# Greater Cambridge Local Plan

# Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) Consultation - Response Form

Please submit your comments (known as representations) by **5pm** on **Friday 25 September 2026**.

## Data Protection and Freedom of Information

We will treat your data in accordance with our Privacy Notice. All personal information that you provide will be used solely in relation to the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

Please note that each representation and the name of the person or organisation who made the representation, and the name and organisation of the agent (where used), will be published on our website - representations cannot be treated as confidential.

Additionally, respondent details and representation(s) will be made available to the Planning Inspectorate and to the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct the examination.

**By submitting this response form you are agreeing to these conditions.**

## About this Response Form

This response form has two parts:

- Part A – Your details. We cannot formally register your comments without your details.
- Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make. If you need more space to provide your answers, please expand the boxes or continue on an attached separate sheet.

We strongly encourage the submission of representations via our consultation platform at https://consultations.greatercambridgeplanning.org/proposed-submission-greater-cambridge-local-plan If you are unable to submit your representation using our online system, this response form is available to downloaded to complete electronically from www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/local-plan.

Your completed response form should be:

- emailed to localplan@greatercambridgeplanning.org, or
- posted to: Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Policy Team, South Cambridgeshire District Council, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, Cambridge, CB23 6EA

If you are having difficulty submitting your comments, please contact localplan@greatercambridgeplanning.org or call 01954 713694.

## Part A: Your Details

| **Information required** | **Personal details *** | **Agent's details (if applicable)** |
|---|---|---|
| Name | | Ryan Caldon |
| Organisation (where relevant) | | Knight Frank |
| Job Title (where relevant) | | Principal Planner |
| Address, including Post Code | | [redacted] |
| Telephone | | |
| Email address | | [redacted] |

* If you have appointed an agent to represent you, you only need to complete the Name and Organisation (if applicable) under Personal Details, but you do need to complete the full details of the agent. All correspondence will be sent to the agent.

## Part B: Your Representation

Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation.

**Section 1: Which document, and section of that document, does your representation relate to?**

| **Document** | **Policy / Paragraph / Site / Map** (please identify) |
|---|---|
| Proposed Submission Greater Cambridge Local Plan | See attached representation |
| Proposed Submission Policies Map | N/A |
| Sustainability Appraisal | N/A |
| Habitats Regulations Assessment | N/A |

**Section 2: Do you consider that the Greater Cambridge Local Plan is sound and legally compliant?**

| **Test** | **Yes / No** |
|---|---|
| Legally compliant | No |
| Sound | No |

**Section 3: Your representation**

**Please set out and explain your comments.** Please be as precise as possible, and please do not just refer to an attached supporting document(s). For your representation (comments) to be considered, your representation must be set out here. Wherever possible, set out precisely any changes you think should be made to the plan and its policies.

On behalf of Huawei (hereinafter 'our Client' / 'the Landowner'), we write to set out formal representations to the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan (Regulation 19). These representations follow the submission of the landholdings in Sawston, Cambridgeshire (hereinafter 'the Site') in January 2026 and refer to the planning history of the Site. A Site Location Plan is provided at **Appendix 1** for clarity.

**Appendix 1**

In summary, these representations support the principle of the preparation and production of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. However, there are changes required to the draft Local Plan to ensure compliance with the NPPF in relation to soundness. Specifically, the evidence supports the allocation and ultimate redevelopment of the 'Former Spicers Site' for employment development but does not adequately justify the specific constraints imposed by Policy S/RSC/FSS.

As a consequence, these representations seek to release the constraints imposed in Policy S/RSC/FSS in relation to the:

- Range of employment uses;
- Developable extent of the allocation; and
- Division of the site by the green line associated with the Borough Hill Scheduled Ancient Monument ('SAM').

The effect of these constraints is to impact the deliverability of the site for employment use, thereby impacting the economic potential of the Site. As a consequence, these constraints mean that the tests of positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy are incapable of being evidenced.

These representations have been prepared having reviewed the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan and its associated evidence base; the site context; the planning history of the

site; and other submissions made to the Council in the course of promotion of the site for employment development.

The specific matters that we comment upon within these representations are limited to those directly relevant to the draft allocation of the Site under Policy S/RSC/FSS. As such, these representations do not purport to respond to any wider issues arising with the framing, content or compliance of the wider policies or evidence base of the draft Local Plan. As a consequence, our Client reserves the right to comment on other policies in future stages of consultation on the draft Local Plan. These representations should not be considered as supportive of any policies or evidence base documents that are not commented on.

## The Site – Description and Planning Context

### Description

The Site as a whole comprises over 200 hectares (over 500 acres) of land including Sawston Business Park, vacant agricultural buildings, agricultural land, and woodland. The Site is split in two parcels by the Cambridgeshire to London railway line.

Within the central part of the Site is Sawston Business Park which comprises a collection of commercial buildings providing approximately 46,500sq.m (500,000sq.ft) floorspace. Of this, approximately two thirds of the floorspace is occupied with the remaining floorspace providing an opportunity for development to deliver jobs and economic growth opportunities for the area.

The Site lies to the west of Sawston Village and to the north of Whittlesford Village. The highway network connects from the A1301 to Sawston (Cambridge Road), which also includes the main cycle route running from the village to Cambridge. The M11 is accessed in under 10 minutes by vehicles via A-roads. It is a strategically well-located Site with a broad potential catchment.

It is a long established and attractive location for employment growth, being located in close proximity to two train stations, 2.4 miles to Whittlesford Parkway to the south and 2.1 miles to Shelford Station to the north and Cambridge located approximately 6 miles to the north of the Site.

The majority of the Site is located within the Green Belt with Sawston Business Park inset from the Green Belt.

## Planning Context

The planning history of the site forms an important part of the context for these representations. In summary, the substantive planning history that is relevant to the consideration of the Site through the Local Plan process is identified below:

- **S/0750/01/F** I Warehouse with Ancillary Offices. **Granted 24 Apr 2004**
- **S/0108/09/F** | Phase 1 - Development of Sawston Business Park for Mixed B1(c) B2 & B8 Scheme & Associated Infrastructure & Landscaping Work. **Granted 22 Apr 2009**
- **S/0069/09/O** | Phase 2 - Redevelopment of Land at Sawston Business Park for a Mixed B1(c) B2 B8 Scheme and Associated Infrastructure. **Granted 22 Apr 2009**
- **S/0680/15/FL** | Change of use from B8 to B2 use class and associated alterations to the Vision Centre including additional fenestration internal floorspace extension installation of plant and external works. **Granted 03 Sep 2015**
- **S/0158/20/FL** I Demolition of 582sq.m (GIA) storage building (B8 Use Class) and erection of 50,445sq.m (GIA) of research and development accommodation (B1(b) Use Class), including ancillary accommodation and broken down as follows: (i) Office accommodation (9,503sq.m); (ii) Wafer fabrication (FAB) cleanroom (22,351sq.m); (iii) Single level basement incorporating 284 no. car parking spaces (9,417sq.m); (iv) Central Utilities Building (8,694sq.m); (v) External storage building (480sq.m); (vi) Cycle parking spaces (80 for staff and 6 for visitors, total 86); (vii) Surface, disabled and visitor car parking (16 spaces) adjacent to the office building entrance; (viii) Access and circulation roads, engineering works and footpaths / cycleways; (ix) Drainage and servicing infrastructure; and (x) Hard and soft landscaping. **Granted 14 Aug 2020**

Significantly, the planning permission for the erection of 50,445sq.m employment floorspace development is considered material to the draft Local Plan. The planning application, while it has lapsed, was accompanied by comprehensive, clear and compelling evidence. Specifically, the application included detailed and site-specific evidence on the effects of the proposals on the site and surrounding area. This included detailed assessment of the historic environment and ultimately concluded with the decision to grant planning permission.

## Material Considerations in the Plan-Making Process

The planning permission (now lapsed, under S/0158/20/FL) for the erection of 50,445sq.m employment floorspace was subject to full and rigorous assessment through the usual process. This culminated in the review of the application by officers of South Cambridgeshire District Council and the preparation of an officer report ('OR') to the Planning Committee on 25 June 2020 (see **Appendix 2**). The application was approved by nine votes in favour to one, subject to the completion of the Section 106 agreement and the variation of two conditions that had been proposed in the officer report. These conditions related to Natural England and re-use and recycling. They did not relate to heritage matters, or specifically the Borough Hill SAM.

**Appendix 2**

The minute of the meeting of the Planning Committee on 25 June 2020 (see Appendix 3) records that the debate about the planning application was focused on matters listed below, which expressly excluded any debate about heritage or the Borough Hill SAM:

- Water supply issues, including potential impact on the water table
- Landscaping and design
- Concern about the apparent lack of cycling connectivity with nearby villages, although officers explained that current proposals were proportionate to the application being considered, and that further opportunities would arise in future as the site was developed
- Biodiversity issues that had been addressed by statutory consultees
- Clarification that the proposal site was not in the Green Belt
- Prematurity
- The need for a Masterplan
- Issues surrounding 'high end' employment, housing, and sustainable transport

**Appendix 3**

The OR correctly recorded that Historic England did not object to the proposed development and summarised the representation as follows [OR55]:

*"Broadly support the changes to the revised landscape along the access road which is adjacent to the monument stating that it will help soften the transition between the monument and the hard edge of the proposed buildings. Also broadly supports the approach to the proposed Conservation Management and Community Outreach Plan, setting out that the document has been developed further following previous HE advice and that, implemented in full, the Plan will result in the enhanced management of the monument, long-term conservation of its significance and greater accessibility for public access and interpretation. Recommends the key proposals of the Conservation Management and Community Outreach Plan be secured by S106 agreement and welcomes the applicant's commitment with this approach. Raises concerns over the landscape and biodiversity proposals for the site, whilst acknowledging that the management improvements to the SAM will result in the creation of a new habitat, which is supported. Nevertheless, HE recommends that the Technical Note on BNG is revised to note any works to the SAM area will require further statutory consents and to cross-reference the Conservation Management and Community Outreach Plan. Further, HE requires drawings are revised to reflect the need for further consents necessary to any works being done in the SAM area, and for the proposals for woodland in the area to be clarified/ reconsidered. Reiterates the need for a condition to be imposed to any permission granted, ensuring an archaeological programme is undertaken in the area."*

It went on to confirm that the Historic Environment Team (Cambridgeshire County Council) also recorded no objection to the proposals, with the summary of the feedback being [OR56]:

*"Welcomes the applicant's consideration of the heritage and its setting within this landholding. Welcomes the submission of a draft Archaeological Conservation Management and Community Outreach Plan (ACMCOP) and supports the policies (1-12) for the scheduled monument shown in the current ACMCOP, noting it encapsulates previous discussions including with CCC Historic Environment team. Recommends that the ACMCOP is modified to indicate that it is an Estate-wide management, with a special section that addresses the specific restoration and management of Borough Hill Marsh Fort. The LEMP should cross refers to this estate management plan to ensure that all assets are suitably protected when threatened by groundworks. Recommends that the long-term management and conservation*

*plans to protect and enhance heritage assets are secured through S106 agreement and an archaeological condition be imposed, with respective informative. The S106 should indicate that it applies to an archaeological management strategy for the whole of the Huawei estate and not be restricted to the scheduled monument at its heart. Therefore, the title of the ACMCOP document should be altered to reflect this."*

The OR also correctly recorded the following matters of significance:

