure the development is delivered in a structured way and aid the discharge of conditions

- 4 Before any works on site commence within that phase, a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority, including details of timing of events, protective fencing and ground protection measures. This should comply with BS5837. The tree protection measures shall be installed in accordance with the approved tree protection strategy before any works commence on site. The tree protection measures shall remain in place throughout the construction period and may only be removed following completion of all construction works.

Reason: To protect trees which are to be retained in order to enhance the development, biodiversity and the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 5 No development, including preparatory works, shall commence within that phase until details of measures indicating how additional surface water run-off from the site will be avoided during the construction works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The applicant may be required to provide collection, balancing and/or settlement systems for these flows. The approved measures and systems shall be brought into operation before any works to create buildings or hard surfaces commence.

Reason: To ensure surface water is managed appropriately during the construction phase of the development, so as not to increase the flood risk to adjacent land/properties or occupied properties within the development itself; recognising that initial works to prepare the site could bring about unacceptable impacts in accordance with South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) Policy CC/9.

- 6 No development shall take place within that phase until:
- a) The application site has been subject to a detailed scheme for the investigation and recording of contamination and remediation objectives have been determined through risk assessment and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority; and
 - b) Detailed proposals for the removal, containment or otherwise rendering harmless any contamination (the Remediation method statement) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- c) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the works specified in any remediation method statement detailed in Condition b must be completed and a Verification report submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- d) If, during remediation or construction works, any additional or unexpected contamination is identified, then remediation proposals for this material should be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any works proceed and shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved.

Reason – To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land 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 SC/11 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 7 No demolition or construction works shall commence on site with regards to the respective phase until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The principal areas of concern that should be addressed are:

- a. Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted highway)
- b. Contractor parking, for both phases all such parking shall be within the curtilage of the site and not on the street.
- c. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted public highway.
- d. Control of dust, mud and debris, in relationship to the functioning of the adopted public highway.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) Policies HQ/1 and TI/2.

- 8 No development, including demolition, shall commence until a Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP) associated with the respective phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The DCEMP shall include the consideration of the following aspects of demolition and construction:

- a) Demolition, construction and phasing programme.
- b) Contractors' access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel including the location of construction traffic routes to, from and within the site, details of their signing, monitoring and enforcement measures.
- c) Construction / Demolition hours which shall be carried out between 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless in accordance with agreed emergency procedures for deviation.
- d) Delivery times and collections / dispatches for construction / demolition purposes shall be carried out between 0800 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, Bank of Public Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- e) Soil Management Strategy having particular regard to potential contaminated land and the reuse and recycling of soil on site, the importation and storage of soil and materials including audit trails.

- f) Noise impact assessment methodology, mitigation measures, noise monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites.
- g) Vibration impact assessment methodology, mitigation measures, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-2:2009+A1:2014 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Details of any piling construction methods / options, as appropriate.
- h) Dust mitigation, management / monitoring and wheel washing measures in accordance with the provisions of Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition – Greater Cambridge supplementary planning guidance 2020.
- i) Use of concrete crushers.
- j) Prohibition of the burning of waste on site during demolition / construction.
- k) Site artificial lighting including hours of operation, position and impact on neighbouring properties.
- l) Drainage control measures including the use of settling tanks, oil interceptors and bunds.
- m) Screening and hoarding details.
- n) Access and protection arrangements around the site for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.
- o) Procedures for interference with public highways, including permanent and temporary realignment, diversions and road closures.
- p) External safety and information signing and notices.
- q) Implementation of a Stakeholder Engagement / Residents Communication Plan, Complaints procedures, including complaints response procedures; and
- r) Membership of the Considerate Contractors Scheme.

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved DCEMP.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties in accordance with Policy CC/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 9 Prior to the commencement of development above ground level within that phase, a scheme of ecology enhancement shall be supplied to the local planning authority for its written approval. The scheme must include details of bat and bird box installation, hedgehog connectivity, and other enhancements as applicable and in line with the Greater Cambridge Planning Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (2022). The approved scheme shall be fully implemented within an agreed timescale unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: To conserve and enhance ecological interests in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and the Greater Cambridge Planning Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (2022).

10 No laying of services, creation of hard surfaces or erection of a building shall commence within that phase until a detailed design of the surface water drainage of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Those elements of the surface water drainage system not adopted by a statutory undertaker shall thereafter be maintained and managed in accordance with the approved management and maintenance plan. The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy for TWI prepared by Logika Noise Air Quality Consultants dated 14 December 2022 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, attenuation and flow control measures, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers, designed to accord with the CIRIA C753 SuDS Manual (or any equivalent guidance that may supersede or replace it);
- d) Full detail on SuDS proposals (including location, type, size, depths, side slopes and cross sections);
- e) Site Investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates;
- f) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants;
- g) Demonstration that the surface water drainage of the site is in accordance with DEFRA nonstatutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems;
- h) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
- i) Permissions to connect to a receiving watercourse or sewer;
- j) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development and to ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage can be incorporated into the development, noting that initial preparatory and/or construction works may compromise the ability to mitigate harmful impacts in accordance with South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) Policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9.

