

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

10<sup>th</sup> January 2007

**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

---

### **S/2039/06/F - SWAVESEY**

**Erection of 19 Terraced and One Single B1( C ), B2 and B8 Units (20 Total) with Ancillary Offices, Service Yards, Ancillary Car Parking and Landscaping and the Erection of 6 Terraced B1 (A) Office Units with Ancillary Car Parking and Landscaping at Buckingham Business Park**

**Recommendation: Delegated Approval**

**Date for Determination: 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2007 (Major Application)**

#### **Notes:**

**This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the comments of the neighbouring Boxworth Parish Council do not accord with the officer recommendation and the application is a departure from the Development Plan.**

#### **Departure Application**

##### **Site and Proposal**

1. This 3.3ha site lies adjacent, and to the north of, the A14 to the south of Swavesey village in the open countryside and forms part of a larger site known as Buckingham Business Park. It has no direct access from the A14 and is largely featureless and flat sitting approximately 2m below the level of the road.
2. The full planning application, received 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2006, proposes a speculative development involving the erection of a mixture of offices, light industrial, industrial and storage/distribution buildings totalling approximately 11,800m<sup>2</sup> of gross external floorspace made up of 3,228m<sup>2</sup> of offices, 4,674m<sup>2</sup> of light industrial and industrial and 3,116m<sup>2</sup> of storage/distribution.
3. Building heights range from 8.6m for units 16-24 (adjacent the A14) to 8.6m and 9.2m for units 1-4 and 5-6 respectively on the western boundary and 8.4m for units 11-14 on the eastern boundary together with 9.6m for units A and F (E-F also on eastern boundary) to 10.6m for the larger unit 15 located more centrally within the site.
4. The application was amended on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2006 to correct the numbering of units and to provide plans for units A-F that were omitted from the initial submission.

##### **Planning History**

5. The site has a long planning history. Of particular relevance to the proposal is the following:
6. In March 1996 Outline planning permission was granted for the Buckingham Business Park (ref. **S/1793/95/O**) and a significant proportion of the site has now been

developed. The remaining portion is that land that lies immediately to the north of the A14 of which the application site is approximately the western half.

7. Since the granting of the Outline permission, it has been renewed periodically with the most recent in January 2005 for a period of 5 years (planning ref. **S/1268/04/F**).
8. A condition of this planning permission required a safeguarding strip of 100m from the centre of the Trunk Road to be kept free of hard development due to possible need for the land for proposed improvements to the A14. The Highways Agency has since confirmed that this safeguarding strip is no longer required.
9. In July 2006 an application reference S/1337/06/F was submitted for 23 units on the same site. This was withdrawn following a consideration by officers that the scheme was too dense, there was insufficient parking space available and the Highways Agency had a holding objection. Four of the units have been removed in the current application.
10. The current application is made on part of the 100m strip and is therefore 'Full' rather than 'Reserved Matters' as it would not be possible for the developer to comply with all of the conditions on the Outline Planning Permission.
11. The Outline Planning Permission also limits the amount of floorspace on the overall site to:  
32,515m<sup>2</sup> in total with no more than 8,128m<sup>2</sup> of Classes B2 or B8 development (industrial or storage/distribution).

### **Planning Policy**

12. **Policy P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (the Structure Plan) – 'Environmental Restrictions on Development' states that development will be restricted in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
13. **Policy P1/3** of the Structure Plan – 'Sustainable Design in Built Development' states (in part):

A high standard of design and sustainability for all new development will be required which:

1. Minimises the need to travel and reduces car dependency by providing:
  - (a) An appropriate mix of land uses and accessible services and facilities;
  - (b) Good access by public transport;
  - (c) Managed access for the private car and other motor vehicles.
2. Provides a sense of place which:
  - (a) Responds to the local character of the built environment;
  - (b) Is integrated with adjoining landscapes;
  - (c) Creates distinctive skylines, focal points, and landmarks;

- (d) Includes variety and surprise within a unified design;
- (e) Includes streets, squares and other public spaces with a defined sense of enclosure;
- (f) Includes attractive green spaces and corridors for recreation and biodiversity;
- (g) Conserves important environmental assets of the site;
- (h) Pays attention to the detail of forms, massing, textures, colours and landscaping.