- The site lies within an Established Employment Area (EEA), as designated by Policy E/15 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018), where appropriate development for employment will be permitted. The EEAs are identified outside the Green Belt; however Policy E/15 (3) requires permission be refused where there would be a negative impact on the surrounding countryside or landscape character [OR70]
- The proposal for the erection of 50,445sq.m of B1(b) of commercial research and development floorspace in this EEA location fulfils expectations of Policy E/15 given the nature of the proposed use to the buildings, which will employ between 350 and 400 people during operation, as set out in the submission documents [OR71]
- Whilst acknowledged the proposed development would have a visual impact particularly in the immediate surroundings, the buildings are considered to sit well in the landscape context, and their design to be reflective of the surrounding countryside and their employment use. In fact, the proposals are considered to deliver an improved quality of design to the built environment of this EEA, with a much-reduced negligible impact on the surrounding landscape from distant views [OR72]
- The area between the courtyard and the SAM has been revised to reflect landscape comments and response from Historic England and the County Archaeologist. This area now provides a softer transition in landscape terms between the scheduled monument and the site, with wildflower mix proposed along the 3m wide planted edge between the access road and the cycle/footway to reinforce the transition. Fagus sylvatica will be planted to the south of the cycle/footway, where it is not constrained by the planter width, combined with groups of Acer campestre, in the proposed green area at the entrance of the courtyard. This is accepted by the Council's Landscape advisor and supported by Historic England. No specific comments were made by the County Council Archaeologist following revision of this part of the on-site landscaped area [OR92]

- The Planning Statement submitted with the application sets out that Huawei intends to redevelop the former Spicers site as a whole over a number of phases and that the quantum and form of any future development of the wider site is yet to be determined in detail. However, further consideration has been given to how the development of the wider site may come forward in the future to ensure that the current proposals would integrate well with further development of the wider estate [OR97]
- Accordingly, an illustrative masterplan and a series of parameter plans have been provided within Section 2 of the submitted DAS to indicate how the wider redevelopment of the site could be organised in the future. Whilst the plans submitted are not for approval and therefore will not be considered with this application, the information submitted with the DAS provide a current understanding of the future redevelopment potential. As such, officers are satisfied that it demonstrates the proposal has taken a comprehensive and inclusive approach in relation to the development potential of the wider estate [OR98]

The OR considered the matters relating to the Historic Environment in paragraphs OR109-118, with the review of the designated assets in OR109-115 and the review of non-designated assets in OR116-117, ultimately concluding at OR118. Within this assessment, it was established that:

- Overall officers are of the view that the proposed ACoMPCOP will contribute to remove factors causing risk to the SAM and represents potential for permanent improvements to the asset's management and conservation, with correspondent increase in access and knowledge by the public in general. In further correspondence dated 5 May 2020, Historic England has stated that the draft ACoMPCOP including all the proposed actions and if secured by a S106 agreement can provide the elements of a public benefit needed to outweigh the harm as set out by paragraph 196 of the NPPF. This is agreed and planning obligations to be set out in a S106 agreement are recommended accordingly [OR115]
- Overall, the proposals raised no objection from Historic England and the County Council's Archaeologist and are considered that management of the SAM through the establishment of the ACoMPCOP with programme for further archaeological investigations on and around the site and SAM setting will contribute to the assets' conservation in a manner appropriate to their significance. Further, the community outreach element of the ACoMPCOP will enable the enjoyment of the SAM by the

public, for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations. It is considered that the direct benefits from the proposals to the designated and non-designated assets on and around the site outweigh any harm caused to these assets and, in balance, the proposal is acceptable in terms of the NPPF and Policy NH/14 of the Local Plan [OR118]

The OR considered the planning balance at OR196-202 and confirmed that the harms identified with the proposed development had been fully and properly evaluated and it is established that they were outweighed by the planning benefits that the scheme would bring. [OR197 – note the errata sheet issued prior to the Planning Committee corrected the error in the weighting of the heritage harm in the original drafting]

These planning benefits were identified in the subsequent paragraphs, with the principal benefit identified in OR198 which confirmed that "*Substantial economic benefits locally will result from the proposed development, through the employment of between 350 and 400 people directly during operation only*". This did not need to consider secondary or tertiary employment matters, but it is clear that the Council considered the employment of this quantum would provide 'substantial benefits'.

In summary, the 2020 planning permission demonstrates that a substantial employment development, extending beyond the area now shown as developable in Figure 80, was capable of being found acceptable following detailed assessment. Neither Historic England nor the County Council Archaeologist sought the imposition of an absolute development boundary equivalent to the proposed green line. Instead, the effects upon the Scheduled Monument and its setting were addressed through scheme-specific design, landscaping, archaeological investigation, long-term management and planning obligations. This provides material evidence that a flexible, criteria-based policy approach is available and that the permanent spatial restriction shown in Figure 80 has not been adequately justified. Nor would it allow the allocation to deliver its full employment potential and range of economic benefits, which were established as public benefits of the 2020 planning permission.

### Engagement in the Plan-Making Process

The Site has been submitted to the Council through the call-for-sites process (via submissions dated 30 January 2026), which identified the potential of the land owned by

our client as a whole. As the Site forms only part of the wider landholding, we consider that the draft allocation misses an opportunity to build on the principles established in the planning application and the opportunity to deliver on the wider growth and economic ambitions of the draft Local Plan.

In the context of the approach to date to the allocation of the site in both the previous draft Local Plan (December 2025) and Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, our Client had a legitimate expectation that the Council would not seek to impose the restrictions it has done in the current draft Local Plan. It was noted that the December 2025 draft contained a material inconsistency between the two stated capacity figures (approximately 40,000sq.m in the draft allocation and around 50,000sq.m in the supporting text). However, nothing foreshadowed the current approach.

The draft allocation in the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan is reported in the Consultation Statement to have attracted eight representations, comprising one objection and seven comments. The detail of these representations does not appear to be available to view, but our Client does not consider that the matters raised in these representations contained sufficient evidence to support the restrictions proposed within the draft allocation.

### Adopted Development Plan

The adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan sets out the strategy and policies to guide development in the area until 2031. Policy S/1 (Vision) sets out the broad vision for South Cambridge to "*be the best place to live, work and study in the country.*" In seeking to achieve this, it is critical that the draft Local Plan reflects on this aspiration, reviews how the adopted plan performed in seeking to deliver on the vision and how it can be maintained.

The Site is identified in the adopted Development Plan as an Established Employment Site, allocated under Policy E/15 (2k) which permits redevelopment and appropriate employment development. It precluded development that would result in "*a negative impact on the surrounding countryside, or landscape character*".

It is significant that the area of allocation under Policy E/15 (2k) includes an area identified as falling within the Borough Hill SAM.

The Site is clearly capable of accommodating significant areas of new employment development to deliver jobs and economic growth.

### Requirements of the NPPF 2024

The NPPF requires Local Plans to be:

- Succinct and up to date [15]
- Prepared positively in a way that is aspirational but deliverable [16]
- Shaped by effective engagement between plan-makers and businesses [16]
- Clearly written and unambiguous [16]
- Serve a clear purpose [16]
- Underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence [32]
- Focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies and take into account relevant market signals [32]
- Sound [36]

For the reasons identified in these representations, the draft Local Plan as drafted fails to adequately address and embrace the requirements of the NPPF in this regard.

In addition to the above, Section 6 of the NPPF sets out the aspirations of the planning system in relation to the delivery of a strong competitive economy. The content of this section of the NPPF focuses on the significance of helping to create conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt, requiring significant weight to be placed on the need to support economic growth.

Paragraph 86 requires planning policies to, inter alia, pay particular regard to facilitating development to meet the needs of a modern economy, seek to address potential barriers to investment and be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the Plan.

### The draft Regulation 19 Local Plan

The draft Regulation 19 Local Plan confirms, inter alia, that development proposals will be decided against all relevant policies of the Plan [1.36]; the Plan will support a flourishing, dynamic and mixed economy in Greater Cambridge which includes a wide range of jobs

[2.4]; will seek to deliver the 73,300 additional jobs identified as the objectively assessed need [Policy S/JH]; and will support economic growth and productivity [2.8].

In seeking to achieve this it is clearly critical that the policies of the Plan do not artificially constrain or reduce the capacity of sustainable development sites to deliver on these goals and objectives.

Paragraphs 2.10 to 2.12 identify the nature and scale of the job growth and the evidence base upon which the objectively assessed needs is based. It is important to note that within this, the evidence base identified a higher growth forecast than that being pursued in the Plan, which demonstrates that there is capacity to go significantly beyond what is proposed in the draft Local Plan.

Paragraphs 2.68 to 2.71 inclusive set out the high-level 'Employment strategy' for the draft Local Plan. It is notable that this strategy seeks to direct life sciences and ICT to specific locations, mid-tech space (Use Classes E(g)/B2/B8) allocations on the edge of the urban area and logistics floorspace (Use Classes B2/B8) to two substantial new allocations and several mixed-use allocations.

The Site is not identified in this high-level strategy, but it is noted that the restricted range of employment uses proposed within the draft allocation does not accord with the strategy in principle due to the location of the site. To accord with the strategy in principle, the draft allocation should not seek to constrain the form of development that can be accommodated within it.

The rural southern cluster is identified at Section 3.4 of the draft Local Plan. This confirms that the ambition is to support and grow this successful and nationally important business cluster by providing more business space where needed. [3.4.2]

The draft allocation of the Site is set out in Policy S/RSC/FSS Former Spicers Site, Sawston Business Park, Sawston. It identifies capacity for "*approximately 40,000 square metres gross internal area of employment floorspace including research and development E(g)(ii) floorspace with the potential for additional floorspace in future phases subject to future exploration of capacity including evidence of suitable site access.*" It then proposes a series of criteria against which development proposals will be assessed.

Our Client supports the allocation of the site for employment use in the Local Plan. However, it does not support the drafting of the policy, on the basis that it is both unduly restrictive and unnecessarily complex. In the context of the existing levels of built development at the Site (approx. 46,500sq.m), its recent planning history, the evidence to support the previous planning approvals and the historic allocation, it is not considered that the form of the draft allocation meets the requirements of the NPPF, specifically the needs to ensure the Plan is 'prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable', sufficiently clear and unambiguous and serving a clear purpose in line with Paragraphs 16, 32 and 36.

With specific reference to the planning history of the site, this confirms that the Council accepted as recently as 2020 that the site can support the development of 50,445sq.m (GIA) across a range of different uses. The draft Local Plan does not provide any clear or coherent evidence base to demonstrate why the proposed restrictions in the draft allocation. What is required at the Site, which is consistent with the extant allocation and planning history, is a careful, evidence-led management of development near the Borough Hill SAM, including an application-specific assessment of the necessary stand-off and controls over physical works. It does not require the application of restrictions as set out in the draft allocation.

To clarify, the evidence base for the draft Local Plan does not support, and does not even purport to support:

- Any form of confinement of the acceptable uses to a narrowly defined R&D or life-sciences use;
- The exclusion of other parts of the 'Former Spicers Estate';
- The Borough Hill SAM or its setting requires the site to be divided by an arbitrary green line that risks becoming a 'fixed feature' if the allocation is carried forward in its current form;
- That the land on one side of that line is developable while all land on the other side must remain undeveloped, as there is no defined 'line' that determines the setting of the Borough Hill SAM or its setting, or that sensitive treatment of development within the setting should be precluded.

