

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

5 December 2012

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

S/1726/12/FL – DUXFORD

Development of new facilities for Welch's Transport Group incorporating storage and distribution building, vehicle sales, service, MoT and repair building, associated offices, customer car, staff car, truck and crane parking – Moorfield Road, Duxford for Welch's Group Holdings Ltd

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Date for Determination: 27 November 2012

Major Development

Departure Application

Notes:

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination as the Officer recommendation is contrary to the recommendations of Duxford, Whittlesford and Ickleton Parish Councils

Members of Committee will visit the site on Tuesday 4th December 2012.

To be presented to the Committee by Kate Wood

Site and Proposal

1. The 3.85 hectare application site lies on the south side of the A505, outside the village frameworks of Duxford and Whittlesford and within the countryside. It is bounded to the west by Moorfield Road, beyond which are commercial premises occupied by Volvo Construction Equipment and to the east by the Cambridge-Liverpool Street railway line. The southern site boundary is defined by a belt of trees and a drainage ditch, beyond which lies open farm land. On the opposite side of the A505 to the north are residential dwellings located within Knight's Orchard and The Moraine, modern dwellings that have recently been constructed in small cul-de-sacs accessed off the south side of Station Road. The north-western corner of the site is adjacent to a staggered junction of the A505 (a stretch of road that is subject to a 50mph speed limit), with Moorfield Road leading south towards Duxford and north towards Whittlesford. When approaching this junction from the south, right turns onto the eastbound carriageway of the A505 are prohibited, but no such restrictions apply to traffic approaching this junction from the north.
2. The site consists of open fields to the west and woodland/dense scrub further to the east, from where there is an access onto the A505. The land slopes down towards the southern boundary and sits at a much lower level (approximately 4 metres) than the A505 to the north, from which it is separated by an embankment, and also

narrows and becomes steeper from west to east. The southern part of the site lies within an area of medium-high flood risk.

3. The full application proposes to develop the site in order to provide new facilities for Welch's Transport Group, incorporating a storage and distribution building, vehicle sales, a service, MoT and repair building, associated offices, and parking (of cars for customers and staff, trucks and cranes). Welch's is a local company that is presently based on three separate sites within Great Shelford and Stapleford, and proposes to relocate to this single site in Moorfield Road. The proposed scheme consists of two buildings with a total floorspace of 4,934m², and comprising:
 - A warehouse building (3806m²) incorporating: 2,490m² of warehousing with ancillary facilities; 420m² of offices and an 896m² canopy. This structure would be approximately 10 metres high. Materials would consist of horizontally profiled metal cladding for the warehouse element, and composite metal panelling for the offices, both under a very shallow-pitched profiled steel roof. This would be sited adjacent to the northern boundary, behind a landscaped screen, and set approximately 55 metres away from the western boundary.
 - A vehicle sales and servicing building (1128m²) incorporating: 800m² of workshops and 328m² of offices. This would be 9.7 metres high, with materials consisting of horizontal profiled steel cladding for the vehicle sales and servicing element and composite panelling for the offices. This would be sited in the south-western part of the site, approximately 25 metres from the southern boundary, 5 metres from the western boundary and 95 metres from the northern boundary.
4. The proposed vehicular access to the site would be obtained via Moorfield Road. The scheme proposes the following parking provision:
 - Vehicle sales and servicing – 22 car spaces and 12 HGV spaces, located to the south and east side of this building.
 - Warehouse – 75 car spaces, located in the north-western corner of the site.
 - Lorry parking – 23 spaces, located to the south of the main warehouse and on the south side of the main circulation route through the site.
 - Larger vehicle and mobile crane parking – 30 spaces, located at the eastern end of the site.

It is also proposed that lorry wash and refuelling facilities would be provided to the south of the main warehouse building and towards the eastern end of the site.

5. The planning statement accompanying the application explains that Welch's Transport Ltd was established in 1934 and is a local family-run business engaged in: road haulage, distribution and warehousing; truck and van sales; crane and motor vehicle hire; and car sales. In the local area, the company currently operates on three separate sites within Great Shelford and Stapleford. It also has 3 other depots in the Eastern region. Welch's has a fleet of 100 vehicles, and employs a total of around 150 people. Approximately 75 staff are employed at the Great Shelford and Stapleford sites, around half of which live in Sawston/Duxford and Haverhill. Some of Welch's main clients are:
 - Ardex UK Ltd – based in Haverhill – one of the world's leading solution providers of high performance speciality building materials, with a total of approximately 1600 employees worldwide.

- The Blayson Group Ltd – based in Waterbeach – leading specialist manufacturers of superior investment casting wax and supplier of ancillary materials, equipment and services to the global investment casting industry.
 - Ampac – based in Melbourn – the world’s leader in creative flexible packaging.
 - Vailspar Paint – based in Pampisford – the leading global provider of innovative paints and coatings.
6. As stated above, Welch’s currently operate out of 3 premises in Great Shelford and Stapleford, comprising: 1.63 hectares in Granta Terrace, Stapleford; 0.28 hectares at 29-35 London Road, Stapleford; and 0.22 hectares at 32 London Road, Great Shelford. These sites are highly constrained, as they are surrounded on nearly all sides by residential properties and, in the case of the Granta Terrace site, unsuitable for a 21st century haulage firm. The company is currently run by the 3rd generation of the family, who wish to be in a position to hand on the business to the 4th and 5th generations on a sound financial footing. Welch’s propose to move their existing operation from their three sites in Great Shelford and Stapleford to a new, purpose-built facility. Applications to redevelop these sites for housing have been submitted concurrently (application references S/1725/12/OL, S/1727/12/OL and S/1728/12/OL), and it is intended that revenue from the sale of these sites would be used to fund the purchase of the Duxford site and construction of their new bespoke facility.
7. The applicants have advised that the following key issues currently seriously affect their business, and that, as a result, the relocation of the business is essential to the survival of its operation in South Cambridgeshire:
- The current access to the main haulage and distribution site in Granta Terrace, Stapleford is along a narrow, residential road. This road is unsuitable for 44 tonne articulated lorries and taking this size of vehicle along a narrow residential street is becoming untenable.
 - Notwithstanding the above, the Government is reviewing existing maximum limits on vehicle sizes (European Directive 96/53/EC), which would allow an increase in trailer lengths from 13.6 to 15.7 metres. In due course, this longer length is likely to become the ‘industry standard’ to which all Welch’s clients will require the company to comply. Such vehicles would not be able to use Granta Terrace, and this factor signals the demise of this site as a distribution location within the next three to five years.
 - The existing buildings at Granta Terrace would have been industry standard when built by Welch’s in the 1950s, but are no longer fit for purpose and are coming to the end of their economic life.
 - Given the length of modern trucks, it is increasingly difficult to manoeuvre vehicles around the existing service yard, whilst avoiding other trucks and people.
 - The Council recognised the need for Welch’s to relocate as far back as 1993 when Granta Terrace was designated for residential use in the Local Plan. This allocation recognised Welch’s difficulties and the potential of Granta Terrace for residential use. The company applied for planning permission for the redevelopment of Granta Terrace for residential use in 1993. However, this application was withdrawn, as Welch’s could not find suitable alternative

premises, and this problem has blighted the business ever since.