14. **Policy P2/1** of the Structure Plan - 'Employment Strategy' states:

"The economic growth of the Plan area will be supported:

1. In the Cambridge Sub-Region by:
  - (a) Encouraging the continued expansion of high technology and knowledge-based industry;
  - (b) Securing investment in new infrastructure needed to relieve obstacles to growth using existing land allocations and making new allocations where appropriate.
2. The selective management of employment which does not need to be located in or close to Cambridge (see **Policy P9/7**); in Peterborough and North Cambridgeshire by:
  - (a) Securing investment in physical infrastructure and supporting social, environmental and community initiatives which will assist economic regeneration.
3. Taking full advantage of the range of existing land allocations and vacant or under-used sites in the area; in both areas by:
  - (a) Encouraging a wider range of business and industrial development;
  - (b) Developing the skills of the labour force in line with the needs of the economy;
  - (c) Enabling the diversification of the rural economy (see Policy P2/6)."

15. **Policy P2/2** of the Structure Plan – 'General Location of Employment' states:

1. Where there is a need for new land allocations for employment, provision will be mainly concentrated in Cambridge, in Peterborough, in market towns and in Rural Centres where this could help reduce out commuting and also on the strategic sites identified in **Policy P2/3**.
4. Local Plans will review existing employment allocations and allocate a range of sites for the continued growth of employment and to broaden the local economy. Development will be located in line with the objectives of **Policy P1/1** so as to:

- (a) Work towards a balance of jobs and housing;
- (b) Maintain a range of types and sizes of premises for business requirements;
- (c) Encourage a range of employment opportunities for local people;
- (d) Reduce the need to travel, particularly by private car;
- (e) Enable the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling for work-related journeys;
- (f) Maximise the use of previously developed land and buildings;
- (g) Support rural services and facilities (see **Policy P3/4**).

16. **Policy P2/5** of the Structure Plan - Distribution, Warehousing and Manufacturing states:

Distribution, warehousing and manufacturing activities which generate large volumes of freight movement will only be located on sites with good access to rail freight facilities, and to motorways, trunk or other primary routes (see also **Policy P8/11**). Distribution and warehousing facilities will not be permitted within or close to Cambridge (see **Policy P9/7**).

17. **Policy P2/6** of the Structure Plan – ‘Rural Economy’ states:

Sensitive small-scale employment development in rural areas will be facilitated where it contributes to one or more of the following objectives:

1. Helping to achieve a balance of employment with the type and quantity of local housing;
2. Supporting new and existing business and research and technology clusters (see **Policy P2/4**);
3. Providing opportunities for home working, or making good use of new information and communication technologies;
4. Enabling farm or rural diversification where appropriate to the local area, including appropriate rural tourism (see **Policies P4/1 and P4/2**);
5. Enabling the re-use of existing buildings;
6. Enabling the re-use of vacant, derelict or under-used land within villages;
7. Helping to maintain or renew the vitality of rural areas;
8. Employment allocations in local plans for rural areas will be predominantly located in Rural Centres (see **Policy P1/1**).

18. **Policy P9/7** of the Structure Plan - Selective Management of Employment Development states:

“Employment land in and close to Cambridge will be reserved for development which can demonstrate a clear need to be located in the area in order to serve local requirements or contribute to the continuing success of the Sub-Region as a centre of high technology and research. Development proposals must demonstrate that they fall into one or more of the following categories:

- a) High technology and related industries and services concerned primarily with research and development including development of D1 educational uses and associated sui generis research institutes, which can show a special need to be located close to the Universities or other established research facilities or associated services in the Cambridge area;
- b) Other small-scale industries which would contribute to a greater range of local employment opportunities, especially where this takes advantage of, or contributes to the development of, particular locally based skills and expertise;
- c) The provision of office or other development providing an essential service for Cambridge as a local or Sub-Regional centre.