Furthermore, the use of the arbitrary green line within the draft allocation has not been supported by heritage evidence relating to significance, effect, harm, mitigation and enhancement, or the weighting of harm against public benefits. It is not appropriate or deliverable to introduce a mapped line in the draft allocation that could be treated as an absolute constraint to development.

As an alternative, the draft allocation should be amended to remove the green line and to identify a wider form of development that can be accommodated. We recommend that this is framed in similar wording to the below, which would be supported in principle by our Client and justified by the context and evidence base:

> "*Employment-led development, including research and development, laboratories, offices, advanced manufacturing, innovation and other compatible employment-generating uses, together with ancillary and complementary uses necessary to create a sustainable employment campus*."

In place of the arbitrary green line, our Client would be willing to accept the insertion of additional policy wording to the effect that:

> "*Development must conserve the significance of Borough Hill Scheduled Monument, including those elements of its setting which contribute to its significance. Proposals should be informed by an up-to-date archaeological and heritage assessment and should demonstrate an appropriate built form and layout, access and movement, open space and landscaping. Physical works within or close to the scheduled boundary will require early engagement with the Council and Historic England*."

It would also be appropriate and in line with the wider strategy and policies of the draft Local Plan and the requirements of the NPPF to delete Figure 80.

### Conclusion

Our Client supports the principle of the preparation of the draft Local Plan, and broadly agrees with the vision and objectives of delivering development to support the needs of the area, including the provision of high-quality economic and employment growth. In particular, the Client supports the principle of the allocation of the 'Former Spicers Site' under Policy S/RSC/FSS for employment.

However, the wording of policies of the draft Local Plan, including S/RSC/FSS, require further detailed consideration as to the soundness and deliverability implications that they present. These policies should be amended to ensure they are sound and provide for deliverable development to be brought forward. They need to be amended to ensure they are clear for future developers and decision-makers and to avoid any restrictions, which are not absolutely necessary, are allowed to endure. Restrictions risk preventing the delivery of economic growth and employment potential over the Plan period where there is a significant shortfall at present.

Therefore, we consider that the draft Local Plan in its current form, would not pass the tests of soundness in the NPPF. Once amended, the draft Local Plan is capable of being found to be sound.

While we comment on a number of specific policies within these representations, our Client reserves the right to comment on other policies contained within the draft Local Plan at future consultation stages. These representations should not be read as being supportive of any policies that have not been commented on.

We also confirm that our Client wishes to appear at the Local Plan Examination in Public in due course, to further address the matters raised within these representations.

Should you have any queries or require further information at this stage, please contact David Churchill via email:

[redacted]

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

**Knight Frank**

**Please provide a 100 word summary of your representation.**

The representation is set out above.

**Section 4: Supporting Documents**

**If you are submitting any supporting documents with your representation, such as maps or further evidence documents, please provide a list.**

Appendix 1. Land at Sawston - Red Line Promap 1
Appendix 2. Officer Report to Committee S015820FL
Appendix 3. Minute of 25062020 Planning Committee

**Section 5: Proposed Modifications**

**Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Greater Cambridge Local Plan legally compliant and sound.**

You will need to say why each modification will make the Greater Cambridge Local Plan legally compliant or sound. Please put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or paragraph, being as precise as possible.

| |
|---|
| The proposed modifications are set out in the above representation. |

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to justify your representation and any proposed modification(s), as there will not be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations other than at the invitation of the Inspector during the Examination process.

**Section 6: Participation at the Examination**

**If you are proposing a modification to the Greater Cambridge Local Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the examination hearings?**

| **Examination** | **Yes / No** |
|---|---|
| Participate at the hearing sessions | Yes |

**If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.**

| |
|---|
| For the reasons set out in the above representation. |


**Please note:** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in Examination hearing sessions. You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

**Section 7: Being Kept Informed**

**Would you like to be kept informed of the progress of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan through to adoption?**

| **Notifications** | **Yes / No** |
|---|---|
| Informed of submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State for independent Examination | Yes |
| Informed of the publication of the Inspector's recommendations following the Examination of the Local Plan | Yes |
| Informed of adoption of the Local Plan | Yes |

Land at Sawston




Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION
© Crown Copyright and database rights 2026. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:14000. Paper Size – A4

Land at Sawston (ownership boundary for indicative purposes)

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee 25 June 2020

AUTHORS: Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

Application Number: S/0158/20/FL

Parish(es): Sawston

Proposal: Demolition of 582 sq.m (GIA) storage building (B8 Use Class) and erection of 50,445 sq.m (GIA) of research and development accommodation (B1(b) Use Class), including ancillary accommodation and broken down as follows: (i) Office accommodation (9,503 sq.m); (ii) Wafer fabrication (FAB) cleanroom (22,351 sq.m); (iii) Single level basement incorporating 284 no. car parking spaces (9,417 sq.m); (iv) Central Utilities Building (8,694 sq.m); (v) External storage building (480 sq.m); (vi) Cycle parking spaces (80 for staff and 6 for visitors, total 86); (vii) Surface, disabled and visitor car parking (16 spaces) adjacent to the office building entrance; (viii) Access and circulation roads, engineering works and footpaths / cycleways; (ix) Drainage and servicing infrastructure; and (x) Hard and soft landscaping.

Site address: Former Spicers Site Sawston Bypass Sawston Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB22 3JG

Applicant(s): Huawei Research & Development (UK) Ltd

Recommendation: Approve Full Application subject to completion of the S106 Agreement and conditions.

Key material considerations:

Development of employment floorspace on Established Employment Area (Policy E/15)

High-quality design

Sustainability of Design and Construction

Improvements to sustainable travel network

Enhancement of the significance of the Borough Hillfort scheduled monument

Enhancement of ecology and biodiversity

The Planning Balance

Committee Site Visit: No

Departure Application: No

Presenting Officer: Yole Medeiros (Strategic Sites)

Application brought to Committee because: The application is significant and/or of strategic importance to an area beyond both specific site and parish; Linton Parish Council requests the application to be considered by Planning Committee.

Date by which decision due: 16 July 2020

Executive Summary

1. Permission was granted for the site in 2004, for the erection of 15,044m2 of warehouses with ground and first floor plus a mezzanine and ancillary offices (ref. S/0750/01/F). The approved building would be 11.25m high, counted from the finished floor level at ground floor. The ground floor would be an open plan with 12 unloading bays to the eastern elevation, with further 8 lorry parking spaces south of the building and 84 car parking spaces distributed to the northeast, east and southeast of the building. Access would be given via the existing southern route and level crossing at the A1301. On correspondence dated 6 May 2009 the Council confirmed the permission had been implemented, however officers' site visit confirm it has not been completed to date.

2. In 2019 the applicants submitted a new application for full planning permission (ref. S/2122/19/FL) to erect a 28,954m2 (GIA) of B1(b) use (research and development), raising several concerns. These related primarily to the visual and landscape impact due to the proposed rigid massing and building heights, and further issues relating with the transport assessment, the approach to the scheduled monument conservation and biodiversity. The current application was prepared following withdrawal of application S/2122/19/FL and pre-application process discussing these principal matters and additional aspects of sustainability, water environment and environmental health.

3. The operational requirements of a rigid rectangular footprint and building heights did not change and drove most of the architectural proposal, however in the current application creating a high-quality building, with a series of six bays which forms the well-articulated roof design and a much more sympathetic building in its context. The finishing materials were carefully chosen and the matt finishing colour

to the roof help reduce the visual impact, as the cladding and limestone applied to the elevations.

4. The architecture of the building considered elements of the sustainable design hierarchical approach and includes features to reduce energy demand, with a bespoke Sustainability Assessment Matrix being produced for the proposed development. The building will recover heat use from its own operational process to provide all the heating and hot water demand for the building. The use of photovoltaics will provide approximately 11% of the energy demand for the building. Overall, 25% of the building emissions will be reduced, which equates to a BREEAM 'excellent' accreditation on these topics. The proposal is for a target water recovery of 40%, equates to 3 BREEAM water efficiency credits, above current policy requirements.

5. During the application assessment further discussions have taken place regarding underground water contamination and water demand, which have all been satisfied. Infrastructure to secure foul water drainage will be secured through agreement with Anglian Water and be delivered with the development of the site. Further transport measures, including a Travel Plan to reduce the use of the private car and the implementation of a foot/cycle path crossing the wider landholding in the east-west direction are further benefits with the development of this site. Improvements to the A1301/Mill Lane junction will contribute to safety of pedestrians and cyclists accessing the site, as will the introduction of a flare to the northern arm of the A1301/A505 roundabout.

6. The proposal includes measures for the conservation and management of the Borough Hill (Marsh) fort Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM), with potential increase of public access to the monument. This is proposed with the establishment of an Archaeological Conservation Management Plan and a Community Outreach Plan (ACMPCOP), considered a step change for keeping the significance of this rare historic asset and another benefit brought by the development of the site.

7. The visual impacts are in a considerable extent mitigated by the measures included in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), which will add the benefit of off-site biodiversity gains with the creation of important habitats in this

context. The views from A1301 and from the Magog Hills demonstrate that the proposed buildings will in fact have lesser impact than the existing buildings. From Whittlesford Road and bridleway 199/3 further north-west, where the buildings will be visible the roof silhouette help identify this Established Employment Area (EEA), without being overbearing in the landscape and being responsive to the rural context.

8. The proposed research and development use responds to the designation of the site, as approximately 350 to 400 people will be directly employed considering operation phase only, resulting in significant economic benefits locally and regionally. Having carried out the planning balance, the positive benefits of the proposals demonstrably outweigh any harm arising from the proposals and the proposals will be of high quality and will exemplify the approach for the delivery of this employment area in Sawston.

9. Reference must be made to the future development of the wider Huawei landholding (with 530 acres in total) of which the application site is part. Whilst this wider landholding will facilitate the implementation of several mitigation and enhancement measures for transport, and the natural and historic environments, the further development of the wider landholding is not subject of this application and any information provided within the submitted documents are for illustration only.