- A bespoke new facility can be designed and built to the company's own specification to address all the problems inherent within the existing sites. The opportunity to start again would provide a layout and accommodation that would enable the company to operate with greater efficiency, provide more spacious and safer vehicle manoeuvring, and an ability to expand in the future.
8. The above sets out the general need to relocate. The submitted planning statement also includes the following further explanation of Welch's requirements and site selection criteria:
- Welch's employment base is local to villages around Sawston and Duxford, and their client base is concentrated along the A505, A10, A11 and M11. For both, moving more than 5 miles from their current location would be very difficult given the connections they have in the area. Being located in close proximity to the existing base is therefore an absolute necessity in order to retain staff, customers and key clients.
 - A minimum site area of 2.8 hectares, in order to ensure the site is efficient in its layout, and to allow for potential future growth of the company.
 - Good connections to the strategic highway network, particularly the A505 and M11.
 - Ease of access from the public highway.
9. Welch's have been looking for new premises that meet the above criteria for nearly 20 years. They have considered numerous sites that have been on the market, or are classified as brownfield land, but these have all been discounted as being unsuitable. A full list of sites considered is included as an Appendix to this report (electronic version only).

Planning History

10. SC/0484/61 – 6 bungalows and 19 houses – refused.
11. S/1825/90/O – Sub regional shopping centre and leisure developments including retail stores, restaurant, food court and other supporting uses – withdrawn.

Planning Policy

12. National Planning Policy Framework 2012
13. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD, 2007:

DP/1: Sustainable Development

DP/2: Design of New Development

DP/3: Development Criteria

DP/4: Infrastructure and New Developments

DP/7: Development Frameworks

ET/1: Limitations on the Occupancy of New Premises in South Cambridgeshire

ET/3: Development in Established Employment Areas in the Countryside

ET/4: New Employment Development in Villages

ET/5: Development for the Expansion of Firms

ET/6: Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses

NE/1: Energy Efficiency
NE/3: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development
NE/6: Biodiversity
NE/10: Foul Drainage – Alternative Drainage Systems
NE/11: Flood Risk
NE/12: Water Conservation
NE/14: Lighting Proposals
NE/15: Noise Pollution
NE/16: Emissions
CH/2: Archaeology
SF/6: Public Art
TR/1: Planning for More Sustainable Travel
TR/2: Car and Cycle Parking Standards
TR/3: Mitigating Travel Impact

14. South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):
Trees and Development Sites – Adopted January 2009
Public Art – Adopted January 2009
Biodiversity – Adopted July 2009
Landscape in New Developments – Adopted March 2010
District Design Guide – Adopted March 2010
Health Impact Assessment – Adopted March 2011
15. Circular 11/95 (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.

Consultation by South Cambridgeshire District Council as Local Planning Authority

16. ***Duxford Parish Council*** – Recommends refusal, stating:
1. The proposed development is on a green agricultural site. The reasons given in the application that the land was set-aside and no longer needed sets a precedent for development of other adjacent sites. The Council is concerned about, not only this application, but also development creep outside the provisions of the adopted development framework and local plan.
 2. Increased pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle conflict by the increase in traffic and pedestrians on the Moorfield Road A505 slip road going south together with the crossing of the A505. The Council feels this exacerbates an existing poor solution around sightlines from both the vehicle and pedestrian point of view.
 3. The strong possibility that the proposed pedestrian/cycleway around the site to Whittlesford Parkway railway station will not happen due to the concerns raised by Network Rail. This increases the conflict outlined above. The proposal is included in the application to lessen the conflict on Moorfield Road/A505 and hence help the scheme gain acceptability.
 4. The Council also has issues with the loss of amenity and increased noise levels between 0400 and 0600 each morning when individual incidences are not covered by the ambient noise levels and are therefore generally accepted as a nuisance.

The applicant has subsequently confirmed to the Council that they will address the above concerns. The Council trusts that SCDC Planning Department will ensure that that will be the case before taking a final decision.

In response to the Transport Assessment Addendum, Duxford Parish Council states that its position remains unchanged and recommends refusing this application on the grounds that the Council's concerns over road safety have not been addressed. As a minimum requirement, the Council consider that the A505, from the roundabout of the BP garage to Junction 10 on the M11, should have a speed limit of 40mph in line with the section of the A505 on the other side of the M11 going towards Royston.

17. **Whittlesford Parish Council** – Recommends refusal on the following grounds:

- Hours of operation: The early morning starts of 06.00 or before is likely to give rise to sufficient noise to disturb nearby residents.
- Road safety:
 - (a) slow moving lorries exiting from Moorfield Road onto the A505 could give rise to accidents
 - (b) lorries leaving the proposed site on Moorfield Road could be in conflict with cyclists and pedestrians on the only pavement on Moorfield Road
 - (c) in fact there is a requirement, should permission be granted, for a complete re-assessment of the provisions for cyclists and pedestrians for crossing the A505 at the Moorfield Road junction. The present provisions are inadequate and the exiting of lorries from Moorfield Road will just add to the problems.
- Landscaping: if permission is granted the landscaping programme should include the planting of a fast-growing hedge on the site boundary alongside the A505 so as to mitigate the visual impact of the buildings on the site when viewed from Knights Orchard. And also, the erection of a close-boarded wooden fence, 2-2.5 metres high inside the hedge, would reflect the troublesome effects of noise from the site.

In the application form there are no detailed proposals for the building of the fuel storage areas; hopefully this will be addressed if permission is granted. Also there is no mention of the provision of part-time traffic lights at the junction of Moorfield Road and the A505 and the construction of a footpath/cycleway along the south side of the planned site to Whittlesford Parkway rail station.

Decisions:

The Meeting opposed the planning application as this development goes against the policy of keeping rural villages as distinct units and represents a further urbanisation within a residential area.

18. **Ickleton Parish Council** - Recommends refusal, stating:

We would prefer to see a development of this nature located on a brownfield site, or on an industrial estate/business park (several in the local area), rather than on an undeveloped Greenfield site. The development would also mean the loss of a buffer between settlements and bring about additional pressure to develop sites bordering the A505. We recognise that Ickleton is not immediately impacted by such concerns, and leave it to the Parishes most affected to make representations as they see fit.