19. **Paragraph 5.2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (the Local Plan) refers to the Buckingway Business Park as a purpose built park.
20. **Paragraph 5.4** of the Local Plan states (in part) that New research employment development is primarily to be accommodated in the northern areas of the district including the expansion of the Cambridge Science Park, employment allocations at Landbeach, Swavesey and at Cambourne west of Cambridge. Through these sites and others identified in the Plan, together with unimplemented employment commitments, it is anticipated that this will provide for 14,000 jobs to the year 2006.
21. The application site is not allocated in the Local Plan but as stated above has an element of unimplemented employment commitment through the extant Outline planning permission.
22. **Policy EM3** of the Local Plan states (in part) that development within Class B1 will only be permitted if it is subject to a condition, or Section 106 Agreement, for a period of 10 years from the first date of occupation, which limits offices over 300m<sup>2</sup> to the provision of a local or sub-regional service or administrative facility principally for persons resident or organisations situated in the Cambridge Area excluding national or regional headquarters offices or light industry to a maximum of 1,850m<sup>2</sup> of floorspace; large scale expansion of such firms will not be permitted.
23. **Policy EN1** of the Local Plan states: “Relevant parts of the Landscape Character Areas of England are defined on the Proposals Map. In all its planning decisions the District Council will seek to ensure that the local character and distinctiveness of these areas is respected, retained and wherever possible enhanced. While recognising that landscape is a dynamic concept, planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an adverse effect on the character and local distinctiveness of these areas.”
24. **Policy ET/4** of the Local Development Framework Development Plan Document Submission Draft January 2006 – Development in Established Employment Areas in the Countryside states:

1. In defined Established Employment Areas in the Countryside, redevelopment of existing buildings, and appropriate development for employment use may be permitted.
2. The following Established Employment Areas in the Countryside are defined on the Proposals Map: Buckingway Business Park.
3. Permission will be refused where there would be a negative impact on surrounding countryside, or landscape character area. Developments will be subject to other policies in the plan, in particular **Policy ET/6** on the Expansion of Existing Firms.

5.10 New employment development outside village frameworks will not generally be permitted. This is to protect the countryside from unnecessary development, which can be visually intrusive, but also lead to unsustainable patterns of development. However, South Cambridgeshire contains a number of Established Employment Areas in the Countryside, which are identified on the Proposals Map. The policy provides a context for considering planning applications on these sites.

5.11 Within these areas, appropriate development and redevelopment will be permitted, subject to consideration of land supply across the district, and other policy concerns. This will enable more efficient use of the sites, and allow them to be adapted for the needs of existing and future users.

5.12 The sites identified are outside village frameworks, and not in the Green Belt. Employment sites created from the conversion of agricultural buildings have not been included, as these were permitted through specific policies, and are not intended for extension.

## **Consultation**

25. **Swavesey Parish Council** has made no recommendation. It states:

“The comments made with regard to the previous application (ref S/1337/06) still remain valid for this current application. In particular the Parish Council wishes to comment on:

1. The Council would like to see financial provision made for the funding of a safer route for cyclists/pedestrians along Buckingway Business Park, in support of the green transport plan included.
2. Also the Council is against the increased use of B8 land use on the site. This type of activity generates increased traffic to and from the site.
3. The Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss the further development of the Business Park directly with the applicants and the Planning Authority.

26. **Boxworth Parish Council** has recommended refusal. It states:

“The Planning Committee continue to feel that although some extra development on this site is inevitable the extra traffic on this already busy junction is unacceptable until improvements are made to the A14”.

### **Chief Environmental Health Officer**

27. No objections subject to conditions to require the submission of details of the location and type of any power driven plant or equipment and to an informative stating that new legislation is proposed on smoke free premises and vehicles and that SCDC is keen to promote smoke free public places in accordance with the proposals and that the implications of this should be considered as part of the development.