Relevant Planning History

S/0750/01/F Warehouse with Ancillary Offices. Permission granted 23 April 2004

S/0674/19/E1 24,000m2 of commercial floorspace which includes 6000m2 office space (B1(a)) and cleanroom/ research and development (B1 (b)) and ancillary uses at Former Spicers Site, Sawston, Cambridgeshire. EIA is required 26 March 2019

S/1471/19/E2 21,400m2 of commercial floorspace which includes 6000m2 for office use (B1(a)) and the remainder for cleanroom/ research and development (B1(b)). EIA Scoping Report Issued 20 May 2019

S/2122/19/FL Full application for 28,954m2 (GIA) of research and development (B1(b)) use including ancillary office accommodation, clean room, support space, plant and equipment: two level basement incorporating 406 car parking spaces (14,314m2 GIA); central utilities building (5,245m2 GIA); an external storage building (480m2 GIA); cycle parking, surface disabled and visitor car parking (16 spaces), access, drainage and servicing infrastructure and associated landscaping. Withdrawn

Reference (County Council) Description Decision

None identified

Relevant Planning Policy

10. National Guidance and Legislation:

Town and County Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended)

Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (2017) (as amended)

Climate Act 2008 (as amended)

Equalities Act 2010 (as amended)

National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide

11. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan - Adopted September 2018

S/1: Vision

S/2: Objectives of the Local Plan

S/3: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

S/5: Provision of New Jobs and Homes

CC/1: Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change

CC/3: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments

CC/4: Water Efficiency

CC/6: Construction Methods

CC/7: Water Quality

CC/8: Sustainable Drainage Systems

CC/9: Managing Flood Risk

HQ/1: Design Principles

HQ/2: Public Art and New Development

NH/2: Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character

NH/4: Biodiversity

NH/6: Green Infrastructure

NH/8: Mitigating the impact of development in and adjoining the Green Belt

NH/14: Heritage Assets

E/10: Shared Social Spaces in Employment Areas

E/15: Established Employment Areas

SC/2: Health Impact Assessment

SC/9: Lighting

SC/10: Noise Pollution

SC/11: Contaminated Land

SC/12: Air Quality

SC/13: Hazardous Installations

SC/14: Odour and Other Fugitive Emissions to Air

TI/2: Planning for Sustainable Travel

TI/3: Parking Provision

TI/6: Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone

TI/8: Infrastructure and New Developments

T/10: Broadband

12. South Cambridgeshire and further Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) and material considerations:

Trees & Development Sites SPD - January 2009

Landscape in New Developments SPD - March 2010

Biodiversity SPD - July 2009

District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010

Health Impact Assessment SPD - March 2011

Sustainable Design and Construction - January 2020

Sawston Village Design Guide - January 2020

Air Quality Action Plan 2009

Cambridgeshire RECAP Waste Management Design Guide - February 2012

Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD - November 2018

Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth 2008

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment - November 2010

Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy 2011

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan 2011

13. Paragraph 48 of the NPPF sets out the weight that may be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, including Neighbourhood Plans, stating that when determining planning applications the stage at which a particular plan has reached and what objections have been made to policies within in the plan will be considered. A neighbourhood area for Sawston has been designated by South Cambridgeshire District Council on 14 June 2018 and the Neighbourhood Plan is currently being prepared. At this pre-submission stage, Sawston Neighbourhood Plan has not been tested against the basic conditions and may not be legally compliant, therefore no weight has been given to the Plan while assessing the current application.

Application Site

14. The application site is part of the former Spicers Site in Sawston, with approximately 6.3 hectares (ha), mostly comprising an area of cleared land with further areas including the access roads to the site entrance and peripheral grading and landscaping areas. The site is also part of a Huawei's landholding of approximately 530 acres, which will be referred along this report as the 'wider estate'.

15. The immediate context of the site is formed by a developed area to the east with large scale industrial and commercial buildings, also part of Huawei's wider estate and associated with the former use of the site. To the south the site is marked by an existing agricultural field, and the western and northern boundaries are framed by mature trees identified as deciduous woodland (Priority Habitat Inventory) and protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO), which extends to the central part of the site. An existing drainage system is located within the woodland, comprising of a rectangular pond (ditch) in the area west of the site and a drain forming part of the same system along the northern boundary of the site.

16. Within the wider context, the site is part of a built 'island' surrounded by designated green belt, mostly comprised of farmland outside the villages of Sawston and Whittlesford. The location is just above the river Cam valley floor with rising valley sides, and open views to this developed area. The Dernford Fen Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is within approximately 400m north-east of the application site and fully within Huawei's wider estate. Further west and north of the site is the River Cam County Wildlife Site (CWS). The northern portion of the site is designated Mineral Safeguarding Area and underlaying the site's most of the site are designated groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZs).

17. There are no listed buildings within the site and the site does not lie within a conservation area. The Borough Hill Iron Age multivallate hill(marsh)fort designated SAM is immediately to the south-east of the application site, comprising of very low earthwork and buried archaeological remains. The site location and surrounding areas comprise the Chilterns & East Anglian Chalk National Landscape Character Area (NLCA).

18. Access onto the site is via the existing vehicular access at the priority junction on the A1301 followed the railway level crossing. The A1301 runs in close proximity along east of the site, with links to Cambridge centre towards north and the junction with the A505 corridor towards south, and from this with further connections with the wider region, including via the M11 corridor. The site is well connected by the existing public transport network, including the West Anglia main railway which runs adjacent to the eastern most boundary of the site, with the nearest railway station within 3km to the south-east at Whittlesford Parkway. The City 7 bus service between Cambridge and Sawston runs at approximately 1km east of the site along Cambridge Road. Cambridge Road is also part of the National Cycle route NCN11, which continues along New Road/ Mill Lane and across the railway and A1301 into the site and further along the existing public cycle/footpath southwards to Whittlesford village.

19. Two private access tracks run near the application site and within the wider estate. One of the tracks links the 196/1 footpath from the Dernford Mill House and the railway crossing point north of the wider estate and North Road south of the wider estate and into Whittlesford. Another wider track runs east-west from the main site access at the railway level crossing, through the existing farmstead and then the access to the wider estate at Whittlesford Road.

20. From the application site entrance at the bypass the public footpath 196/15 and cycleway crosses the south-eastern most part of the wider estate, connecting the railway level crossing (and Sawston further east), and Whittlesford Church garden south of the wider estate, within Whittlesford village.

Proposals

21. The application is for a full planning permission for the Demolition of 582 m2 of (GIA) storage building (B8 Use Class) and erection of 50,445 m2 (GIA) of research and development accommodation (B1(b) Use Class), including ancillary accommodation and broken down as follows:

a) Office accommodation (9,503 m2);

b) Wafer fabrication (FAB) cleanroom (22,351 m2);

c) Single level basement incorporating 284 no. car parking spaces (9,417 m2);

d) Central Utilities Building (8,694 m2);

e) External storage building (480 m2);

f) Cycle parking spaces (80 for staff and 6 for visitors, total 86);

g) Surface, disabled and visitor car parking (16 spaces) adjacent to the office building entrance;

h) Access and circulation roads, engineering works and footpaths / cycleways;

i) Drainage and servicing infrastructure; and

j) Hard and soft landscaping.

22. The development consists of three main elements: the fabrication building (FAB), which adjoins the office building that is part of the FAB, and the central utility building (CUB). The FAB (including offices) is generally 25.1m high, with the flues raising a further 4.5m, and the CUB is a building of 22.3m height. The highest parts of the FAB building are at 43.60m AOD (peak roof) and 48.10m AOD (top of flues), with the CUB slightly lower at 39.53m AOD (roof ridge).

23. The ground and first floor levels of the clean room/ research FAB element mainly comprise of a central open area with surrounding circulation and offices/ closed spaces, with a void for air circulation making up for the second floor. The office element of the FAB comprises mainly of open plan offices throughout the three levels, with some closed conference/ meeting spaces. The car parking spaces are mainly located in the basement and the cycle parking is at the ground floor of the research area.

Environmental Impact Assessment

24. The application was subject to a screening opinion prior to submission and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (ref.: S/0674/19/E1). Following consideration, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) has concluded that an Environmental Statement was required, as the development proposals fall inside the thresholds of Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations 2017, being an urban development project of Category 10b.

25. The screening opinion concluded that given the proximity of the application site to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM), (a 'sensitive area' as defined in the EIA Regulations 2017) and the potential of the proposed development to have significant impacts on the landscape setting, an Environmental Statement (ES) should be submitted alongside the planning application.

26. A scoping opinion was subsequently issued upon request from the applicants (ref.: S/1471/19/E2). The Council was generally supportive of the approach to the ES, as well as of the scope of the EIA covering the matters of Archaeology and Heritage and Landscape and Visual, with recommendations made towards the assessment of the cumulative impact and further topics to be scoped in the EIA. The Council was satisfied that the matters of Transport and Access could be scoped out of the ES, as well as Biodiversity/Ecology, given this latter would be assessed with the submission of Biodiversity/Ecology Survey and reports, as well as an Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) provided in support of an application.

27. The Council requested matters of Flooding and Drainage to be scoped in the assessment, mainly due to the ground protection zones which underlain the site. This is would have impact on any proposed sustainable drainage, as well as potential impacts from construction, decommissioning, and future operation of the site on the new surface water drainage scheme and groundwater quality, surface water quality, local abstractions and to other receptors. The Council was also of the opinion that the matters of Land Contamination should be scoped into the ES, given the historical (and possibly unknown) industrial use of the site.

28. During the assessment of the current application, the quantum of development was revised to 50,445 m2 of gross internal area (GIA), which is significantly above the Scoping Opinion's development area of 21,400m2. Nevertheless, the use as research facility remains and the type of ancillary buildings did not change significantly, if at all. Moreover, impacts usually associated with the level of floorspace provided, such as car parking and number of employees in this case, have either been reduced or maintained. For this reason, the scoping opinion is considered still valid for the purposes of the impact assessment prepared in support of the application.

Consultation Responses

29. Sawston Parish Council - Supports the application and requires that (i) a cycle contribution is made to extend the cycleway along A1301; (ii) the Dernford Fen is protected and (ii) that there is much access through the site as possible. On further correspondence, the Parish Council reiterates support to the application and requests that consideration be given to the provision of a direct cycle route between the site and Stapleford and to a contribution towards a similar route running south between the site and the A505 junction [assumed same cycle contribution previously requested]. Encourages consultation between the applicant and the Wellcome Trust (in relation to approved outline application S/4329/18/OL) concerning provision of southern portion of the requested cycleway.

30. Whittlesford Parish Council - Supports the application and suggests the applicant should contribute to provide a cycleway from their entrance along the west side of the Sawston bypass to join up with the cycleway to Stapleford and Great Shelford. The Parish Council submitted further correspondence reiterating support to the application and requesting (i) a cycle path from the entrance of the site in the northerly direction on the western side of the A1301 to link to present path [assumed same cycleway requested in previous correspondence]; and (ii) a footpath northerly from the southwestern edge of the site to North Road emerging in the Bees in the Wall (Public House) as to provide a circular walk to both Whittlesford and Sawston residents.

31. Stapleford Parish Council - No objection. States that the application fails to provide sufficient access from Cambridge and recommends that a footpath/ cycle path is installed to the northern end of the site from Dernford Quarry site, with a footbridge over the rail track. Furthermore, suggest a footpath/ cycle way to link the site to the south with Whittlesford and Sawston and a cycleway along B1301 [A1301] into Sawston.

32. Linton Parish Council - Objects to the application and requires it to be referred to the District Council Planning Committee. Future workers of the development are likely to reside in Haverhill and therefore the impact on the A1307 and additional traffic on the villages should be considered. The supply of water in the area is limited and further abstraction would be unsustainable given the current level of stress to rivers and aquifers and potential ecological effect from further abstraction.

33. Highways England - No objection as the development would not have a severe impact on the strategic road network.

34. Highways Authority (Transport Assessment Team) - No objection subject to mitigation package required to make the development acceptable. Sets out sufficient detail has been presented to make a sound assessment of the proposed development and agrees with the provided study area; traffic data; trip generation; distribution and assignment; assessment scenarios and traffic growth and junction models. Based on the Transport Assessment provided with the application and the development's relative impacts on the A1301 corridor concludes the following mitigation measures would be required: (i) provision of flare on northern arm of the A1301/A505 junction to be secured by S106 and works to be undertaken by the applicant as part of S278 agreement; (ii) Travel Plan to be secured by condition; (iii) provision of a 3m wide shared pedestrian and cycle path linking the site to the A1301 to be secured by condition; and (iv) provision of a cycle path across the site linking the A1301 site access to Whittlesford Road to be secured by condition.