Transport Assessment

The Transport Assessment is only adequate in so far as it addresses impact of the proposed development on the A505 and other major local roads. It is inadequate as

far as the impact on minor local roads and in particular the impact on roads through neighbouring villages is concerned.

Ickleton Parish Council's recommendation is to refuse this application unless the following conditions are met:

1. The exit from the site should be designed so that all vehicles are obliged by physical constraint to turn right onto Moorfield Road before proceeding to the A505. We welcome the intention of Welch's to restrict all of their trucks to using the A505 and Moorfield Road to access the site. But they can only promise 'reasonable endeavours' on their part relating to HGV's not operated by Welch's. In the context of Duxford's narrow and winding streets this is just not good enough. Especially when those streets lead traffic on to the equally narrow and problematic streets of Hinxtton and Ickleton.

We are also concerned about the impact of traffic other than HGV's driving to and leaving this site. The Traffic Assessment refers to visitors, customers and suppliers coming to the site by car as well as by truck. Inevitably, light commercial vehicles will also be involved. Welch's has a substantial retail business – car sales (three franchises currently), service and repair including MOT – which they are seeking to expand. It is not reasonable to assume there will be only a minor impact on Duxford village and beyond. Visitors, customers and suppliers that are locally based will be well aware that the A505 is often congested or slow moving particularly at peak times and it is to be expected that they would seek to avoid problems by rat-running through the villages. We believe the impact would be tangible and adverse, particularly at peak times, unless physical measures are taken to prevent it.

2. If the District Council is minded to approve the application, this should be subject to a S106 agreement with the applicant to make funds available to Ickleton Parish Council, the funds to be applied to traffic management measures in Ickleton. We suggest a sum of £20,000 would be appropriate. This could help address issues such as traffic speeds and the use of Ickleton as a transit route for HGV's contrary to the policy of the Highways Authority.

The weakness in the Traffic Assessment from Ickleton's perspective is that it assumes all is well once vehicles are on the A505. However, vehicles that are heading south of the site (other than those heading for the M11 and beyond) will turn south at the Hunts Road roundabout on the A505. They will certainly do this if there is a perception that the A505 heading east is slow moving: they will be encouraged to do so by their satnav systems, which will be indicating this as the quickest route to Saffron Walden.

Our fear therefore is that a significant amount of vehicles will use Duxford and Ickleton as a transit route from the site, exacerbating existing problems suffered by our communities. It seems to us that a request for funds to be accessed via a S.106 agreement to attempt to mitigate the problems likely to be generated by the development is a reasonable one.

19. ***The Trees and Landscape Officer*** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
20. ***The Landscape Design Officer*** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.

21. **The Ecology Officer** – Raises no objections. It is noted that a badger sett has been identified but that the hole is considered to be inactive. An update survey will be required prior to development taking place as badgers can return to previously disused setts. A condition requiring a repeat walkover survey should therefore be added to any permission. The majority of woodland/scrub is proposed for retention. This parcel of land is likely to have some potential for habitat enhancement whether it be through bat and nest box provision, wildflower planting or coppice management. The stream is noted as being overgrown at present. This may not be a significant issue but may present habitat enhancement opportunities such as willow pollarding. A condition should be added to any consent to secure a scheme of ecological enhancement. Two outfalls to the stream are proposed and no open SUDS are to be used. There could be scope for wetland enhancement along the stream edge. The extensive roof of the main building could be softened through the use of a green roof. This could help to attenuate run-off potentially lessening the need for underground storage SUDS and providing landscape enhancement and biodiversity gain.
22. **The Environmental Health Officer (Air Quality)** – The Air Quality Assessment report indicates there is likely to be a slight adverse impact in the vicinity of the development when considered in accordance with guidelines published by EPUK Development Control: Planning for Air Quality 2010. The proposed transfer of operations includes specialist transport and haulage, warehousing, crane hire, van and truck servicing and car sales indicating a potential increase in emissions of fine particles and a higher percentage of HGV movements at the proposed site. However, the assessment indicates that even with the increase in emissions from the proposed development, air quality standards at the relevant sensitive receptors will not be exceeded. The Transport Assessment proposes a travel to work plan and footpath/cycle route to the new development as mitigation. These should be conditioned before development in order to reduce the impact of transport emissions. The applicant should develop a low emission strategy for the ongoing business activities from the site, and should include details of how the business will reduce transport emissions by switching to low emission vehicles. There is scope to condition the provision and installation of charging points.
23. **The Environmental Health Officer (Contaminated Land)** – States that the submitted reports indicate that basic remedial measures are required to be incorporated into the development comprising removal of made ground. Any permission should be subject to a condition requiring finalised proposals for the removal/remediation of any contamination.
24. **The Environmental Health Officer (Public Health Specialist)** – Raises no objections, stating that the submitted Health Impact Assessment has been assessed as Grade B. This meets the required standard of the HIA SPD, which states that only grades A or B are acceptable. There are concerns of noise from the commercial use of the site and the potential for a reduction in air quality and the EHO should be consulted with regards to location/layout and potential noise mitigation measures and air quality.
25. **The Policy Officer** – The development of the site is in conflict with policies concerning employment including ET/1, ET/4 and ET/5. However, the applicants have submitted a justification as to why they should be treated as an exception to policy. The reasons given include the unsuitability of their existing premises (comments should be sought on this from Environmental Health and Highways) and the lack of another suitable site. They have searched for another suitable site but have determined that those available are unsuitable. If this is considered to be thorough, it would appear that policy ST/8 has failed to allocate land in the right places to meet

local needs. Moreover the NPPF is clear that considerable weight should be given to both housing development and stimulating and ensuring economic growth, and this package of applications can be seen to address both concerns. It follows that in these circumstances an exception to policy could be justified provided the detailed design is of sufficiently high quality in terms of landscaping, design, lighting, noise and general impact on the environment.

Section 106 Officer – This application has been scrutinised for development viability purposes at the same time as the three relating sites. The scale of the proposal triggers the need for a public art scheme under development control policy SF/6 and the applicant has suggested that they are willing to comply with this.

