

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

4<sup>th</sup> November 2009

**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director (Operational Services)/  
Corporate Manager (Planning and Sustainable Communities)

---

### S/0621/08/RM – ORCHARD PARK

**Erection of Commercial Units (B1 Use 5142 sqm, amended 6<sup>th</sup> October 2009 to 4180 sqm) with Associated Parking and Infrastructure. Land North of Chieftain Way Adjoining A14 for Gallagher Estates and Lands Improvement**

**Recommendation: Approval**

**Date for Determination: 30<sup>th</sup> June 2008**

#### **Notes:**

**This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because Impington Parish Council objected to the application prior to the October 2009 amendments. During the life of the application, the new Orchard Park Community Council has been created, and is now the authority responsible for commenting on applications on this site. The Community Council has no objections in principle to the amended plans**

#### **Background**

1. There are a small number of key sites at Orchard Park that do not have the benefit of full/reserved matters planning consent. They are highly visible, being along the northern edge adjacent the A14, and on the corner of Histon Road and Kings Hedges Road. The LDF Inspectors' report has confirmed Members policy decision to look to providing an additional 220 dwellings in addition to the 900 permitted through the outline planning consent. Approval of this application for Commercial purposes will not compromise this additional housing provision.

#### **Site and Proposal**

2. The site lies north of Chieftain Way and immediately south of the A14 which, at this point along the northern boundary, is elevated above the level of the site by an embankment and separated by an acoustic fence (a mixture of close boarded fencing and glass screens). To the west and fronting Chieftain Way is affordable housing in the form of a four-storey apartment block (parcel E2) and to the rear of this a vacant parcel of land which recently received Committee approval (August 2009) for a local centre. To the east is land formerly proposed for commercial uses and now part of the land that may bring forward some of the additional 220 dwellings supported by the LDF process. To the south are two completed and occupied blocks of two/three storey affordable housing (F1 and F2) with additional housing approved but not yet started to the south-eastern side.
3. The application, received on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008 and amended on 6<sup>th</sup> October 2009, proposes 8 commercial blocks of similar sizes (total of 4180 sqm gross) with 5 positioned close to the back of the pavement with Chieftain Way and the remaining 3 located in the rear area behind the housing on E2. All units have a similar curved mono pitched roof with a height ranging from 6.5m-9m front to back. The lower 6.5m eaves



Crown Copyright. Licence no. 100029060



Reproduced from the 2008 Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's stationary office (c) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Scale 1/5000 Date 26/10/2009

Centre = 544884 E 261773 N

November Planning Committee 2009

height will front Chieftain Way, except where abutting the housing at E2, in which case the block is positioned end on rising to a height of 9m.

4. In this amended scheme the floor space and car parking numbers have been reduced to provide 116 spaces (of which 6 will be disabled bays), which creates a ratio of approx 1 space to 36 sqm floorspace. It is also proposed to provide 180 covered cycle spaces.
5. The application seeks approval of all reserved matters of Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale. The scheme submission was accompanied by:
  - (a) A Design and Access Statement
  - (b) A Transport Report
  - (c) A Noise Impact Assessment
  - (d) A Landscape Statement

### **Planning History**

6. Outline planning consent **S/2379/01/O** granted permission for a mixed use development comprising 900 dwellings (on up to 16.48 hectares), up to 18,000m<sup>2</sup> B1 gross floorspace (on up to 3.32 hectares), up to 1.21 hectares of education facilities, 4.86 hectares of open space, up to 0.56 hectares of local centre facilities (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and D1 uses), up to 2.07 hectares of public transport infrastructure corridor and mixed uses on up to 2.87 hectares in five areas to include B1, C1, C2, C3, D1, D2 uses and car showroom.
7. Condition 25 limits the occupation of all B1 units above 300sqm to a local Cambridge Sub Area user, and the use to Research and Development.
8. Condition 27 limits the total quantum of B1 uses to no more than 18000sqm, as directed by the Highways Agency to ensure the A14/Histon Road junction can accommodate the traffic associated with the development. This application, together with that approved, as part of the Local Centre does not go beyond these limitations.
9. Condition 5 limits submission of reserved matters to 3 years, i.e. before 14<sup>th</sup> June 2008. After the determination of this application there are no outstanding reserved matter applications for Orchard Park. All further applications will either require a new outline application or a full application.