35. Highways Authority (Development Management) - No objection however raises concern over highways safety particularly for pedestrians and cyclists crossing A1301 at the junction with Mill Road to access the site. Refers to any modifications to the junction being dependent on the outcome of the Transport Assessment. On

further correspondence, queries about the highways works sought to improve highways safety and conditioned to permission granted in 2004 (condition 4 of ref. S/0750/01/F) have been carried out. States that the proposed development would have an impact on highways safety primarily to vulnerable highway users accessing the site and recommends modifications to the junction of the site with the A1301 and Mill Lane, to be secured either by condition or S106 agreement. States that it would not be acceptable to leave such works to a later phase of development.

36. Network Rail - No objection. The development does not impact NR in terms of construction and infrastructure.

37. Sustainability Consultant - No objection. States proposed development is supported in sustainable design and construction terms and recommends two conditions relating with the implementation of the bespoke Sustainability Assessment Methodology (including water efficiency), and Renewable Energy implementation. Supports measures to achieve 3 BREEAM water efficiency credits, with a target of 40% of water recovery for re-use; the use of sustainable procurement plan to reduce the environmental impact of construction materials and to maximise responsible sourcing; the hierarchical approach to reducing building energy demands and associated carbon emission, including the use of a process water source heat pumps to recover heat and photovoltaic panels; a commitment to full post evaluation for one year after occupation, with on-going energy monitoring; and detailed consideration to the façade design which mitigates the risk of overheating and reducing the cooling load of the building through external shading, deep window revels, building overhangs and solar control glazing. Notes the scheme has developed a bespoke Sustainability Assessment Matrix as opposed to pursuing formal BREEAM certification, and this approach was considered acceptable subject to condition to secure the implementation of the measures outlined in the submitted Sustainability Statement. Further notes a BREEAM pre-assessment has been carried out showing that the building would be capable of achieving BREEAM 'very good' with 'excellent' credits achieved for energy use and carbon reduction.

38. Sustainable Drainage Engineer - No objection, following review of the further information provided in relation to the flow controls, pollution control measures and the inclusion of all the proposed SuDS elements on the drainage network drawings. Welcomes the use of several Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) features.

Requires conditions for the submission of a detailed surface water drainage scheme and arrangements for its maintenance to be approved by the LPA.

39. Environment Agency - No objection, following review of the design and technical information relating with the underground fuel storage tanks and further information submitted regarding contamination and further ground conditions, as well as drainage. Recommends conditions requesting details of the installation of the underground tanks, a remediation strategy, unsuspected contamination, surface water disposal, and pilling to be approved by the LPA. Further recommends informative regarding surface water drainage, foul water drainage, pollution prevention, de-watering during construction, conservation and further general informative. Sets out further technical advice to the applicants.

40. LLFA Lead Local Flood Authority - No objection following submission of further information and correspondence exchange. LLFA is satisfied that surface water from the proposed development can be managed through the use of a swale to take runoff from the access road, permeable paving across all pedestrianised area with an area of bioretention, and rain gardens to take runoff from the area of impermeable pedestrian areas. Notes a pump is proposed on site to ensure water can drain effectively to the outfall and that due to the high risk of pollution from these areas, a separator is proposed within the system to remove hazardous material before discharge from the site. Recommends conditions requesting details of a scheme for surface water drainage and details of the long-term maintenance arrangement for the drainage system, along with informative relating with ordinary watercourse, and pollution control, in the event permission is granted.

41. Cambridge Water - No objection. Notes that CW's current Water Resources Management Plan 2019 (WRMP19) indicates that CW would be able to accommodate the proposed demand for the Huawei development, however maintaining this condition is dependent on CW's supply side options for the 2020-2025 period being completed as planned, and meeting CW's demand management commitments. Further notes the demand resulting from growth related to the CAM-OX arc will be included in our next WRMP for consultation in 2022, the final plan being published in 2023 if approved by Defra. Encourages therefore on-site water re-use and recycling to be a major consideration for the proposal, to overcome any risks of the revised WRMP headroom not being sufficient to accommodate the projected demand beyond 2025.

42. Anglian Water - No objection, subject to a condition requesting details of the on-site foul water drainage works and noting the development is in the catchment of Sawston Water Recycling Centre (SWRC), which has capacity for the proposed wastewater treatment flows. Following assessment of the potential impact of the site, AW have concluded that the proposals do not impose risk to AW potable water source. Raises concerns that the proposed connection to the local foul network will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream and that local foul network does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate domestic flows from the development. Advises that AW will need to plan effectively and work with applicants to ensure any infrastructure improvements are delivered in line with the development. Notes AW has previously given a positive connection directly to SWRC. Further notes the discharge of trade effluents to a public sewer vested in AW requires the organization's consent and requests an informative is included with permission should it be granted. Sets out further technical advice to the applicants.

43. Natural England - No objection. Expresses general support the proposal for SSSI management and monitoring. Acknowledges this aims to establish a long-term programme which would be reactive and adaptable to reflect local changes in conditions including potential changes in the ground water levels due to increased water demand from development. Note potential opportunities for enhancing the SSSI and advised on the monitoring of the chalk stream in the SSSI. Welcomes the additional information provided and is supportive of a Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (GQRA) to be secured through a planning condition, to identify environmental risks including impacts to flora and fauna. NE are satisfied that the northern access road will be on existing hardstanding and no direct operational impacts on the Dernford Fen SSSI are predicted, noting that measures to minimise air, noise and light pollution impacts associated with road construction will be included within a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP). Fully supports ecological enhancement and BNG objectives as proposed, particularly management objectives for the SSSI detailed in section 4.4 of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan. Supports the proposal to agree provisional management options for the SSSI with NE and sets out the most up to date advice on the matter. States NE are generally supportive of the proposed tree planting subject to phytosanitary precautions being implemented. Gives further advice on tree planting in and close to SSSI. Foul and surface water drainage strategies and pollution prevention measures will need to be agreed and delivery secured through planning conditions. Ecological mitigation, enhancement and management measures should be de tailed in an appropriate strategy and delivery secured through appropriate planning mechanism/s.

44. Ecology Officer - No objection. Generally agrees with the submitted Biodiversity Technical Note and does not have major concerns regarding the content of the document. Notes the preliminary bat roost assessment of the building to be demolished found it to have negligible potential for roosting bats, noting non-direct disturbances (increased light pollution for example) can be controlled through onsite mitigation. Is satisfied that the further information is sufficient to remove initial concerns and does not require any further information or amendment to be submitted at this time. As most of the net gains will be delivered outside the application boundary, requires the LEMP to be secured through a S106 obligation. Recommended conditions to secure a Construction Ecology Management Plan (CEcMP) and a lighting design strategy for biodiversity. Is satisfied that the installation of bat and bird boxes and other non-measurable biodiversity enhancements were included in the revised LEMP.

45. Tree Officer - No objection. Notes trees on or adjacent to the site have legal protection through TPO or have no statutory protection, and hedgerows may qualify as 'important hedgerows' under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, and/or have no statutory protection. Requires Volume I [off-site proposals] of the proposed LEMP not to be approved without a Woodland Management Plan and requires further amendments to the document. Notes in relation to Volume II [on-site proposals] of the LEMP officer raises concern with the overuse of fertiliser and proposed irrigation, providing advice on these matters. Generally supports the submitted Tree survey, arboricultural impact assessment & Tree protection plan, as well as the draft Woodland Management Plan and recommends that more detailed plans are secured through conditions to provide a detailed tree protection plan and methodology. Notes he Woodland Management Plan have insufficient detail to satisfy the TPO requirements for a woodland tree works application. Further notes that any future woodland work be of larger quantity the Council would be consulted via the Felling Licence process.

46. Landscape Consultant - No objection. Despite difference of opinion regarding the predicted landscape and visual effects, it was considered that the application could be supported. Notes position is not fundamentally different from that of the applicant. Agrees with applicants the development would result on residual adverse landscape and visual effects but disagrees these would be minor and not significant in EIA terms. Further notes this does not invalidate the overall thrust of the findings of the LVIA. This support was subject to a satisfactory S106 legal agreement of

appropriate duration being put in place for the mitigation works, should permission be granted. Further, states that support is caveated by the Council being satisfied about the long-term appearance of the photovoltaic panels on the roof; and a more sustainable solution regarding the disposal of surplus material being proposed. Is satisfied that the several previous points made in previous consultation responses have been adequately addressed at this stage and that the documents form an appropriate basis to guide the subsequent production of more detailed plans in the event planning permission is granted. Despite these concerns would not advise against the implementation of the on-site landscape, subject to approval of amended/ further details and specifications.

47. Urban Design Officer - Supports the proposed scheme and states that it would create a distinctive new building that responds to both its setting and constrains of the site. States that the current design approach to the buildings results in a well-articulated building that removes concerns around the horizontality. Notes how technical requirements of the building affect the design and massing of the proposals, and how these have been further developed in response to review by the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel. Recommends a material condition to be controlled through the detailed design and construction phase. The design and location of the proposed cycle parking are acceptable in design terms and recommends the size of the car parking bays are revised to 5.0 x 2.5m to improve their usability.

48. Designing Out Crime Officer, Cambridgeshire Constabulary - In support of the application, with no further comments.

49. Minerals and Waste Planning Authority - No objection. Welcomes the consideration given to waste management and the circular economy in the Sustainability Statement, and the Concept Stage Report which includes the Waste Strategy and a completed RECAP checklist. Is satisfied that the documentation provided contains information previously required. Requires information regarding temporary additional heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements are forwarded to the Highways Authority in case they are not aware of this information.

50. Environmental Health (Air Quality) - No objection to the proposed development in relation to potential impacts on and from local air quality. The Low

Emission Measures incorporated to the submitted Air Quality Assessment are acceptable and recommends a condition to secure the implementation of those prior to the occupation of development.

51. Environmental Health (Land Contamination) - No objection. Requires re-submission of documents relating with land contamination to reflect the most updated redline boundary covering the entire Phase 1A of the development. In case the information is not available prior to determining the application, any permission should include a pre-commencement condition to secure the submission of the revised desktop study, and a remediation method statement, along with a subsequent verification report, all to be approved by the LPA.

52. Environmental Health (Noise & Vibration, Odour and Lighting) - No objection on balance provided conditions are imposed to any permission granted, in relation to noise, vibration & dust. These can be incorporated on a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and/or Construction Method Statement (CMS). Recommends a condition relating with burning of waste on site and further informative covering matters of noise impact and demolition notice requirements.

53. Environmental Health (Licensing) - No objection. Confirms the development will be subject to environmental licencing from the Environment Agency.

54. Development Officer (Health) - No objection. Advised to have reviewed the application using the NHS HUDU (Health Urban Development Unit) tool checklist for assessing the health impacts from the proposed development. States that is satisfied that the development will improve the socioeconomic opportunities for local people and that no adverse health impacts on the local population will occur because of the proposed development. Makes a note in relation to the methodology applied to the submitted Health Impact Assessment (HIA) and on several different aspects of the proposal and requires further information/ commitment for a CEMP; zero carbon strategy; travel plan package and local employment. Following clarification, is satisfied that the draft S106 HoTs include measures which support the Council's aims for Health and Wellbeing.