26. **The Urban Design Officer** – Recommends approval, stating that the site planning rationalises the on-site requirements and vehicular movements whilst grouping the buildings in association with the large buildings on the western side of Moorfield Road to the west. The proposals present a viable intent in relation to vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access and circulation. The proposal for a cycleway connection from Moorfield Road to the railway station is welcomed. The proposed arrangement of buildings creates a grouping of large buildings with the Volvo building to the west. The northern elevation will be partly screened from the residential properties to the north of the A505 by the proposed tree planting. Due to being set at a much lower ground level than the A505 and houses to the north, the visual impact of the building's mass is considerably reduced when viewed from these houses. The screen planting will further reduce the visual impact. The more visible western elevations fronting Moorfield Road and the northern elevation of the sales building have better articulation. The proposed materials selection appears appropriate in principle. Further details of materials, including samples, should be required.
27. **The Environmental Services Department (Waste Management)** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
28. **The Arts Officer** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
29. **The Sustainability Officer** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
30. **The Environment Agency** – Objects to the application, as insufficient information has been provided to fully assess the proposals with regards to flood risk. The FRA has used a single downstream flood level node to assess the risk to the site despite being given a full range of node points. There are therefore serious concerns that the data used to assess the site is inappropriate. There are significant areas of development proposed in the FZ3 that will impact on flood risk, and the FRA also fails to comply with the NPPF with regard to surface water drainage proposals. Refusal is recommended on the grounds that the submitted FRA does not provide a suitable basis for assessment; scheme to dispose of surface water including trade effluents; a contamination risk assessment to be made of the flood risks.

Following the submission of additional flood risk information, the Environment Agency has withdrawn its in principle objection subject to submission of a detailed design that can be secured by way of planning conditions: a scheme of flood risk mitigation measures; a surface water drainage scheme; no development below the 1 in 100 year flood contour and the Flood Compensation Area indicated in the drawings;

surface water drainage/disposal, including trade effluent; contamination investigation and remediation; prior approval to be sought for any penetrative foundation design.

31. **Anglian Water** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
32. **The Local Highways Authority** – Requests that a routing agreement for commercial vehicles be agreed as part of a S106 Agreement to ensure HGV's do not use Duxford or Whittlesford as a through route. The access to the site should be designed/amended such that all large vehicles turn right out of the site. A drawing showing full visibility splays onto Moorfield Road should also be provided. The design of these will be dependent on speeds and traffic flow. The applicant should provide empirical data in the form of speed and traffic flows and subjective observations will be considered by the LHA and the use of lower visibility splays as detailed in Manual for Streets. The proposed cycle route through the site will need to be a minimum of 3m but preferably 4m, and built to the County Council's housing estate road specification, if it is to be offered for adoption as public highway. Any consent should be subject to a condition requiring a traffic management plan during the construction period.
33. **Highways Agency** – Raises no objections, stating that the level of additional trips expected from the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the nearby A11 or M11 junctions.
34. **The County Archaeologist** – States its records indicate the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential. The site has been subject to an archaeological evaluation, the results of which indicate that evidence for late Iron Age to early Roman settlement survives in the area. The site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation, which can be secured through a condition of any planning permission.
35. **Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
36. **The Imperial War Museum** – Raises no objections but comments that there may be additional noise and traffic when there are air shows and events and that the applicants should be made aware of this.

Representations by District Councillors and by members of the public

37. District Councillor Mick Martin requests that the application be referred to Planning Committee. The position of Duxford Parish Council to recommend refusal is based amongst other things on the increased danger to pedestrians and cyclists attempting to cross the A505. The Highways statement does not indicate that they have considered these categories of road users. There are a number of Duxford children who attend school in Whittlesford, as well as a significant number of cyclists who commute to work by rail. Safe provision must be made for these people. Many years ago now when the roundabout was put at the end of Hunts Road, we were told that traffic lights were not appropriate/permitted on trunk routes. This was later not an insurmountable issue when traffic lights were installed outside the IWM visitor entrance. Indeed traffic lights have subsequently been installed at the junction of Heathfield and the A505. Traffic lights may slow down the flow, but they are probably the safest solution.

38. District Councillor Topping expresses concern about the proposal due to the lack of safe passage across the A505.
39. Letters of objection have been received from Nos.53 and 83 Moorfield Road; Nos. 4, 6, 9 and 10 Knights Orchard; No.5 Owls Close; Nos. 29 and 30 Station Road, and No.16 St John's Street. The main points raised are:
- The site lies within the countryside and the development would therefore be contrary to policy. Businesses should be located in established areas of industry. Why can't a brownfield site, such as the Spicer's land, be used instead?
 - Although Volvo occupies a nearby site, there was historically industry on the land. The proposed development would be much closer to the road and adjacent dwellings.
 - The Transport Assessment (TA) appears to be based on car rather than HGV movements. The constant flow of traffic on the A505 will not enable a slow accelerating HGV to turn out of the junction.
 - The TA was undertaken the week after the Jubilee holidays – traffic at this time was much lower than normal. It should be repeated outside holiday time.
 - The proposal should include junction improvements, as the junction is hazardous at present, and particularly difficult for cars turning west from the north.
 - Illegal right turns from Moorfield Road to the east would increase.
 - Staff may decide to park in Royston Road, Whittlesford (as Volvo staff do) to avoid having to turn left to go back onto the A505.
 - Reduced parking ratios would encourage staff to use public transport.
 - The turn off the A505 into Moorfield Road enables high speed turns, and the crossing from the south-east corner onto the first island would be even more dangerous when lorries are turning past pedestrians/children. The current foot and cycle path will cross the new entrance and space should be made for a safe refuge in the middle of the access. There is only a pavement on this side of the road.
 - If permitted, the A505 crossing should be made absolutely safe, possibly by slight alteration of the 'slip road' and using on-demand traffic lights for pedestrians, or by providing a footbridge from the Volvo corner to Whittlesford.
 - Volvo employees from Duxford approach their site through the village as there is no turn from the west into Moorfield Road. Development should not increase traffic in the village.
 - The application proposes more HGV spaces than appear to be required. 53 spaces are shown but the application submission states only 42 spaces are needed.
 - The highways assessment includes no study of the impact on traffic in St John's Street and Moorfield Road to avoid going to the McDonald's roundabout and doubling back.

- The development would result in noise disturbance to residents, with operations starting at 4am and prediction that all 30 HGV's will be on the move by 7am. This would increase traffic noise to residents, and noise from the site caused by reversing vehicles/bleepers and vibrations.
- Existing businesses in the area (Volvo and the scrap yard) have operating conditions applied to them (Volvo 8am-6pm Monday-Friday). Such conditions should be applied to the proposed site if the scheme is approved.
- If the site operates on a 24 hour basis, how will lighting guidelines be complied with?
- The proposal would result in a loss of outlook from dwellings to the north.
- The development would have a negative impact on the character of the area. It is important to keep a rural break between villages.
- Hazardous materials will be stored on the site, including petrol/diesel tanks. Welch's website states they offer warehousing for hazardous freight. Given the location near residents and in a flood risk area, the types of materials stored on site should be restricted.
- It would be sensible to bund the site to prevent any hazardous materials entering the watercourse. Interceptors will be needed to catch the diesel and oil.
- No outside storage should be permitted. At present, Welch's store tyres, pallets, kegs and a disused oil tank outside.
- The site is a field of Cambs and Ouse chalk which is important for biodiversity of the area. Given the pond and river on the site, a full biodiversity survey should be carried out.
- Development should be directed away from areas of high flood risk.
- How many local residents would be employed at the site?
- Archaeological remains have been found on the site.
- The cranes may be on the flightpath for Duxford and may affect low flying aircraft.
- The drainage schemes have not been fully developed. The documentation states that there will be no change in the volume of surface water run-off but, as much of the site will have an impermeable surface, how could this be? The river would therefore be more likely to flood downstream.
- The MoT business would generate more traffic and take away business from local garages.
- The proposal would result in an underdevelopment of the site and a very low density of jobs per acre.
- Who will pay for the construction of the pathway to the station – the developer should be asked to put money aside for the pathway in the event that terms can

be agreed with National Rail, and the money returned to the developer if after 5 years if no terms can be agreed.