### **Planning Policy**

10. **East of England Plan 2008:**  
**ENV7** (Quality in the Built Environment)  
**SS1** (Achieving Sustainable development)
11. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy, adopted January 2007:**
12. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Site Specific Policies DPD (January 2006):**  
**Policy SP/1** will replace **CNF1** (Cambridge Northern Fringe).

13. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Polices DPD (July 2007):**

**DP/1** sets principles for Sustainable Development;  
**DP/2** requires high quality Design of New Development;  
**DP/3** sets Development Criteria for the provision of facilities and consideration of impact;  
**DP/6** requires Construction Methods to minimise impact;  
**ET/1** imposes Limitations on the Occupancy of New Premises to local businesses;  
**SF/6** requires Public Art in developments over 1000sq.m. floorspace;  
**NE/1** requires the application to demonstrate Energy Efficiency;  
**NE/3** requires the use of Renewable Energy Technologies to provide at least 10% of predicted energy requirements;  
**NE/6** requires Biodiversity mitigation and enhancement;  
**NE/9** requires Water and Drainage Infrastructure to be in place;  
**NE14** requires Lighting Proposals to be the minimum required for safety and security, and not impact on amenity or highway safety;  
**NE/15** requires that permission should not be granted for development which would be subject to unacceptable Noise Pollution;  
**TR/1** requires Planning for more Sustainable Travel by ensuring a choice of non-car modes, the integration of travel modes, and measures to increase accessibility;  
**TR/2** sets standards for Car and Cycle Parking, car parking being a maximum, to be reduced where there is good accessibility to facilities and services and high quality public transport;  
**TR/3** requires Mitigation of Travel Impact through Travel Plans and improved transport infrastructure.

14. **Circular 11/99 The use of Conditions in Planning Permissions:** Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

**Consultations**

15. **Impington Parish Council** was consulted on the original application, as it pre-dated the setting up of the Orchard Park Community Council. They recommended refusal of the original application for 5142sqm of commercial floorspace. The reasons being:

- (a) Noise Report important (day and night), as nearby residencies, but not supplied;
- (b) Concern over contiguous stretch of car parking and suggestion of a barrier to break it up and inclusive of a security control system or traffic calming measures, to minimise night time use for leisure activity or rat running;
- (c) Alternative suggestion of reconfiguration to place units to rear and bring car parking forward, especially in view of the loss of the noise barrier integrity along the boundary with the A14 and the Air Quality Management area, and if possible this could allow the doubling up of the commercial parking (which could be forward and bordering the road) as out of hours parking for residents;
- (d) Police liaison Officers comments requested;
- (e) Concern over lack of green space and areas to sit at lunch time for the occupants of the commercial premises.

They also commented by email 5<sup>th</sup> June 2008 that, at a subsequent meeting, Members had noted Page 3 item 1.13 of the Consultation draft on Open Space in New Developments SPD stated; "In addition to the standards detailed above, additional informal open space provision will be sought as part of business park, retail

and large-scale commercial developments; this is for the benefit and well being of the workforce and also visitors to the site. The space will be negotiated with the Council having regard to the nature and location of the development, and will be in addition to the 2.8 hectares standard above”.

Further to their comments already made on the 2 applications (S/0621/08/RM and S/0622/08/RM) the Committee note that the consultation document on Open Space provision makes reference to the requirements that are expected by SCDC and would therefore anticipate these requirements to be made in any revision of the plan.”