55. Historic England - No objection. Broadly support the changes to the revised landscape along the access road which is adjacent to the monument stating that it will help soften the transition between the monument and the hard edge of the proposed buildings. Also broadly supports the approach to the proposed Conservation Management and Community Outreach Plan, setting out that the document has been developed further following previous HE advice and that, implemented in full, the Plan will result in the enhanced management of the monument, long-term conservation of its significance and greater accessibility for public access and interpretation. Recommends the key proposals of the Conservation Management and Community Outreach Plan be secured by S106 agreement and welcomes the applicant's commitment with this approach. Raises concerns over the landscape and biodiversity proposals for the site, whilst acknowledging that the management improvements to the SAM will result in the creation of a new habitat, which is supported. Nevertheless, HE recommends that the Technical Note on BNG is revised to note any works to the SAM area will require further statutory consents and to cross-reference the Conservation Management and Community Outreach Plan. Further, HE requires drawings are revised to reflect the need for further consents necessary to any works being done in the SAM area, and for the proposals for woodland in the area to be clarified/ reconsidered. Reiterates the need for a condition to be imposed to any permission granted, ensuring an archaeological programme is undertaken in the area.

56. Historic Environment Team (Cambridgeshire County Council) - No objection. Welcomes the applicant's consideration of the heritage and its setting within this landholding. Welcomes the submission of a draft Archaeological Conservation Management and Community Outreach Plan (ACMCOP) and supports the policies (1-12) for the scheduled monument shown in the current ACMCOP, noting it encapsulates previous discussions including with CCC Historic Environment team. Recommends that the ACMCOP is modified to indicate that it is an Estate-wide management, with a special section that addresses the specific restoration and management of Borough Hill Marsh Fort. The LEMP should cross refers to this estate management plan to ensure that all assets are suitably protected when threatened by groundworks. Recommends that the long-term management and conservation plans to protect and enhance heritage assets are secured through S106 agreement and an archaeological condition be imposed, with respective informative. The S106 should indicate that it applies to an archaeological management strategy for the whole of the Huawei estate and not be restricted to the scheduled monument at its heart. Therefore, the title of the ACMCOP document should be altered to reflect this.

57. Health and Safety Executive, Land Use Planning (LUP) - Confirms the site does not fall within any HSE consultation distances.

58. Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service - Request that adequate provision is made for fire hydrants, to be secured by way of a S106 agreement or a planning condition, the cost of which should be recovered from the developer. Notes the provision of hydrants should follow relevant guidance and access and facilities for the Fire Service should be provided Building Regulations Approved Document B5, Section 16. Advises on the Cambridgeshire Service having non-standard Fire Appliances and provides details on the matter.

59. Sports England - No comments as the proposed development would fall outside SE's statutory or non-statutory remit.

60. Section 106 officer - No comments as the application is for a non-residential development and, as such, would not typically give rise to community type infrastructure that will be delivered by the Parish or District Council.

61. Wildlife Trust - No objection. Following review of the additional information including BNG Technical Note and LEMP, concludes they generally address concerns raised in previous comments. Notes any further suggestions would not alter the fact that the proposed development demonstrates a significant net gain in biodiversity of over 20%. Supports the latest comments from Natural England regarding Dernford Fen SSSI and those of the Council's Ecology officer regarding other aspects of the application. Is of the view that the LEMP provides a sound basis for ensuring that the whole Huawei site becomes an important wildlife haven and that this section of the river Cam valley is significantly enhanced for nature. Requests a mechanism to secure the off-site biodiversity measures for at least 30 years.

62. Cambridge Past, Present and Future - Objects to the application on the grounds of the visual impact on landscape and the environmental impact on water resources. No objection to the principle of redeveloping brownfield. The main concerns raised were the following:

- The 2m reduction of the finished floor levels not being significant to ameliorate the visual impact;

- The proposed buildings not being screened by trees and therefore visible from distant locations, including from the Gog Magog Hills;

- Lack of clarity on why the R&D section of the building cannot be partially at basement to reduce overall building heights;

- The additional woodland proposed to screen the buildings taking too long to take effect as mitigation to visual impact caused;

- High volume of water required by the development and lack of clarity of available water source to meet the development's requirements;

- Lack of appreciation of how the development contributes to the changing conditions of the Dernford Fen SSSI and increasing demands on the local water table, in the relevant documents submitted with the application;

- Incongruence between the proposal for a water intensive factory and the location in the designated water stressed area, contributing to ecological damage and being contrary to the principle of sustainable development;

- Failure to provide assurance that the risks of pollution to controlled waters are acceptable or can be appropriately managed;

- No proposals have been put forward as to why underground fuel storage is necessary in this location;

- Other comments relating with ventilation and extraction; ground engineering desk study; trade effluent; travel plan; roadside signage; ecological impacts; BNG; and wildlife friendly lighting.

Cambridgeshire Quality Panel (Meeting of 4th December 2019)

63. Given the scale of the proposal, the scheme was presented to the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel during pre-application stage. In summary, the main recommendations of the Panel were:

1) The wider site needs a masterplan to allow the current proposals to be considered against a longer-term vision for the site in terms of access, land use, landscape and biodiversity.

2) What is the relationship between the employees and the local community?

3) It is intended that the facility will operate around the clock and will require a degree of self-sufficiency. What additional facilities need to be provided to ensure that the needs of employees are met?

4) What are the concerns and issues of the local community?

5) Green networks need to be developed to link the site with Sawston and further into other employment hubs.

6) As part of the long-term vison for the wider site it will be necessary to consider the capacity of the railway crossing and the impact that will have on movement into the site.

7) The fully glazed office facades should be resigned to address heating and glare.

8) The excess heat produced by the operation needs to be recycled.

9) Night-time light spillage from the office building needs to be managed.

10) The extreme visual impact is a major issue that needs to be mitigated.

11) The visual impact should, in part, be addressed through building design.

12) The Panel was generally impressed with the wave form of the FAB roof although questioned whether it needed to extend to the office building.

64. The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

Public Participation Responses

65. Further 13 representations were received from neighbouring residents, including 5 objections. These included concerns related with potential impact on roads and pollution generated by additional traffic; potential loss of recreational area and access to nature; removal of County Wildlife Site; accommodation being proposed on the site for employment; the visual impact from the proposal; loss of privacy at neighbouring properties; proposed mitigation measures causing loss of daylight to neighbouring properties; potential light spill caused by vehicles using the wider estate access on Whittlesford Road; lack of connectivity (mainly for cyclists) between the proposed development and the surrounding villages, where potentially future workers of the development will reside; lack of an outline proposal making it difficult to adequately assess the proposed heights.

66. Three letters of support expressed contentment with the sensitive use of the site; the contribution to the need for regeneration of the area; the potential transport improvements in the area; and the ecological enhancements.

67. The further letters comprised general comments, recommendations or suggestions including the retention of public access to the lake with re-wooding of the area and creation of walking routes; access to the wider estate for public enjoyment of nature and dog walking, including through establishment of permissive paths; requirement for highways improvements, including to the bypass junction, the provision of a bridge over the railway, improvements to the cycleway to Whittlesford and the extension of the cycle route along A1301, from the site access to the A505; provision of electric vehicle charging points (EVCP); creation of a train station to serve Sawston; outline planning application for the whole site to provide greater opportunities to create strategic landscape scale enhancements; proposed roadside planting north of the lake to Ley Grove Cottages to be relocated to re-establish the original character of the area; non-motorised vehicle opening of the existing east-west route thorough the site.

68. The above is a summary of the representations that have been received and the relevant planning matters will be considered in the assessment. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

Assessment

69. From the consultation responses and representations received, and from inspection of the site and the surroundings, the main issues are considered:

- Principle of development
- Design Quality
- Landscape Character and Visual Impact
- Historic Environment
- Natural Environment
- Climate Change
- Impact on Amenity
- Transport and Infrastructure
- Planning Obligations

Principle of Development

70. The site lies within an Established Employment Area (EEA), as designated by Policy E/15 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018), where appropriate

development for employment will be permitted. The EEAs are identified outside the Green Belt, however Policy E/15 (3) requires permission be refused where there would be a negative impact on the surrounding countryside or landscape character.

71. The proposal for the erection of 50,445 m2 of B1(b) of commercial research and development floorspace in this EEA location fulfils expectations of Policy E/15 given the nature of the proposed use to the buildings, which will employ between 350 and 400 people during operation, as set out in the submission documents. It is noted that the Statement of Community Involvement provided with the application includes the community's feedback on themes considered important in relation to the proposed development, with 85% of the responses indicating the creation of jobs to be an important or a very important aspect of the application proposal.

72. Whilst acknowledged the proposed development would have a visual impact particularly in the immediate surroundings, the buildings are considered to sit well in the landscape context, and their design to be reflective of the surrounding countryside and their employment use. In fact, the proposals are considered to deliver an improved quality of design to the built environment of this EEA, with a much-reduced negligible impact on the surrounding landscape from distant views.

73. In balance, the development of this site is supported in consolidation of this EEA, and in context the landscape and visual impacts are considered acceptable. A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) will be secured via S106 agreement to contribute in reducing the level of impact from closer sensitive locations, at the same time providing biodiversity gains and an enhanced natural environment, as discussed in the next sections of this report.

Design Quality

74. HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan sets out that all new development must be of high-quality design, with a clear vision as to the positive contribution the development will make to its local and wider context.

Scale and Massing

75. Policy HQ/1 is supportive of schemes that are compatible with their location and appropriate in terms of scale, mass, form, siting, design, proportion, materials, texture, and colour in relation to the surrounding area. In terms of heights, the immediate context of the woodland to the north and west of the site form a belt of matures trees of approximately 10m to 15m height, and the existing warehouse east of the site a solid massing with roof ridge at 33.77m AOD. The proposed buildings are therefore approximately 10m to 15m taller that the immediate natural and built surroundings.

76. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) submitted with an application demonstrates how the function of the fabrication building (FAB) dictates the building's heights. The section at page 04.7 of the DAS shows the core of the research facility, which is formed by a sub-fab element at ground floor and a 'cleanroom' at first floor. Whilst the cleanroom is only 3.5m high, it requires significant additional space all around to provide consistent clean and climatically controlled air circulation to support the research activities. Mechanical elements would be located in the space formed by the proposed vaulted roof in the perimeter of the FAB, with the size of the air handling units determining the angle and ultimately the final height of FAB at 25.1m (roof peak).

77. The fabrication process includes exhaust air streams that will be discharged through flues located 4.5m above roof level of the FAB laboratory, reason to the overall height of 29.6m, if considered at the top of the flues. The approach taken was of grouping the flues together and architecturally integrating them to the FAB, which in the view of the Council's Urban Design officer creates a more sculptural quality to provide a series of three well-considered punctuations to the skyline, supported in design terms. Further, this approach is considered to address the suggestion from Quality Panel members to turn the flues more 'expressive' in the architecture of the building.

78. The proposed vaulted design of the roof is also supported by the Council's Urban Design officer who notes the positive articulation of the roof creating a series of six bays. This contributes in reducing the scale of the mass of the building and integrates the FAB research/laboratory and the office functions. Whilst the Quality Panel advocated a different form/elevational approach to the office element of the FAB, the consistent roof form and development of a 'modular' approach works well and creates coherence to the architecture. It also contributes in creating a consistent design within the landscape context, reducing the impact of the required building height and rectangular footprint.

79. As discussed later in this report, underground sources of public water consumption underlain the site, imposing restrictions to any proposal on the application site, to protect these from potential sources of ground pollution. This drives the establishment of the lowest level of the FAB, and officers are satisfied that the minimum ground finished floor level has been proposed at 18.5m AOD.