11 Within any reserved matters application pursuant to this approval, details of any biodiverse (green, blue or brown) roof(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any superstructure works commencing on site.

Details of the green biodiverse roof(s) shall include means of access for maintenance, plans and sections showing the make-up of the sub-base to be used and include the following:

- a) Roofs can/will be biodiverse based with extensive substrate varying in depth from between 80-150mm,
- b) Planted/seeded with an agreed mix of species within the first planting season following the practical completion of the building works (the seed mix shall be focused on wildflower planting indigenous to the local area and shall contain no more than a maximum of 25% sedum (green roofs only),
- c) The biodiverse (green) roof shall not be used as an amenity or sitting out space of any kind whatsoever and shall only be used in the case of essential maintenance or repair, or escape in case of emergency,
- d) Where solar panels are proposed, biosolar roofs should be incorporated under and in between the panels. An array layout will be required incorporating a minimum of 0.75m between rows of panels for access and to ensure establishment of vegetation,
- e) A management/maintenance plan approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority,

All works shall be carried out and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To ensure proposals are in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 12 Prior to commencement of development with regards to the respective phase of development, a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEcMP shall include the following:
- A) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
 - B) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
 - C) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
 - D) The location and timings of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features
 - E) The times during which construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
 - F) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
 - G) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
 - H) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs if applicable.

The approved CEcMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that before any development commences appropriate construction ecological management plan has been agreed to fully conserve and enhance ecological interests in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 13 A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority prior to commencement of development of that phase. The content of the LEMP shall include the following.
- a. Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
 - b. Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
 - c. Aims and objectives of management.
 - d. Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
 - e. Prescriptions for management actions.
 - f. Prescription of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).
 - g. Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan.
 - h. Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results form monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.

The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that before any development commences an appropriate landscape and ecological management plan has been agreed in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 14 Prior to commencement of development of above ground works associated with the northern decked car park only, a “lighting design strategy for biodiversity” features or areas to be lit shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall:
- a) Identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites

and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and

b) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specification) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect bats in accordance with Policy NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 15 No occupation of the development hereby permitted shall commence until a Travel Plan for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify: the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking how the provisions of the Plan will be monitored for compliance and confirmed with the Local Planning Authority The Travel Plan shall be implemented and monitored as approved upon the occupation of the development.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site in accordance with Policy TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 16 Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of the provision and location of fire hydrants to serve the development to a standard recommended by the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the approved scheme has been implemented.

Reason: To ensure an adequate water supply is available for emergency use in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 17 The development or respective phase of development, hereby permitted, shall not be used or occupied until energy and carbon reduction measures have been implemented in accordance with the Energy & Sustainability Statement (Dec 22) for that phase. This shall demonstrate that all new buildings shall achieve reductions in CO2 emissions of 10% below the Target Emission Rate of the 2021 edition of Part L of the Building

Regulations via the use and onsite renewable or low zero carbon technology, and shall include the following details:

- a) Levels of carbon reduction achieved at each stage of the energy hierarchy;
- b) A summary table showing the percentage improvement in Dwelling Emission Rate over the Target Emission Rate for each proposed building;
- c) A schedule of proposed on-site renewable energy technologies, their location, design, and a maintenance programme; and
- d) In relation to potential installation of ground source heat pumps, a layout plan for any ground works required for heat pump installation showing the location of works in relation to haul routes, trees and tree root protection zones to comply with BS 5837:2012 : Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction.

Where grid capacity issues subsequently arise, written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and a revised Energy & Sustainability Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The revised Statement shall be implemented and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with Policy CC/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

- 18 No operational plant, machinery or equipment shall be installed until a noise assessment and any noise insulation / mitigation as required has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority for that phase. Any required noise insulation / mitigation shall be carried out as approved and retained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and S/10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 19 All future reserved matters applications for the appearance, layout and scale of the development shall be accompanied by a BREEAM pre-assessment prepared by an accredited BREEAM Assessor, indicating that each building is capable of achieving the applicable excellent rating as a minimum, with a minimum 2 credits achieved for Wat 01.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction in accordance with Policy CC/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

20. *As part of the first Reserved Matters submission, a public access plan in association with the approved outline application 22/05549/OUT shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include a review of the public access strategy as part of the scheme design to ensure a safe and secure campus with clearly defined public and private areas and consider how outdoor spaces might be best accessed by local residents' as an amenity resource whilst respecting the needs of existing and future park users with the view to create a place that is safe, inclusive and accessible and which promotes health and well-being. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved public access plan and retained thereafter.*

Reason: To ensure that a permeable development with ease of movement and clearly defined private and public routes is delivered in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018).

Background Papers:

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework SPDs