16. **Orchard Park Community Council** is now the administrative Parish for the application site. They had no objection to the amended plans but raised concerns regarding the need to address rat runs, security issues, the need for a lighting scheme and servicing.
17. **The Local Highway Authority** commented on the original scheme that details of the proposed cycle parking for the commercial units must be provided to ensure suggested capacity could be achieved. They also requested manoeuvring diagrams to demonstrate that the layout would accommodate the largest vehicles likely to be generated. Such tracking diagrams should be for at the very least a 10 metre ridged delivery vehicle, preferably an articulated vehicle should be provided showing turning into and out of the site, and at the internal corners.

Cycle parking is now included in the amended scheme and tracking diagrams have been submitted and the LHA has confirmed that they are acceptable.

18. **The Environment Agency** – commented on the original application that insufficient information was submitted in respect of surface water drainage and pollution control. Confirmation from the applicant has been sought that the impermeable footprint (m<sup>2</sup>) of the development parcel does not exceed that originally proposed for the parcel. Requested from the applicant and waiting confirmation.

In addition comments were made regarding design details for surface water drainage and foul sewage or trade effluent.

19. **Corporate Manager (Health and Environmental Services)** – has no objections in principle to the amended plans but has asked for the following to be carefully controlled by condition.
  - (a) Demolition/Construction Phase: Noise/dirt.
  - (b) Noise Impact of A14 Traffic Noise on proposed Commercial use.
  - (c) Noise Impact of proposed Commercial on existing residential premises.
  - (d) Operational Odour Generation & Control.
  - (e) Air Quality (further information has been requested regarding the implementation of 10% renewables, the fuel sources and its impact on the AQMA).
  - (f) Artificial Lighting.
  - (g) Waste and Recycling Provision.

20. **The Arbury Camp Design Review Panel** – met on 21<sup>st</sup> July to consider the submitted application.

“SCDC commissioned Savilles to look at possible suggested design solutions. This work centred on looking at design solutions, control mechanisms, creating a park like setting by clarifying landscape objectives and aim to rationalise floor space in terms of design guide.

Concerns were raised about security of the proposed area of parking at the back of the site. The proposed buildings would be constructed of steel and glass to breem very good standards. The RSL expressed concerns about the glazing suggested.

Suggested alternative approaches to car parking i.e. multi-storey car parking. Developers were concerned that this would need controlled access, would be difficult to manage and very expensive to implement. Queries were raised about whether it would be to serve this area only or in light of the Barrant's appeal aim to service a larger area of the development. There would also be various ownership/management questions that would need to be addressed.

A query was raised about whether the local centre and off site landscaping could be altered. It was suggested that the blocks could be broken up more.

Concerns about the noise reflection were expressed particularly in relation to noise attenuation. Further checks with noise acoustics officers to be made.

Discussed whether the block form provided an acoustic barrier with regard to the buildings with or without the fence and how the computer models would reflect this.

The Parish Council who are also represented on the task and finish group expressed concerns about the lack of clarity regarding the barrier. The issue about whether to remove the barrier or not needs to be urgently resolved. Current residents are concerned about the acoustic performance particularly as the EU/Planning regulations differ in targets.

The land has been passed into Highways Agency ownership therefore developers cannot remove barrier. Any agreement on the removal of barrier would need to be discussed with the Highways Agency. There is also an S278 agreement with a covenant regarding removing barrier if detrimental to residents.

Solutions re acoustic performance and quality of area are urgently needed.”

The Panel has subsequently been superseded by the Joint Urban Design Team, whose comments are represented below under SCDC Urban Design.

21. **Police Architectural Liaison Officer** made a number of comments on the original application (reproduced here) but is no longer available to comment on the revised scheme.

“The proposed layout of Blocks N, O and P present few opportunities for natural surveillance over the highway and across the junction opposite Block N.