80. The CUB massing is driven by its function as well as the FAB, in accommodating most of the mechanical, electrical, and plumbing (MEP) equipment required to run the FAB. This part two part four-storey building will be overall 22.3m in height, with its ground finished floor level at 17.2m AOD, therefore overall lower than the FAB. This contributes to the CUB being conceived as an agricultural 'outbuilding', in a sitting apart from but connected to primary buildings in a farmyard like setting. Its vaulted roof and overall materiality reflect the expression of the larger FAB.

81. Overall officers are satisfied that the proposal is designed with the minimum building heights achievable, having considered the technical requirements of the buildings and the need to protect underground waters that underlain the site. Moreover, officers are content that the proposal has explored the roof and modularisation of the larger elevations as massing elements which positively contribute to the countryside landscape character and reduce the buildings' visual impact.

Sustainable design and materials

82. Stone and glass curtain wall enveloped by a vaulted metal standing seam roof dominates the office element of the building. The east and west gables of the office building are glazed, again to take advantage of the views and to provide transparency. Solar gain and evening light spillage will be mitigated with external louvers and an internal mechanized shading system.

83. The FAB office ground level has over 5m of floor to ceiling height, to allow the floor of the first level to align with the FAB clean room floor level, providing direct connection between the two elements of the building through a glazed atrium. The two upper levels provide open plan office workspaces for the most part, with supporting meeting rooms and clear floor to ceiling height of 3.2 meters, providing daylight throughout the open plan space. The south facing windows are openable to provide natural ventilation, with shading louvers and generous reveal depths added to this façade to control solar gain and help minimize the cooling requirement in summer.

84. The FAB research/ clean room component is mostly finished in bronze cladding reflecting the more 'industrial' nature of the use accommodated here, with vertical strip window fins and air intake louvers which generate rhythm by matching the vaulted volumes of the overall mass and façade. Technical requirement of the building would prevent the proposals to include more openings in the part of the FAB building, and this is acceptable.

85. Other ancillary buildings, the CUB and the external storage, are also designed with matching metal cladding to the FAB to create a cohesive appearance. Officers are supportive of the approach to use a matt finish recessive colour to the roof and are satisfied that a good balance of the elevations was achieved with the use of bronze metal cladding and limestone with granite bases to the columns.

86. Overall, the Council's Urban Design and Sustainability officers are supportive of the scheme design and proposed materials as it would create a new distinctive

building, having considered principles of sustainable design and construction. Recommended conditions are supported.

Activity and Place Making

87. As noted by the Council's Urban Design officer, the proposals have been sited to take advantage of the screening qualities of the retained tree belt and woodland to the western and norther site boundaries. An arrival/entrance square has been formed to the south-east corner with visitor reception and drop-off facilities within the courtyard landscaped area. This reception area is connected by a colonnade to the south-western corner of the building, where social areas for employees are located. This area is provided with an external terrace fronting the existing woodland to the west, and new footpaths linking to existing footpath across the woodland and the wider estate. The social spaces at the ground level of the FAB office are open providing shared and supporting spaces including reception, large meeting and presentation rooms, faith room, coffee area and large multipurpose exhibition space.

88. Generally, the internal and external areas of the FAB building provide safe and convenient access for all users and abilities, including those with limited mobility. The main entrance to the building is level with the ground level reception, and lifts provide the vertical circulation to all levels, including basement car park. Disabled car parking spaces are located both in the underground car park and in front of the main building entrance. Connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists is proposed to be enhanced, as set out in the DAS (pages 02.21 and 06.01) and discussed in the Transport section of this report. The proposals provide covered space for 82 bicycles at the ground floor of the FAB research building, with a combination of Sheffield type stands, high capacity racks and stands to accommodate 'off gauge' bikes. A maintenance area is also provided and overall, the Council's Urban Design officer has considered the design and location of the cycle parking acceptable.

89. From the main southern access route, a series of vehicle routes are proposed to serve the development, one to access the basement car park which are via a ramp located within the green space delivered as part of the scheme. A second route roughly aligning with the scheduled ancient monument (SAM) boundary and buffer landscape, gives access to the visitor's car park, located conveniently for the FAB

entrance. The building design allows for the logistics to be at the north of the building, separated from visitors and the main entrance to the building to allow for security and considering health and safety principles. Separation of flow will be used for waste and service in a route east of the building linking with the northern entrance of the site.

90. A fire lane is provided all around the building and will be maintained clear at all times, which did not raise in principle concerns from the Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service, who note access and facilities for the Fire Service should be provided in accordance with Building Regulations.

On-site Landscape

91. The podium central landscape combines a wide variety of flowering plants chosen to encourage pollinators as well as providing year-round interest, combining ornamental rainwater and aquatic gardens. Applicants advise that the design has been developed to encapsulate the idea of a grand country estate garden nestled within the surrounding countryside. Whilst not objecting the proposal, the Council's Tree officer has made several recommendations in relation to the planting and maintenance of the podium landscape, which should be captured by the detailed landscape to be secured by condition, should permission be granted.

92. The area between the courtyard and the SAM has been revised to reflect landscape comments and response from Historic England and the County Archaeologist. This area now provides a softer transition in landscape terms between the scheduled monument and the site, with wildflower mix proposed along the 3m wide planted edge between the access road and the cycle/footway to reinforce the transition. Fagus sylvatica will be planted to the south of the cycle/footway, where it is not constrained by the planter width, combined with groups of Acer campestre, in the proposed green area at the entrance of the courtyard. This is accepted by the Council's Landscape advisor and supported by Historic England. No specific comments were made by the County Council Archaeologist following revision of this part of the on-site landscaped area.

93. The relatively rigid end to the courtyard south of the application site is explained by the intention to, in the future, create a strong axial connection with a similar 'domestic' landscape character further south of the application site. The development of this further area would 'enclose' the proposed landscaped area giving it a more domestic, courtyard feel. Therefore, whilst this off-site development is not currently a development proposal under consideration by the LPA, this landscape and perimeter treatment at the southern portion of the application site is acceptable.

94. The soft landscape palette for the large area to the north of the CUB includes native woodland planting to provide enclosure to the FAB service yard and visual connection to the surrounding woodland. The extent of gabion walling at the western and northern boundaries are adequate to accommodate the levels difference, respecting the tree route zone area. Plans LP1.02 and LP1.03 show wildflower area along the area between the FAB building and the woodland belt west of the site.

95. The Council's Landscape advisor does not advise against the implementation of the on-site landscape, subject to approval of amended/ further details and specifications. This is agreed and a condition referring to landscape details is recommended accordingly.

Wider Estate Masterplan and Design Codes

96. Policy HQ/1 (2) sets out that larger and more complex developments will be required to submit Masterplans and Design Codes to agree an overall vision and strategy for a development as a whole, demonstrating a comprehensive and inclusive approach with the proposals.

97. The Planning Statement submitted with the application sets out that Huawei intends to redevelop the former Spicers site as a whole over a number of phases

and that the quantum and form of any future development of the wider site is yet to be determined in detail. However, further consideration has been given to how the development of the wider site may come forward in the future to ensure that the current proposals would integrate well with further development of the wider estate.

98. Accordingly, an illustrative masterplan and a series of parameter plans have been provided within Section 2 of the submitted DAS to indicate how the wider redevelopment of the site could be organised in the future. Whilst the plans submitted are not for approval and therefore will not be considered with this application, the information submitted with the DAS provide a current understanding of the future redevelopment potential. As such, officers are satisfied that it demonstrates the proposal has taken a comprehensive and inclusive approach in relation to the development potential of the wider estate.

Conclusion

99. The Council's Urban Design officer supports the proposed scheme as it will create a distinctive new building that responds to both its setting and the constraints of the site. The proposals are considered to be in accordance with policies HQ/1 and NH/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, provided that the recommended materials condition apply to permission if granted and further consideration is given to landscape matters as set out in the next section.

Landscape character

100. The application site lies within the East Anglian Chalk National Character Area (NCA) which, as described by Natural England, is characterized by its visually simple and uninterrupted landscape of smooth, rolling chalkland hills with large regular fields enclosed by low hedges, with few trees, straight roads and expansive views.

101. Chapter 5 of the ES provided with the application deals with the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) noted by the Council's Landscape Advisor to be largely clear and concise. In characterising the NCA, the ES highlights one of its objectives being the conservation and promotion of its landscape character, historic environment and historical assets of the chalklands, including the open views of undulating chalkland, large rectilinear field pattern and linear ditches.

102. In the context of the NCA, the Established Employment Area (EEA) where the site is located consists of a built 'island' surrounded by Green Belt, visible from distant locations, including from the Gog Magog hills (Viewpoint 12 of the LVIA), approximately 4km north-east of the site. A further key distant view is the footpath adjacent to a Grade II Listed obelisk at St Margaret's Mound (Viewpoint 13), approximately 3km north-west of the site, from where the EEA would not be visible, as demonstrated by drawing 5.13 of the LVIA.

103. From closer locations the site is screened from most directions by tree cover, with key locations within a 2km radius including along the A1301 north-east of the site (viewpoints 5, 6 and 7 of the LVIA); the view from the Ley Groove Cottages and from bridleway 199/3 to the west of the site (viewpoints 2 and 3 and 4 respectively); and the views from the public foot/cycleway from Sawston to Whittlesford, which runs south-east of the site (viewpoints 8, 9, 10 and 11).

104. Following the above methodology, viewpoints 2 and 7 are considered the most sensitive in terms of visual effects from the proposed development, with the significance of the effect identified as moderate to minor. The Council's Landscape advisor concludes the effect should be graded as moderate and, whilst this is agreed, it is overall considered that the proposal responds well to the site allocation for employment use in a rural context, in design terms, with further considerations as follows.

105. The photomontage from Viewpoint 2 and year 1 of the proposed development (drawing 5.14) demonstrates that the proposed FAB building given its height would break the existing tree line, from a location where the existing warehouses are filtered by the existing woodland west of the application site. Nevertheless, the photomontages prepared from both viewpoints 2 and 3 at year 1 of the proposed

development (drawings 5.14 and 5.15 respectively) demonstrate that the sinuosity of the undulated roof sit comfortably within the tree line and the surrounding landscape, this latter an effect also noted by the Council's Landscape advisor.

106. Furthermore, the proposed architecture of the FAB building reflecting the surrounding rural character contributes for the architectural integration of the building in its context and is a much-enhanced design solution when compared to the existing buildings of this employment area. On balance, despite the building being now visible and therefore having a level of impact to its landscape and visual setting, the proposals are considered to positively consolidate this employment location. This is also evidenced by the photomontages from viewpoints 6 and 7 and year 1 of the proposed development (drawings 5.16 and 5.17, respectively).

107. In terms of the distant views, the photomontage from Viewpoint 12 and the Magog hills at development year 1 (drawing 5.20) is an evidence that the proposed design to the roof and chosen finishing materials sit well in this landscape. Moreover, the photomontage demonstrates that the development would cause a negligible visual impact when viewed from long views, especially when compared to the existing warehouses in this employment area. The proposals are considered to enhance the local character and distinctiveness of the rural landscape, as well as of the East Anglian Chalk NCA undulating chalkland character, as well as the distant views of this employment site.