40. The Ickleton Society objects to the application for the following reasons:
- Loss of Greenfield land.
 - Alteration to character of countryside.
 - The development would not provide new employment to warrant development in the countryside.
 - The applicants should find a more suitable site that has an established industrial use.
 - Vehicles leaving the site to go south will have to go left along the A505 and, unless heading for the A505, are likely to go south via Hunts Road and through Ickleton.
 - The garage is likely to attract new customers from further south resulting in further rat-running through Ickleton and Duxford. To deter this, the applicant should be required to fund the construction of a roundabout at the junction of the A505 and Moorfield Road so that vehicles can turn right onto the A505 from Moorfield Road.
41. 20 letters of support have been received from employees of Welch's. the key points raised are:
- Support the relocation to Moorfield Road, Duxford as the current access to the Granta Terrace site is along a narrow residential road and unsuited to large modern vehicles.
 - The proposed buildings are more appropriate for the needs of 21st century haulage than the current buildings.
 - The new site would improve the operation of the workshop. This would offer employees more job security.
 - The development would remove a large volume of HGV movements from Stapleford and Shelford, and generally enhance the Stapleford environment and reduce noise pollution to existing residents.
 - There is a shortage of skilled industrial jobs. If permission is not granted, Welch's may be forced to close, resulting in the loss of such jobs in the local area.
 - The fact the new site is close to the existing means current employees can still work for the company.
 - The marketplace and recession has placed demands on Welch's to be more efficient in order to remain competitive and to provide improving services to many local businesses that depend on their services in order to succeed. The move to the Duxford site is essential to enable the company to move into its fourth generation.
 - The location of the site on the major road network is ideal.

Material Planning Considerations

Principle of the development/loss of employment

42. The site lies outside any defined village framework and within the countryside. Policy DP/7 states that, outside village frameworks, only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses that need to be located in the countryside will be permitted.

43. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the NPPF require planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Clearly, the proposal represents a departure from the development plan (and has been advertised as such), and it is therefore necessary to consider whether there are any material planning considerations to justify the development in this instance.
44. Paragraphs 5-9 set out Welch's justification for the proposed relocation of the business away from their existing sites in Great Shelford and Stapleford. Officers consider that this justification forms a compelling argument for the relocation of the business, and the significant shortcomings inherent within the existing sites has long been acknowledged by this Authority. In the 1993 Local Plan, the Granta Terrace site was allocated for housing, as the location within a residential area was considered to generate considerable nuisance to surrounding residents, particularly from HGV movements. The redevelopment of the site for housing, together with the relocation of the firm to another site in the District better related to the road network and away from residential areas, was considered to solve the problem. Almost 20 years has lapsed since the Granta Terrace site was allocated for residential purposes and, despite their best efforts, the company has not been able to find any suitable alternative premises in the meantime.
45. Whilst the need for the company to relocate is accepted, it is still necessary to consider whether this proposed site is acceptable in principle. Policies relating to employment development generally aim to steer such development to existing established employment areas and brownfield sites. Applying the sequential process, prior to considering any development of this site acceptable, the Council would need to be satisfied that there are no suitable brownfield sites available that would meet the company's needs. The site selection criteria have been set out in paragraph 8 of this report but, to recap, consist of: the need to be located within 5 miles of the existing premises; a location with easy access from the main primary road network (especially the A505 and M11); and a minimum site area of 2.8 hectares. A checklist showing all alternative sites considered and how they have performed against each of the essential criteria has been submitted with the application and is enclosed as an Appendix to this report. 17 alternative sites have been considered in the South Cambridgeshire area. In total, 8 of these sites are located too far away from employees and clients, and are not sufficiently well-related to the A505 and M11/A14 (these are in Swavesey, Papworth, Longstanton, Over, Fulbourn, and Linton). The remaining closer sites have been discounted for the following reasons:
- Sawston business park – problems of site access, which is compromised by the railway line with the level crossing shut for a significant part of every hour. The site is also much more expensive and requires demolition of existing buildings.
 - Spicers, Sawston - problems of site access, which is compromised by the railway line with the level crossing shut for a significant part of every hour. Also, the buildings are subject to a sale and leaseback and will not be available for 5 years.
 - Cambridge South, Sawston – site does not meet minimum size criteria.
 - Eastern Counties Leather, Pampisford – site does not meet minimum size criteria.
 - Langford Arch and London Road, Pampisford – uncertainties regarding access to the site and financial viability, and inability to deliver the site within the required five year timescale. Owner unable to fund/back the application.
 - Dales Manor Business Park – poor site access, and uncertainties regarding financial viability and deliverability within the required five year timescale.

- Marshalls, Cambridge - uncertainties regarding access to the site and financial viability, and inability to deliver the site within the required five year timescale. Owner unable to fund/back the application.
 - CIBA, Duxford – planning uncertainty and owner unable to fund/back the application.
46. Officers consider that the applicants have carried out an extremely robust and thorough examination of potential alternative sites that have either been on the market or are classified as brownfield land. The company has wanted to move, and has actively been seeking suitable alternative premises, for almost 20 years. It has been made clear by the applicants that the relocation of the business is essential to its survival in South Cambridgeshire. Reading on from this, it can only be assumed that, if an alternative site cannot be secured, there is a distinct possibility that the significant number of local jobs provided by Welch's would be under threat. There would also be a negative spin-off effect for the clients that rely on Welch's for their business. It is therefore imperative that alternative premises are secured for the company, in a location that is close enough to secure the retention of the existing jobs and client base. A key objective of the development plan is to support existing businesses and the rural economy and, given that Welch's have not been able to secure any suitable alternative premises, granting permission for the relocation of the company to this site would be in keeping with this objective.
47. In conclusion, Officers consider that there is sufficient justification to override the normal presumption against the development of land located in the countryside, and hence to support the development of this site in principle as a departure from the development plan.