### **Chief Engineer - Middle Level Commissioners**

28. State that the site is outside the Board's area and should have no direct effect on the Board's system but the commissioners are concerned that surface water from the development will discharge into the upstream tributaries of Swavesey Drain – previously the Environment Agency has indicated that this watercourse is close to capacity during high rainfall events and any additional unregulated discharges could exacerbate flooding in the Board's area due to overtopping of the adjacent flood defence embankments.
29. The Board has not had sight of the Flood Risk Assessment and therefore objects to the proposal until adequate information has been approved.

### **30. Landscape and Design Officer**

1. "We accept the principle of the reforming of the bund with 2m high crib wall. This will raise the level of the soil so that it is closer to horizontal and improve the likelihood of good tree establishment.
2. This is based on a number of requirements:
  - (a) Any trees removed in the process are replaced at equivalent or larger size.
  - (b) Planting mix should consist of standards, multi-stems and whips to ensure both an instant screen and ongoing growth, all plants must be of high quality.
  - (c) No Populus species in the mix.
  - (d) Due to the previous poor establishment of planting and the very harsh conditions both of wind and salt etc. from the road, the soil must be of the highest quality and the planting must be undertaken professionally. Maintenance must include a regular regime which is more often and of a higher standard than would normally be required, to ensure good establishment.
3. If there is any likelihood at all that planning permission will be granted for the second area, then it is acceptable and more sensible to continue the reformatting and planting regime across the entire site. As it will then become more established for screening the new development. If however, further permission is not likely, then reformatting of the bund should finish at the edge of the development and a 10m band of trees should be planted on the inside of the bund (opposite side to the A14). To help screen the development.
4. I think it is important to remember that we have lost a 20m tree belt along the whole length of the site plus an established hedge across the width of the site. Whilst the hedge line in the middle of the area could be considered a replacement for the hedge and the reforming of the bund with planting

ensures status quo for this area, none of the new landscaping scheme replaces the lost tree belt.”

#### **Trees Officer**

31. Noted that all trees have been removed from the site but has no objections to the proposal.

#### **Police Architectural Liaison Officer**

32. The removal of the units to the south west of units A-F enhances natural surveillance into the site from Anderson Road. If the site is not to be operated constantly throughout day and night and at weekends it may be advisable to incorporate speed reduction measures to prevent the site becoming attractive to youths in motor vehicles.

There should be lighting throughout the site provided by means of column mounted white down lighters to BS 5489:1996 Code of practice for outdoor lighting to include roads, footpaths and car parking areas.

Care should be taken to ensure that planting does not impede natural or formal surveillance (such as CCTV or patrolling). Planting should not provide potential hiding places and low growing thorny species would generally be recommended.

Given the relative remoteness of the area and its close proximity to the A14 consideration should be given to the provision of CCTV on the site with boundary treatment of fences sufficiently high and robust to deter unauthorised pedestrian access. 2.2m high weldmesh might be the minimum standard required.”

#### **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service**

33. Asks that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants by way of a condition or S106 agreement.

#### **Highways Agency**

34. No objections subject to the applicants agreeing to fund the provision of ‘Keep Clear’ road markings on the Cambridge Services/Trinity Foot roundabout, adjacent to the A14 westbound off-slip approach. This would be subject to agreement from Cambridgeshire County Council, as Local Highway Authority.

#### **Environment Agency**

35. States that the Council is expected to respond on behalf of the agency in respect of flood risk and surface water drainage related issues.

#### **36. Drainage Manager**

“1. The Flood Risk Assessment for the scheme is acceptable. Application should have surface water drainage condition that refers to a detailed scheme for disposal of surface water to be approved by Council’s Drainage Manager.

2. Bylaws  
(a) No buildings, fencing, planting or other obstructions will be allowed within 5 metres of the top of the bank of the adjacent award drain.