Virtually all of the car parking spaces, with the exception of those space to front of units Q – S, are out of view of the highway and has the potential to be vulnerable to crime and anti social behaviour, particularly late at night when it is not to be unexpected that a number of the units will be closed.

To enhance natural surveillance, thought could be given to placing Blocks N – P along the Boundary with the A14 with the parking to the front and visible from the highway.

I would also be concerned if there was an intention to link the car park to the front of Unit B1 to neighbouring development of the Local Centre as this would create

excessive permeability in an area which may become attractive to youths driving cars or motor cycles in an inappropriate manner. Additionally it would increase the crime risk by providing offenders with the anonymity they seek together with additional access and escape routes.

If the layout does remain unaltered it is recommended that the spaces between the Blocks are closed off with fencing such as weldmesh or railings (2m high Min), to enhance views into the site but to restrict unauthorised access.

The car parking areas should be lit by means of column mounted white down lighters to BS 5489 Code of practice for outdoor lighting.

Consideration should also be given at the design stage to the provision of CCTV to cover the exterior of the units together with the parking areas.

Care should be taken with the provision of planting associated with the development, which should not have the potential to create hiding places and should facilitate natural surveillance. Further tree and shrub planting should not inhibit the effects of lighting or CCTV. Planting next to car parking areas should be of a low growing thorny species not capable of exceeding 0.9m in height with tree canopies not allowed to fall below 2.2m above ground level thereby maintaining a clear visibility splay.”

22. **SCDC Urban Design Officer** - recommended that the original application be amended: Commenting on the revised plans:

- (a) They acknowledge that an attempt has been made to try to break up the car parking areas with landscaping but this is still consider this to be too thin and lacking at the western end.
- (b) Proximity of cycle parking to the units poor in places.
- (c) Entrances to the side of each unit rather than the preferred front access to benefit the street scene.
- (d) Construction design detail of the units should meet noise requirements.
- (e) Suggested addition of green roofs (sedum).

In conclusion they acknowledged the chances have been made in response to the previous comments but also pointed out that they would like to have received a single plan, which addresses the boundaries with neighbours. They requested a 3D massing model. The applicants have previously indicated that they are unwilling to provide such matters.

23. **Local Disability Forum** - commented on the original application:

- (a) Toilets - no toilets on first floor, toilet needs to be centre of wall with pull down bar on either side and space for carer.
- (b) Parking – all disabled parking bays need to be 1.5 spaces wide and space to rear/front for wheelchair access, no kerb adjacent to disabled bays to ease access to and from vehicles, there should be a minimum of 1 disabled space per unit.
- (c) Lifts - none in commercial buildings therefore prevents access to first floor and/or access to toilets on the ground floor for those working up stairs.
- (d) Access statement wrong in terms of parking and employment opportunities e.g. first floor and no lifts/toilets.

24. **Landscape Officer** – has commented on the amended plans noting that the scheme runs up to the steepest section of the A14 embankment, where there is little space for screening. The major difficulties are:
- (a) Total loss of green landscape between the northern boundaries of housing parcel E and this scheme.
  - (b) Space for tree planting to the west of parcel E is squeezed to 30% of previous schemes, and to an extent that the proposed trees will be unlikely to survive.
  - (c) Uninterrupted long views to the A14 embankment from within and outside of the development.
  - (d) Public spaces concentrated along the foot of the embankment with little separation from it are not likely to be attractive or well used.
  - (e) No screening or separation at all from the embankment - apart from a line of fastigate trees - behind the three units to the east of the development.
  - (f) Bike storage is unevenly spaced across the site and clutters vistas and public spaces.
  - (g) Central public space is very hard with little separation from roads, parking areas, bikes or pathways.

The whole area is visually dominated by car parking, and connects with similar areas to the west and south to create a sea of cars.

Some further suggestions for improving the plan have been made. Any response from the applicant will be reported verbally.