Visual Impact

48. The land in the immediate vicinity of the site is not open and undeveloped in character. On the opposite side of Moorfield Road to the west is the Volvo Construction Equipment site, which contains commercial buildings used in connection with the service and repair of equipment, whilst immediately to the north are residential dwellings. A short distance to the north-east, on the opposite side of the railway bridge, are a range of buildings including Whittlesford Parkway station, a number of industrial premises and a hotel (Holiday Inn). The buildings would be viewed in the context of, and consolidate, this existing developed area. As such, it is not considered that the development of the site would unduly harm the rural character of the area. Concerns have been raised that the development would fail to provide a clear break between the villages of Duxford and Whittlesford. However, the A505 itself acts as the natural break between the two settlements, and there is a substantial gap between the site and the main part of Duxford village to the south, thereby preventing the development resulting in the coalescence of the two villages.
49. The A505 rises along the northern boundary from west to east, towards the railway bridge, and this creates an embankment along part of the northern side of the site. There are trees and hedges along the A505, whilst there is also established, dense screening to the southern boundary. The site is most prominent from Moorfield Road, and from the junction of the A505 with Moorfield Road, and can also be seen from first floor windows of houses sited on the north side of the A505 within Knight's Orchard. The site has a shape that tapers from west to east and slopes from south to north, and the development has been designed to take account of the site's constraints and topography. The buildings have generally been concentrated towards the western half of the site where the land is deeper and flatter. The main transportation/warehousing building would be sited adjacent to the northern boundary

of the site and set some 50 metres away from the western boundary. It is considered that the rising A505 and resultant high embankment along the northern boundary, together with the additional landscaping proposed along this boundary and in the north-western corner of the site, would help to minimise the visual impact of the development from the north.

Residential amenity including noise issues

50. The site lies in close proximity to residential dwellings on the north side of the A505. The application indicates that the site would operate on a 24-hour basis, and significant concerns have been raised by local residents regarding potential noise disturbance that would arise from activities being carried out on site and from associated vehicle/HGV movements.
51. The application has been accompanied by a noise impact assessment, which concludes that any potential noise impact from the use can be appropriately mitigated. No formal comments have been received to date from the Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO). However, there have been ongoing discussions between the EHO and applicant's consultants, within which the EHO has raised a number of concerns and requested the submission of additional information, to ensure that worst-case scenarios on adjacent residents are considered:
- Additional noise measurements to be undertaken at the nearest residential garden on a Sunday, and to include the hours of 1900-2300 and 2300-0700.
 - Maximum noise levels of lorries pulling away from Moorfield Road onto the A505, and manoeuvring within the site, during the early morning hours.
 - Confirmation regarding the amount of noise reduction that would be achieved by the acoustic fencing.
 - Consideration of whether the acoustic fencing would increase noise levels (ie – echo effect) to dwellings further away in Knight's Orchard, The Moraine and Owl's Close.
52. In response to these concerns, a revised noise impact assessment has been submitted. This concludes that noise levels from proposed activities will not have a significant impact on adjacent dwellings, given that the A505 is already heavily used by HGV's and other vehicles throughout the day and night. The report states the following mitigation measures should be included within the scheme to ensure noise levels are kept to a minimum:
- All loading and unloading of lorries to be undertaken behind the warehouse/under the canopy to ensure screening of dwellings to the north by the building itself.
 - Trailers/lorries that have already been loaded the evening before should be parked in appropriate locations behind the warehouse to ensure movement of vehicles are screened as much as possible when leaving the site between 1900-0700 hours.
 - Good site management should be implemented to ensure that vehicle engines should not be left to idle unnecessarily, particularly at night.
 - Cranes should be parked in appropriate locations behind the warehouse to ensure movement of vehicles is screened as much as possible when leaving site between 1900-0700 hours.
 - No reversing beepers to be used at night. The layout of the site has, in any case, been designed to prevent reversing occurring.
 - Where possible, roller shutter doors that face dwellings should be kept closed when noisy work is being undertaken inside the building.

- Workshops will normally be in use between 0600-1900 only.
 - Fork lift truck movements to load and unload lorries to take place behind the warehouse only, so that they are screened to properties to the north.
 - Lorry wash 1 to only be used between 0700-2300 hours.
 - Lorry wash 2 (near sales and servicing) to only be used between 0600-2300 hours.
 - Where possible, exposed lorry spaces to the north-east of the site should be used between 0700-1900 hours only.
53. The EHO has advised verbally that, further to the above information, the application is considered to be acceptable in principle subject to the imposition of noise related conditions. These will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
54. With regards to the lighting of the site, the application states that the general strategy is to provide the minimum levels required for safe access around the site, with columns and building mounted floodlights designed to illuminate the access road, car park and lorry bay areas only. The details of the final lighting scheme should be required as a condition of any planning permission.

Highway safety

55. The site is bounded by the A505 to the north, and lies adjacent to the staggered junction of the A505 with Whittlesford to the north and Duxford to the south. Significant concerns have been raised by Duxford, Whittlesford and Ickleton Parish Councils, by Councillors Martin and Topping, and by local residents regarding the highway safety implications of the development, as well as to the implications for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. They generally consider that problems inherent with the existing junction design should be addressed by this application, that the speed limit should be reduced from 50mph to 40mph, and that a safer passage across the A505 for pedestrians and cyclists should be designed (whether it be by way of a footbridge or traffic lights). There are also concerns from Duxford and Ickleton Parish Councils that the development would result in vehicles travelling through these villages. This is due to the fact that right hand turns onto the eastbound carriageway of the A505 are prohibited from the southern section of Moorfield Road, thereby meaning that any vehicle wishing to travel southwards would have to turn left onto the A505, and then go around the M11 roundabout and back again.
56. The Local Highways Authority has been consulted on the proposal and has advised that it would object to HGV's using Duxford, Ickleton or Whittlesford as a through route. As a result, any permission would need to be subject to a routing agreement for HGV's (to be agreed as part of a Section 106 Agreement) that would control and prevent the use of these routes by HGV's. The LHA also requested that the site access be redesigned in order to ensure that all large vehicles would turn right out of the site, the submission of a drawing showing visibility splays, and further traffic speed and flow data. An addendum to the Transport Assessment (TA) has been submitted, following consultation and discussion with the LHA, and amended drawings have also been provided.
57. The updated TA has considered and responded to local representations regarding the possible safety of cyclists and pedestrians crossing the A505 at this point, arising from increased pedestrian and cyclist crossing movements and a greater number of vehicles turning into Moorfield Road as a result of the development. The TA submitted with the application predicted the development would result in minimal additional pedestrian and cycling movements, and concluded that improvements to

the existing crossing facilities would not therefore be required or justified as a result of the development. The revised TA identifies the problems with the existing junction as being: faded road markings/hatching; overgrown vegetation restricting visibility of vehicles approaching from the east for pedestrians and cyclists waiting to cross the A505 from the south; and a narrow poorly surfaced footpath on the eastern side of Moorfield Road adjacent to the site. To improve the pedestrian and cycling environment, it is proposed to widen this footpath to provide a 3 metre wide shared cycle/footpath from the existing crossing at the Moorfield Road/A505 junction to the pedestrian/cycle access into the development (a length of some 25 metres). South of this point, it is proposed to widen the existing footpath to 2 metres as far as the access to the sub-station to the south. It is also proposed that the overgrown vegetation restricting visibility at the junction be trimmed back.