Additionally, access for the Council's plant will be required at all times in the future.

- (b) The developers' proposals will necessitate higher levels of expenditure along the award drain due to the increased maintenance requirements associated with a developer site. A suitable maintenance contribution will therefore be required to cover this cost increase to the Council".

### **Council's Ecology Officer**

37. "My comments from August do not appear to have been taken on board by the applicant.

I had previously raised concerns about the potential for impact on the adjacent ditch; are water voles present? In the absence of any surveys the buildings must not be allowed to be within 5m (preferably 10m) of the ditch in order to limit the amount of shading that would otherwise occur.

No habitat enhancements have been proposed. Two opportunities present themselves; to sensitively re-profile or deepen parts of the ditch in order to retain some ponded areas of water, and/or to manage the balancing pond that is just off of the site and is presently choked up with plants.

This application does not meet with the aims of PPS9 as such it currently causes me concern and more benefits for biodiversity should be negotiated.

I would not object if the following can be secured:  
Conditions must be used to secure a scheme of ecological enhancement (including nest box provision upon the buildings). Negotiations should be had regarding the management of the balancing pond."

### **Council's Chief Building Control Officer**

38. "Site generally in area of no substantial flood risk however developers proposing to put in attenuation to green field rates and appears satisfactory if this is achieved – subject to suitable details".

### **Local Highways Authority**

39. Comments are awaited

### **Anglian Water**

40. Comments are awaited

### **Waste Minimisation Officer**

41. "The refuse storage as shown is not suitable. In practice each unit will require its own container and therefore storage area, which may or may not be within the building. Access from storage areas must be via ramps i.e. no steps or kerbs. Storage areas should not be sited on road junction as per unit 6".

### **Representations**

42. None

## Planning Comments – Key Issues

43. The key issues are:

Location and Sustainability  
Mix of uses  
Traffic generation and highway safety  
Visual impact – design and landscaping  
Drainage and flood risk

44. The application is a departure from the Development Plan in that the proposal is for new buildings in the open countryside that are not essential for any recognised rural uses. However, material to the consideration of this proposal is the extant Outline Planning Permission for the site, renewed on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2005 for a period of 5 years (see details above).

### **Mix**

45. The proposed floor area is within the upper limit, expressed in the Outline permission, in terms of the overall limit of 32,515m<sup>2</sup> gross floorspace. Existing floorspace on the business park totals approximately 18,133m<sup>2</sup>, the proposed is 11,800m<sup>2</sup> which would leave a remainder of 2,582m<sup>2</sup> if permission were granted.
46. The existing B2/B8 floorspace is approximately 7,707m<sup>2</sup> leaving a remainder available, under the Outline permission, of 421m<sup>2</sup>. The proposal would, if approved, result in a significant increase in this type of use (this cannot be calculated precisely as the application does not differentiate between B1(c) and B2 (light industrial/industrial)). The reason for this limit in the Outline permission was given as: “To accord with Policy E3 of the Approved South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 1993).
47. Policy E3 of the, now superseded, Local Plan 1993 allocated this site for B1 (offices and light industrial) employment uses only. The reason for this was given in the text to the policy:
48. “The emphasis in the Cambridge Sub-Area will be on high technology research and development and related industries which will be predominantly within the Business Class (B1) of the Use Classes Order. General industry and warehousing would be out of scale and character with many of the villages of South Cambridgeshire where, in some cases, modern farms are causing problems of noise, smell and other disturbance. However, such employment may be acceptable on a small scale, away from villages, by the conversion of redundant agricultural buildings (policy E10).

General industrial use may be more appropriate in that part of the District within the Ouse Valley Sub-Area where employment and other policies are less restrictive. This applies to the Local Plan proposals to extend the existing industrial areas at Gamlingay and Over, which are located well away from residential areas. However, other than for the re-location of Barwell International and its tenants from Swavesey village on adjoining land, the employment allocation at Swavesey, beside the A14, is unsuitable for general industry as a high standard of design and landscaping will be required on this important approach to the Cambridge area. This will also help to diversify the employment base of the Ouse Valley Sub-Area through the introduction of high technology firms “*spinning out*” from Cambridge”.