25. **SCDC Commercial (Refuse Collection)** - has not commented on this application but in commenting on the application for the Local Centre that was made at the same time the following general comments were made relating to the commercial units.

“The maximum distance for carrying of refuse is 30m, the width of the access doors to all refuse stores is only 1.2m wide, it needs to be at least 1.6m wide for a 1100 litre bin. The refuse stores for all units are too small, they need to be enlarged to a minimum 2.2m wide by 2.2m depth to accommodate 1 x 1100 litre bin plus recycling space. Unit B bin refuse store needs to be minimum 4.4m wide by 2.2m depth (as whole unit is larger than other units). For all units the refuse stores are not in the ideal position as the refuse vehicle has to stop in the parking areas and large bins wheeled out between parked cars.” Any additional comments from the Environmental operations manager will be reported verbally (see comments below).

26. **SCDC Arts Officer** commented on the original applications for the Commercial area and the Local Centre requesting further details of the previously discussed 'Trial Ground', art work designed for the central square around the Local Centre by Gallagher's lead artist, Patricia Mackinnon Day in 2005. As far as the current application is concerned it was suggested that the applicant contact the Local Group formed to deliver arts “the Park Arts Group”.

27. The following were consulted on the original plans and have not commented:  
**The Highways Agency, Cambridge City Council, SCDC Community Services, SCDC Ecologist, SCDC Commercial Officer** and the **SCDC Sustainability Officer**.

The applicants responded to Impington Parish Councils comments. (Note the plans have since been amended).

“Again I trust a copy of the PLO comments will be sent to the Parish Council. (done)



With reference to the layout of this development and the suggestion that the blocks on the West side of the site could be located nearer to the A14, it should be noted that this particular matter was raised and discussed by the applicant, Gallagher's at a meeting attended by Peter Studdert the chairman of the Design Review Panel and Wayne Campbell, Planning officer for SCDC among others on the 27<sup>th</sup> February 2008. Mr Studdert felt that in urban design terms this layout offers the best balance between maintaining the integrity of the street scene and providing visual interest in turning the corner. This is consistent with the Arbury Camp Design Brief.

The other matters raised by the PLO are as noted for the local centre and our comments equally apply. As all units in this section of the development are B1 an opportunity does exist to install control barriers / fencing as suggested in the PLO's report.

### **Representations**

28. Two site notices were posted on Chieftain Way and neighbours notified and re-notified of the amended plans. No representations have been received to date.

### **Planning Comments – Key Issues**

29. This is an important proposal in that it will provide employment within Orchard Park helping meet the original aspiration of a mixed use development. It will also complete a key section of the development and will help provide an enhanced acoustic barrier of built development for residential properties to the south. The application raises the following issues:

- (a) Compliance with the outline planning consent. Floorspace.
- (b) Design, appearance, built form, scale and massing.
- (c) Layout, Access and Highway and servicing requirements.
- (d) Car and Cycle parking provision.
- (e) Refuse collection.
- (f) Noise Attenuation.
- (g) Air Quality.
- (h) Landscaping.
- (i) Security and Surveillance.
- (j) Disability issues.
- (k) Sustainability issues.
- (l) Public Arts.

### ***Compliance with the outline planning consent. Floorspace.***

30. Condition 27 of the outline planning consent S/2379/01/O limited B1 uses to 18000sqm. This application for 4180sqm of B1 floorspace, together with the 3836sqm office/B1 floorspace approved in August 2009 as part of the proposed local centre, would create a total of 8016sqm B1 floorspace, which would clearly fall well within the limitations of this condition.
31. Condition 25 of the outline planning consent S/2379/01/O limited occupation of units over 300sqm to a local user and Research and Development. Whilst the floor space of these 8 blocks each total between 520/525 sqm, the plans show subdivisions below the 300sqm level so this condition will not apply other than to prevent an amalgamation of units by an outside user.