58. The revised TA states that the following options, that have been suggested in responses received from the Parish Councils and local residents regarding improvement of the crossing facilities across the A505, have been discussed and explored with the LHA:
- Foot/cycle bridge – this would require extensive ramps and steps on both sides that would create a lengthy diversion to the existing route (encouraging people to cross the road itself). There is limited availability of land on the north side of the A505. Given the limited pedestrian and cyclist flows, and the excellent existing safety record at this junction, the LHA did not consider this option to be appropriate.
 - Controlled crossing – a signalled crossing would cause additional delays on this busy road. The LHA considers such a facility is likely to create an accident issue and is not considered appropriate.
 - Speed camera – A speed camera was previously installed around 300m east of this junction but was removed as it was not needed.
 - Speed reduction from 50mph to 40mph – A reduction in speed limit would be difficult to enforce and not be consistent with other A roads in the area. The limit for this road was reduced from 60mph a few years ago, and a further reduction to 40mph is not recommended by the LHA.
 - Additional signage and road markings – There are a relatively high number of existing signs in the area, and the addition of standard signage is unlikely to improve the existing crossing conditions. It was initially considered that Vehicle Activated Signs could be installed on both the A505 approaches. Due to the good overall accident record at this junction, the LHA stated it would not recommend such signage. However, it would allow them to be installed on the highway if requested by the Parish Council, but the Parish Council would need to be prepared to take the responsibility to maintain them.
59. The formal response of the LHA to the revised TA is presently awaited and will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
60. It should be stressed that highway/pedestrian safety improvements can only be required if the Highways Authority considers that the highway safety implications of the development are such that, in the absence of such improvements, the proposal would be unacceptable. The development cannot be viewed as an opportunity to redress existing perceived problems with the junction arrangement, and, in order to

meet the relevant tests of planning conditions, any required highways improvements must be necessary and relevant to the application development.

61. The site lies within easy walking distance of Whittlesford Parkway station and is therefore in a relatively sustainable location. The north-east corner of the site adjoins the station premises, and the possibility of providing a cycle way through the site has been discussed with Network Rail and the station operator. However, Network Rail has opposed this to date on safety grounds, as the existing platform would need to be extended. In the event that the applicants are able to obtain any agreement from Network Rail in the future, land has been set aside at the southern end of the site that could provide a cycle/footpath link through from Moorfield Road to the station. Whilst this link is certainly desirable, its provision should not be conditioned as part of any permission given that its deliverability is dependent upon the agreement of a third party (and it is clear this may prove irresolvable) and given that the Local Highways Authority has not advised that alternative footpath/cycle path routes are necessary for safety reasons.
62. The application proposes to provide a total of 97 car parking spaces on the site, as well as spaces for HGV's. The Council's parking standards require parking to be provided at a maximum ratio of 1 space per 50 square metres, resulting in a total of 98 spaces, and the level of parking provision is therefore in accordance with policy requirements.

Flood risk/contamination issues

63. The site is located within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3, with the latter (highest risk) affecting the area nearest to the watercourse to the south. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposal and raised concerns regarding the originally submitted Flood Risk Assessment. Following the submission of further information, the Environment Agency has withdrawn its concerns, advising that issues relating to flood risk and potential contamination of ground water can be dealt with by conditions.

Trees/landscaping

64. The application proposes that existing trees along the southern and eastern boundaries (which are subject to a Tree Preservation Order) would be retained. The Trees Officer has not formally commented on the application but was involved in pre-application discussions and raised no in principle objections to the development of the site subject to any development being sited outside the root protection areas of these trees.
65. Any comments received from the Trees and Landscape Design Officers will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.

Ecology

66. The application has been accompanied by an ecological survey, which concludes that a badger sett was identified within the site boundary but that there are no recent signs of any activity. The Council's Ecology Officer has raised no in principle objections to the development of the site but has commented that badgers can return to former sites and that any approval should therefore be subject to a further badger survey being undertaken, as well as to a general scheme of ecological enhancement.
67. A further badger survey has since been undertaken following which the Ecology Officer has raised no objections relating to the protection of badgers, but has

recommended that any consent be subject to a requirement for a repeat badger survey within 30 days prior to commencement. Additionally, a scheme of ecological enhancement and management would secure suitable management of the scrub area and trees adjacent to the stream. These issues can be controlled through conditions of any planning permission.

Archaeology

68. The site lies in an area of high archaeological potential, with evidence suggesting that late Iron Age to early Roman settlement remains may survive in the area. Any consent would therefore need to be subject to a condition requiring a scheme of archaeological investigation to be undertaken.

Sustainability

69. The application proposes that the 10% renewable energy requirements stipulated within LDF Policy NE/3 would be achieved through the extensive use of solar panels to southern facing roof of the main transportation/warehousing building.

Contributions

70. In accordance with the requirements of Policy SF/6 and the Public Art SPD, a contribution towards public art would be required, and this should be secured by way of a Section 106 legal agreement. The applicant's agent has confirmed agreement to this.

Recommendation

71. Subject to no objections being raised by the Local Highways Authority to the additional transport assessment information and revised plans, delegated powers are sought to approve the application (as amended by Health Impact Assessment date stamped 16th October 2012, Transport Assessment Addendum dated 23rd October 2012, Addendum to Badger Survey Report dated 1st November 2012, Noise Impact Assessment date stamped 12th November 2012, and Flood Risk Assessment Rev 2 dated 5th October 2012); and drawing numbers D003-003-D14 and D003-006-2 and D003-010 date stamped 21st November 2012. Any approval would need to be subject to the prior signing of a Section 106 Agreement to include a lorry routing agreement and public art contributions, and to the following conditions.

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
(Reason - To ensure that consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development, which have not been acted upon.)
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: [approved plan numbers to be inserted]
(Reason – To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)
3. The development, hereby permitted, shall not commence until details of all materials to be used for the buildings and hard surfaced areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason – To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory, in accordance with Policy DP/2 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007.)

4. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details before the commencement of and shall thereafter be retained.
(Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the site does not detract from the character of the area in accordance with Policy DP/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
5. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development. The details shall also include specification of all proposed trees, hedges and shrub planting, which shall include details of species, density and size of stock.
(Reason - To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity in accordance with Policies DP/2 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
6. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of five years from the date of the planting, or replacement planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.
(Reason - To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity in accordance with Policies DP/2 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
7. No development shall take place until a scheme of ecological enhancement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the features to be enhanced, recreated and managed for species of local importance both in the course of development and in the future. The scheme shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - To enhance ecological interests in accordance with Policies DP/1, DP/3 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
8. Within thirty days prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved a repeat badger survey shall be undertaken of the site in order to establish the current status of badgers within the site. The findings of the survey shall be provided in writing to the local planning authority prior to commencement of the development to allow written approval of the survey conclusions. No development shall commence without a repeat survey for badger activity within the site.
(Reason - There is a low level of historic badger activity on part of the site. Badgers have the potential to re-use sites and could therefore become active

within the site prior to the commencement of development. Repeat surveys will ensure no conflict arises with the Protection of Badgers Act 1992, in accordance with Policies DP/1, DP/3 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

9. No development shall take place until details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - i) Contractors' access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel;
 - ii) Contractors' site storage area(s) and compounds(s);
 - iii) Parking for contractors' vehicles and contractors' personnel vehicles;Development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason - In the interests of residential amenity and highway safety in accordance with Policies DP/3 and DP/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
10. No external lighting shall be provided or installed within the site other than in accordance with a scheme which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason -To minimise the effects of light pollution on the surrounding area and upon the amenities of adjacent residents in accordance with Policies DP/3 and NE/14 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
11. During the period of construction, no power operated machinery shall be operated on the site before 0800 hours and after 1800 hours on weekdays and 1300 hours on Saturdays, nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays, unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason – To minimise noise disturbance to adjoining residents in accordance with Policy NE/15 of the Local Development Framework 2007.)
12. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme for flood risk mitigation measures in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) reference JF/675007/R62 Rev 2 dated 5 October 2012 by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd. has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.
The scheme shall:-
 1. Demonstrate that appropriate flood risk mitigation will be undertaken to ensure the development is not at risk from flooding.
 2. Provide details of flood risk compensation measures for any development or ground raising within the identified floodplain.
 3. Provide details of landscaping proposals and finished floor and ground levels.(Reason - To ensure the development is not at risk from flooding and flood risk is not increased elsewhere, in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
13. Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include: detailed calculations for any storage requirements. The drainage scheme will need to accommodate the 1 in 100 year critical rainstorm event inclusive of climate change allowances in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); and details

of how the scheme and any proposed structures shall be maintained and managed after completion.

(Reason - To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity, and ensure future maintenance of the scheme is secured, in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

14. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification, the development area below the 1 in 100 year flood contour and the Flood Compensation Area as shown on Drawing 675007/155 Rev P2 dated 27 July 2012 (excepting the commercial buildings approved under this Decision Notice) shall remain sterile with no development, including any extensions, buildings, walls and/or ground raising taking place unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - To ensure the potential floodplain area is exempt from permitted development rights and prevent any increased risk of flooding that would otherwise be caused by a reduction in flood storage capacity or deflection of flood flows, in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
15. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until such time as a scheme to dispose of surface water including trade effluents has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.
(Reason - To ensure the protection of the wider environment, in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
16. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority:
 - 1) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
 - All previous uses
 - Potential contaminants associated with those uses
 - A conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
 - Potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site
 - 2) A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to controlled waters as we are not confident that the initial site investigation sampling and the results of the risk assessment provides sufficient evidence to prove that there is no risk to controlled waters on site
 - 3) The results of the site investigation and detailed quantitative risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
 - 4) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

(Reason - To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the River Cam (or Granta) of the Cam and Ely Ouse including South Level catchment east of the site and the Cam and Ely Ouse Chalk waterbody underlying the site) from potential pollutants in line with Environment Agency Groundwater Protection (GP3:2008) position statements P1-4, and P9-5 to P9-7, and in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

17. No occupation of any part of the permitted development shall take place until a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a "long-term monitoring and maintenance plan") for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan. The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.

(Reason - To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the River Cam (or Granta) of the Cam and Ely Ouse including South Level catchment east of the site and the Cam and Ely Ouse Chalk waterbody underlying the site) from potential pollutants in line with Environment Agency Groundwater Protection (GP3:2008) position statements P9-6 and P9-7. See also Reason 1, and in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

18. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

(Reason - To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the River Cam (or Granta) of the Cam and Ely Ouse including South Level catchment east of the site and the Cam and Ely Ouse Chalk waterbody underlying the site) from potential pollutants in line with Environment Agency Groundwater Protection (GP3:2008) position statements P9-6 and P9-7, and to ensure the development is not at risk from flooding and flood risk is not increased elsewhere, in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

19. Development shall not begin until a scheme for surface water disposal has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Infiltration systems shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.
(Reason - To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters in line with the Environment Agency Groundwater Protection (GP3:2008) position statements P4-1 to P4-12 inclusive. The water environment is potentially vulnerable and there is an increased potential from pollution from inappropriately located and/or designed infiltration sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) such as soakaways,

unsealed porous pavement systems or infiltration basins, and to ensure the development is not at risk from flooding and flood risk is not increased elsewhere, in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

20. Using penetrative methods of foundation design shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters in line with Environment Agency Groundwater Protection (GP3:2008) position statement P10-3. Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods can result in risks to potable supplies from, for example, pollution / turbidity, risk of mobilising contamination, drilling through different aquifers and creating preferential pathways. Thus it should be demonstrated that any proposed piling will not result in contamination of groundwater, and to ensure the development is not at risk from flooding and flood risk is not increased elsewhere, in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

21. No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision and implementation of renewable energy technologies, to provide at least 10% of the predicted energy requirements through renewable energy technology, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason – To ensure that the scheme generates at least 10% of its energy from renewable sources in accordance with Policy NE/3 of the Local Development Framework 2007.)

22. No development shall take place on the application site until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(Reason - To secure the provision of archaeological excavation and the subsequent recording of the remains in accordance with Policy CH/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

23. No buildings shall be occupied until a Travel Plan for both staff and visitors has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To reduce car dependency and to promote alternative modes of travel in accordance with Policy TR/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

Plus any additional conditions required as a result of comments from the Local Highways Authority, Environmental Health Officer and Trees/Landscape Design Officers.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Development Control Policies, adopted July 2007

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy, adopted January 2007
- Supplementary Planning Documents: Trees and Development Sites, Public Art, Biodiversity, Landscape in New Developments, District Design Guide, Health Impact Assessment
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- Circular 11/95
- Planning File References: S/1726/12/FL, S/1725/12/OL, S/1727/12/OL, S/1728/12/OL, S/1726/12/FL, SC/0484/61 and S/1825/90/O.

Case Officer: Lorraine Casey – Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713251