The emphasis here was on the need for a high standard of design and landscaping. These matters are dealt with below.

### ***Location and sustainability***

49. The principle of the further development of this site for employment uses is accepted through the granting of the Outline permission. With this principle is also the consideration of the location of this substantial business park in this rural location, sustainability of the Buckingham site to accommodate this type of development and the additional burden of traffic on the road network.
50. The application is made in Full and involves significantly greater B2/B8 uses than already approved. Hence the Council can revisit all of these issues but I am mindful that the Outline Planning Permission has been renewed relatively recently and that the Policy context is unchanged since that time save for the advancement of the Local Development Framework which does not significantly alter Policies in the Local Plan 2004. In addition the Highways Agency has confirmed that it has no objections. I therefore consider the proposal to be acceptable in terms of impact on traffic generation and I do not consider the greater proportion of B2/B8 uses to be any less sustainable than B1 and indeed Policy E3 of the 1993 Local Plan was only concerned with the quality of design and landscaping that these uses may not satisfy.
51. Development of this site as proposed would leave more land available to the east for a future proposal and indeed the road layout provides for access to this land at a future date.
52. A Reserved Matters application could be submitted on the original land available for development under the Outline permission i.e. excluding the 100m strip adj A14. However, the developers clearly have in mind a more 'efficient' use of the site by utilising the 100m strip now that it is no longer required for the A14 improvements. If approved, this proposal could open up more of the original Outline site than envisaged at the time of granting Outline permission and could lead to a significant increase in the size of this business park in this relatively remote location. However, the Council will have the opportunity to consider such a proposal if and when submitted and this current application should be considered on its merits.
53. Having considered that the proposal is acceptable in principle it falls to the detail.
54. I have two principal concerns, the density of the development and the visual impact including the design and landscaping.

### ***Density***

55. The reason for the upper limit on floorspace in the Outline Permission was given as: "To ensure that the density of development provides sufficient space about the buildings for landscaping to assimilate the development within the open countryside".
56. Development of the land that could go ahead under the Outline Permission (excluding the 100m strip) would be likely to result in a less dense development (using the permitted floorspace limits). I am concerned that this current proposal is more dense and would be more typical of an urban context. However, the developers have omitted four units from the original scheme to help address this (and the need for additional parking space) and on balance I consider it is how the site is perceived in its context that is important. To this end the important factors are, in order of

importance, the views into the site from the A14, from the existing estate road and from within the site itself.

### ***Visual Impact – design and landscaping***

57. The application is accompanied by a design and access statement. The design of the units is informed by the existing units on the business park which are predominantly brick and steel clad buildings with concrete service yards and block paving car parking areas. I consider the design to be largely in keeping with the existing buildings on the park and acceptable in this regard.
58. I am concerned that the buildings that are proposed to run alongside the A14, that are approximately 8.6m tall, will not be adequately screened with a bund of only 20m in depth from the A14 and that these will have a significant visual impact on this rural location. I have asked the developer to move these buildings back within the site or to locate them to the east of the site. However the developer is adamant that this is not possible. I have therefore asked the Landscape Design Officer to consider if appropriate measures could be taken to ensure the buildings can be adequately screened.
59. Following much discussion the developer has agreed to reduce the height of these buildings by approximately 1.5m (a combination of reducing their height and lowering the ground level), re-profile the bank, insert a 2m high retaining wall and plant mature trees. As referred to above this will satisfy the Landscape Design Officer but I am concerned that such measures are outside normal requirements and I would like to be sure that all landscaping details are agreed prior to issuing the permission should Members be minded to grant consent. I am hopeful that a full landscape scheme can be submitted soon and Members will be updated at the Meeting.
60. With regard to the impact on existing estate roads, through negotiation more green space on the northern side of the development has been negotiated than in previous schemes and I consider this to be adequate to assimilate the development into the visual context of the business park.
61. As referred to above, four units have been removed from the original scheme and whilst the development remains high density there are green spaces within it that will help to break up the hard appearance of the buildings.