### ***Design, appearance, built form, scale and massing***

32. The application has been amended following the advice of the Urban Designers and the units have been repositioned to follow the Street pattern to provide a more visually pleasing street scene. The suggestion from the former Parish Council (Impington) that some of the buildings should be set to the back of the site - to allow the car parking area at the front to be shared with residents - was considered but the visual advantage of positioning the buildings adjacent the street and footpath were considered to be of greater advantage.
33. The approved Design Guide for the estate development sought 15m high buildings along the northern parcels of the site adjacent to the A14. It is disappointing that with this proposal the acoustic fence must remain as the 15m building barrier which would have provided the necessary acoustic attenuation has not been achievable for economic reasons. Nevertheless, the proposed development is considered visually acceptable in height terms since the frontage elements create a strong street scene in Chieftain Way. In the absence of any further approved Design Guidance this application is found acceptable (A Design Guide for the northern section of Orchard Park, prepared by Savills, is currently being reviewed by the Urban Design Team but is not at a stage that can usefully assist in determination of this application).
34. The clean contemporary design fits well with the design of the neighbouring residential block E2 and the Local Centre designed by the same architect.

### ***Layout, access, highway and servicing requirements***

35. The units would receive vehicular access from the rear. Individual servicing areas are not provided or have been required by the Local Highway Authority. In order to avoid a dead frontage and ensure best practice 'secure by design' principles are met, the Urban Designers identified a need to promote pedestrian access from the street. The amended proposals, in part, meet their concerns, by providing the building entrances to the sides rather than the rear of the buildings fronting Chieftain Way.
36. In commenting on this and the Local Centre application the Police advice was to avoid an unhindered vehicular link around the rear of the site to the Local Centre. To avoid security issues a planning condition is suggested to provide site wide security surveillance and allow the possibility of some form of night time security barrier between the Local Centre and the application site to avoid rat running.

### ***Car and cycle parking provision***

37. The total parking provision has been reduced from 179 to 116 spaces, which equates to 1 space per 36sqm of floorspace. The Council's adopted car parking standards require a **maximum provision of 1 space per 30sqm for B1 uses (schemes of over 2500sqm). However, it is considered that this slightly reduced provision should be supported in this case as it provides an opportunity to break up the large areas of hardstanding by increasing the areas of soft landscaping (to create landscaping zones in the areas where there will be breaks the built frontages and to help accommodate enhanced landscaping to the northern boundary to the A14 embankment) and will help support Employer Travel to Work initiatives, by making personal car usage less attractive.** In support of this latter initiative, the cycle parking has increased from 170 to 180 spaces with all spaces being part covered.

38. The Section 106 Agreement attached to the original outline planning permission includes a requirement for 'Travel for work plans' "...so long as at least 8 persons shall be employed on any part of the Site used as a separate planning unit." The planning units proposed by this application are of such a small size that there is a strong possibility that they would fall below this threshold. However, as the total car parking numbers have been reduced below the adopted standard it considered appropriate to ensure that travel plans are provided and for this reason an additional condition should be applied to address this matter.

#### ***Refuse collection***

39. The plans detail each unit having refuse storage areas of 2 x (2.2 x 2.2m) each with door widths of 1.65m so that is 4.84sqm x 2 = 9.68sqm in total internal storage for each 520/525sqm unit. The street widths are 6.1m. This meets the standards in the Waste Management Design Guide.

#### ***Noise Attenuation***

40. The application relies on retaining the acoustic barrier alongside the A14. The noise attenuation strategy agreed under condition 10 of the outline planning consent sought the removal of the fence only where the desired commercial buildings would offer the necessary noise attenuation. The fence is under the control of the Highways Agency, and is intended to be retained, albeit in a different position and/or to a different design as a result of the current proposals to widen the A14, currently out to consultation. Additional conditions are suggested to control the impact of noise on adjoining residents and occupiers of the commercial units.

#### ***Air Quality***

41. This proposal does not include any residential units so air quality issues relate solely to the amount of traffic that would be generated by the development. The floorspace is reduced and lower overall than the outline permission granted. The potential for reducing NO2 levels lies in schedule 7 of the S106 agreement requiring the preparation of Travel to Work Plans (for any separate planning unit having at least 8 employees) As stated above, under car parking, to ensure these are provided an additional condition is suggested.

#### ***Landscaping***

42. Amendments to the application include revised landscaping proposals, which provide enhanced landscaping to the northern boundary and enlarged soft landscape belts where there are gaps in the built frontage, to create a better visual buffer to A14 embankment.
43. The precise details of the planting schedule and landscaping approach is not considered acceptable to the Council's Landscape Officer. However, it is considered that these can be further refined and dealt with through the discharge of planning conditions.

#### ***Security and surveillance***

44. CCTV positions and operation will depend on the Commercial centre developer and their management regime. A condition requiring these details to be agreed and implemented prior to any use/occupation is appropriate.

### ***Disability issues***

45. The applicant has confirm that the offices are designed to allow the installation of a lift to access the first floor in all 8 units from a point adjacent to the accesses. However, since such matters are dealt with under Building Regulations, no further planning consideration is necessary.

### ***Sustainability issues***

46. As with the proposed Local Centre the applicant has responded to the question as to how the proposal will meet the policy requirement of providing 10% renewables, by proposing a mini CHP scheme together with heat pump systems capable of heating and cooling simultaneously similar to that provided at the recently opened hotel. Since the technology involved is constantly being refined the applicant has not found it possible to give details of the exact type of installation at this stage, but has confirmed that this proposal will not require the provision of any above ground structures on the site, and ventilation requirements will be no more onerous than for any traditional system. It is therefore recommended that a condition be attached to agree details of the system, including the design implications and that 10% of the energy required by the development will be genuinely achieved by renewables. The technology to be used needs to ensure it does not adversely impact on the AQMA.

### ***Public Arts***

47. Discussions were had with the applicant to encourage the provision of Arts within the scheme, possible at the entrances to each unit .In the time available since the submission of the amended plans the applicant has not furthered this. It will require the involvement of the Locally formed Park Arts Group and for this reason this aspect needs to be conditioned .

### **Recommendation**

48. APPROVE details of reserved matters of access, appearance, landscaping (principals of), layout and scale, as amended by plans stamped 6<sup>th</sup> October 2009, subject to additional conditions addressing the following matters:

### **Additional Conditions**

1. Details of landscaping to include hard and soft landscaping.
2. Design details of covered cycle parking.
3. Implementation of parking and cycle parking.
4. Phasing scheme for construction and occupation.
5. Scheme of CCTV and lighting.
6. Scheme of public art.
7. Implementation of refuse stores.
8. Scheme for provision of at least 10% of predicted energy requirements by renewable energy.
9. Signage strategy.
10. Hours of construction.
11. Noise and vibration control for any piling of foundations.
12. Construction dust control.
13. Noise insulation scheme or mitigating measures to protect the commercial units from A14 Traffic noise.
14. Hours for refuse/recycling collections.
15. Hours for deliveries.

16. Opening times for commercial premises.
17. Odour abstraction / filtration / abatement scheme.
18. Air quality protection scheme.
19. Lighting scheme.
20. Requirement for Travel plans for all units.
21. Night time barrier details to Local Centre.

### **Informatives**

1. Condition 13 of **S/2379/01/O** requires a scheme for the location and provision of fire hydrants prior to development commencing.
2. Add in informative with respect to landscaping recommendations.
3. Informative regarding requirements of Food and Health and Safety team.
4. Informative regarding noise protection measures.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted January 2007)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007
- Planning Files Ref: S/0621/08/RM and S/2379/01/O

**Case Officer:** John Pym – Senior Planning Officer (Major Developments)  
Telephone: (01954) 713166

**Presented to the Planning Committee by:** John Pym