### ***Highway safety***

62. With regard to Highway Safety I note that the Highways Agency has no objections. I have not received the comments of the Local Highways Authority and I do not anticipate any significant highway safety issues but Members will be updated at the meeting.

### ***Award Drain***

63. An award drain runs along the western flank of the site. It will be necessary for a 5m unplanted strip to be secured for maintenance of this drain. I have asked the developer to reposition the buildings on the western edge of the site further east to achieve this and for the proposed landscaping along the western boundary to be omitted. In addition this is required by the Council's Ecology Officer (see above comments) Members will be updated on this issue at the meeting.

### ***Flood Risk***

64. I am mindful of the comments of the Drainage Manager and the Chief Building Control Officer. I do not therefore consider the proposal represents a significant threat to flood risk provided appropriate controls are in place.
65. The maintenance contribution required from the developer referred to by the Council's Drainage Manager can be secured through bylaws and does not warrant a S106 agreement.

### ***Ecology***

66. I note the comments of the Council's Ecology Officer in relation to the need for a 5m strip adjacent to the ditch on the western boundary. As indicated above this is currently being negotiated and Members will be updated at the meeting.
67. With regard to the maintenance of the balancing pond off-site (to the north west) I agree that this would be desirable. However, as the balancing pond is not proposed to be utilised as a method of surface water control and it is not within the ownership or control of the applicants, I consider this is a matter to negotiate with the applicants but not to require unless its management does prove critical to the management of surface water on this site. Members will be updated at the meeting.

### ***Car Parking***

68. The application states that 232 parking spaces are provided broken down as follows:  
108 for 3,228m<sup>2</sup> of B1 at 1 space per 30m<sup>2</sup>  
93 for 4,674m<sup>2</sup> of B1c/B2 at 1 space per 50m<sup>2</sup>  
31 for 3,116 of B8 at 1 space per 100m<sup>2</sup>  
I am satisfied that this provision is in line with the Council's maximum parking standards contained with the Local Plan 2004.  
Cycle provision is also provided.

### ***Recommendations***

69. Due to the principle of employment development at this site permitted by the outline planning permission and the nature of representations received, I do not consider the matter needs to be referred to the Secretary of State as a departure from the Development Plan.
70. Delegated approval/refusal subject to the prior submission of an acceptable detailed landscape scheme, the repositioning of buildings to allow a 5m strip adj. the award drain, consideration of bin storage issues and negotiations on ecological enhancement of the off site balancing pond and subject to safeguarding conditions to control materials, ensure local user (in line with Policy EM3), highway safety, green travel plan, landscape implementation, foul and surface water drainage, flood mitigation, ecological enhancement, prevention of direct access to the A14, restrictions on outside storage, safe storage of all fuel, oil, greases and chemicals, details of street lighting, the provision of temporary facilities during construction, removal of permitted development rights to change from B1 to B8 uses and provision and location of fire hydrants.

## Reasons for approval

1. The development is not considered to accord with the Development Plan Policy P1/2 in regard to countryside development but the following material considerations are felt to outweigh that Policy objection in this case:  
  
Extant Outline Permission  
Landscaping  
Compliance with employment policies of the Development Plan
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
  - Drainage and Flood Risk
  - Highway safety and traffic generation
  - Visual impact
  - Sustainability
  - Landscaping
  - Ecology

**Background Papers:** the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Local Development Framework Development Control Policies Submission Draft Jan 2006
- Planning Files Ref: S/2039/06/F, S/1337/06/F, S/1793/95/O and S/1268/04/F

**Contact Officer:** Nigel Blazeby – Area Planning Officer (Area 3)  
Telephone: (01954) 713165