108. It is further noted that from all viewpoints mentioned above, the proposed development would not be visible at year 15, given the proposed mitigation measures set out by the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), particularly the planting of new native woodland blocks in parts of the eastern side of the railway and planting of new native species rich species hedgerow to provide visual screening from the A1301 (drawing 5.21 rev F of the LVIA). overall, the Council's Landscape advisor is satisfied that the mitigation strategy submitted with the ES Addendum accurately sets out the main components of the strategy to be secured in the LEMP. This is agreed and, as such, the proposals are considered to align with the aims of policies NH/2 and NH/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, and the LEMP is recommended to be secured by a S106 agreement, should permission be granted.

Historic Environment

Designated Assets

109. To the southeast of the application site is the Borough Hill multivallate (multi-ditched) marsh-fort, a heritage asset of national importance and designated Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM), which survives as a very low earthwork and as buried archaeological remains. In describing the high significance of the heritage asset and its setting, the applicants have noted the monument score highly in relation to the principals of selection for scheduled monuments and there is high potential for well-preserved archaeological remains (paragraph 6.90 of the ES).

110. In describing the setting of the Borough Hill marsh-fort (paragraph 6.92 of the ES), applicants note it is mainly characterized by construction of the 19th century Sawston Paper Mill and the subsequent construction of Mill Farm and Homewood comprising of later individual buildings, agricultural field systems, access roads, settling ponds and areas of plantation. These creates a separation of the monument from what would be its landscape setting and limiting the experience of the marsh-fort in connection with the river Cam setting. In assessing the contribution of the setting to the significance of the marsh-fort, applicants state that the monument scores low in relation to Historic England's checklist relating to physical surroundings, applying to the area low to moderate sensitivity.

111. The assessment therefore concludes that the contribution the application site makes in the setting of the marsh-fort and to the significance of the monument is considered minor (paragraph 6.97 to of the ES). Bearing in mind the significance of the monument primarily relates to the below ground evidence, the Planning Statement (paragraph 7.31) indicates that this principal significance of the Borough Hill will not be impacted by the proposed development, and that overall the level of harm to its significance will be minor due to a change in setting. Whilst disagreeing with this stated level of harm, Historic England in response dated 18 February 2020 stated that the harm to the ancient monument will be less than substantial in policy terms.

112. Officers agree with Historic England's position and are of the view that the clear and convincing justification for this less than substantial harm is given by the principle of development in this employment site, coupled with the high-quality design of the proposals, as discussed in the relevant sections of this report. Furthermore, the harm has been weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, and officers conclude that the direct public benefits of the proposal to the SAM outweigh the less than substantial harm caused to this designated asset, as follows.

113. Based on the initial consultation response from Historic England and the County Archaeologist, the applicants have submitted a draft Archaeological Conservation Management Plan and Community Outreach Plan (ACoMPCOP), comprising of policies for the management of the SAM, including:

o the finalisation of the plans and a regular review every five years;

o protection of the SAM during enabling or construction works if consent is granted to the current application;

o a requirement for a written agreement from HE to any physical impact within 20m around the SAM;

o the removal of all agriculture within the SAM area, and the design and implementation of a programme for continued tree management of the previous agricultural land;

o the design and implementation of a landscaped plan for the marsh-fort, including the enhancement of the monument and subsequent vegetation, the re-creation of banks and ditches, and potential introduction of chalk grassland, similarly to those at Wandlebury fort and Devil's Dike;

o to provide public access to monument, as a minimum for tours and open days;

o to prepare an archaeological research framework for the site; and

o to provide appropriate physical and virtual interpretative materials to inform and enhance public understanding and enjoyment of the site.

114. The landscape proposal for this area closer to the SAM has been revised to create a more open setting of wildflower and meadow are and a more natural tree planting, which has been welcomed by Historic England. The LEMP provided with the amended application includes and is consistent with the ACoMPCOP, in line with comments made by Historic England and the County Council Archaeologist. Below the ground level landscaping, the proposed car parking basemen will be 5m distant from the 20m buffer area around the SAM boundary.

115. Overall officers are of the view that the proposed ACoMPCOP will contribute to remove factors causing risk to the SAM, and represents potential for permanent improvements to the asset's management and conservation, with correspondent increase in access and knowledge by the public in general. In further correspondence dated 5 May 2020, Historic England has stated that the draft ACoMPCOP including all the proposed actions and if secured by a S106 agreement can provide the elements of a public benefit needed to outweigh the harm as set out by paragraph 196 of the NPPF. This is agreed and planning obligations to be set out in a S106 agreement are recommended accordingly.

Non-Designated Assets

116. Applicants advise on Chapter 6 of the ES that most of the application site has been investigated, with archaeological evidence dating from the Mesolithic to post-medieval periods. Applicants consider the proposed development including groundworks associated with landscaping and access to the north and east of the scheduled marsh-fort will result in the direct impact of non-designated buried archaeological remains in the existing greenfield areas around the scheduled monument.

117. A programme of archaeological excavation is proposed along with the ACoMPCOP, to outweigh any harm caused to the non-designated assets. The proposals are supported by the County Council's Archaeologist and, in agreement, officers recommend a programme of archaeological works to be secured by

condition should permission be granted, alongside the above recommended S106 obligation to secure the ACoMPCOP measures.

Conclusion

118. Overall, the proposals raised no objection from Historic England and the County Council's Archaeologist, and are considered to management of the SAM through the establishment of the ACoMPCOP with programme for further archaeological investigations on and around the site and SAM setting will contribute to the assets' conservation in a manner appropriate to their significance. Further, the community outreach element of the ACoMPCOP will enable the enjoyment of the SAM by the public, for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations. It is considered that the direct benefits from the proposals to the designated and non-designated assets on and around the site outweigh the any harm caused to these assets and, in balance, the proposal is acceptable in terms of the NPPF and Policy NH/14 of the Local Plan.

Natural Environment

Sites of Biodiversity Importance

119. A recent review by Natural England regarding publicly accessible SSSIs across Cambridgeshire has identified sites at risk from the effects of visitor pressure, and the revision of Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) for the relevant sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). The development lies relatively close to the Dernford Fen SSSI, a site of national importance for its fen meadow, tall-herb fen and alder carr habitats, which are habitat types vulnerable to changes in the local water table as primarily wet habitats. The proposed development falls within the Fen's IRZ and given the development's characteristics of being a large infrastructure of over 1,000m2 of GIA, it is considered likely to affect the SSSI.

120. The Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) submitted with the application conclude that impacts associated with construction activities from the proposed development are likely to be insignificant to the SSSI due to distance and barriers between the site and the SSSI. Nevertheless, applicants propose the implementation of supplementary mitigation measures to be detailed in a Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP), to be secured by conditions. The DCEMP should seek to protect retained habitats and associated protected species and manage airborne dust, run-off, waste, noise/vibration and construction lighting, ensuring these elements do not cause a significant effect to the identified ecological features. In addition, the Council's Ecology officer has recommended a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP) to be secured by condition, including risk assessment and other measures to avoid unnecessary ecological harm from development, should permission be granted.

121. The EcIA concludes that a positive residual effect is the management and monitoring proposal for the Dernford Fen SSSI which lies wholly within the wider Huawei estate boundaries. It is proposed that, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, the SSSI is brought into management, aiming to bring the habitats for which it is cited into a more favourable condition. The management measures of the Dernford Fen SSSI has been incorporated to the proposed LEMP and have received ample support by Natural England and the Wildlife Trust. This is considered to address CPPF's objection. As such, the proposed LEMP is recommended to be secured by S106 planning agreement in the event permission is granted.

122. The EcIA also highlights that increases in abstraction rates and changes to the water table could cause a deterioration in the habitats for which the area is designated. The proposal includes monitoring of the site to inform the management proposals as site conditions may change in the future due to climate change and increasing demands on the local water table, which is discussed in the Climate Change section of this report.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

123. The application site is an industrial site with grassland areas, ruderal vegetation, scrub and woodland, with adjacent habitats including rough grassland,

drains, woodland, further buildings, hardstanding, arable fields, and large ponds and lakes to the north and west. Protected and priority species surveys have been undertaken on and in the vicinity of the site with an assessment of potential effects of the development presented in support of the application.

124. Within the wider context of the site location is the Dernford Fen SSSI previously mentioned and the River Cam County Wildlife Site (CWS), this latter to the west and south of the site and noted for being a major river that has not been grossly modified by canalisation, with areas of concentrated mature pollard willows. Species data from a 2km radius from the site shows great crested newts, barn owls, kingfishers, corn bunting, lesser woodpecker, and many other breeding birds, invertebrates, reptiles, bats, badgers, otter, hedgehog, and brown hare, in addition to a large number of plants recorded in the nearby SSSI.

125. Following initial review by the Council's Ecology officer, the applicants have submitted a Technical Note dated 25 March 2020, with supplementary information to the BNG Report initially submitted with the application. The Technical Note includes the revised result and details of the calculation using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 (Beta Version, July 2019). The conclusion is that the proposed development would result in loss of 23.61 biodiversity units. Nevertheless, the off-site landscaping within the wider estate as proposed in the LEMP includes habitat creation and enhancement measures such as the creation of woodland and forest, grassland, and native hedgerow habitats. This delivers the required habitat creation and enhancements that will result in net gains of 9.42 Biodiversity Units and 8.34 Hedgerow Biodiversity Units with the proposed development.

126. Natural England is generally supportive of the wider estate measures to offset the biodiversity loss, given the potential benefits they could deliver for Dernford Fen SSSI, to be secured through a Section 106 agreement. The Wildlife Trust and the Council's Ecology officer are satisfied for the application to proceed to determination without any further changes to the BNG calculations.

Conclusion

127. Overall officers are of the view that the proposal is acceptable considering South Cambridgeshire Local Plan policies NH/4, NH/5 and NH/6. This is on the basis that a detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) will be secured by S106 agreement should permission be granted to the proposed development.

Climate Change

Recycling and Waste Reduction

128. The sustainability assessment developed for the scheme includes waste management as one of the sustainability objectives, with commitments for an effective segregation, storage and collection of waste across the site to maximise diversion from landfill, and construction waste minimised through a site waste management plan and contractual targets. In response to consultation, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) expressed support to the consideration given in the proposal to waste management and the circular economy in the Sustainability Statement, the Concept Stage Report which includes the Waste Strategy and the completed RECAP checklist submitted.

129. Nevertheless, the MWPA required clarification over the waste soil deriving from the excavation for the construction of the basement, addressed on the Design Note dated 25 March 2020. This demonstrates that the net excess cut will be 72,380m3, with a total volume allowed for bulking factors (20% extra), the total volume to cart away is 86,856m3. The applicants state that at present there is no potential re-use of the material on site and that all material will be removed off site either to a licenced treatment facility or disposal facility following waste legislation.

130. Having reviewed the further information provided, the MWPA is satisfied and has no objection to the proposal. Officers acknowledge that the excess soil partially results from the lowering of the ground floor levels to avoid visual and landscape

impacts, which is a positive aspect of the proposals. In balance, the proposals are acceptable, and the submission of a detailed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan is recommended to be secured by condition, in the event permission be granted.

Renewable and low carbon energy

131. As noted by the Council's Sustainability officer, the proposed development takes into consideration the hierarchical approach to reducing building energy demands and associated carbon emissions. The proposals include the use of a process water source heat pump, to recover heat from the process condenser water cooling to provide all of the heating and hot water for the building, and extensive use of photovoltaic (PV) panels to provide electricity for use in the building. Together these technologies are predicted to reduce emissions by 118,739.82 Kg/CO2/annum, which represents 11% requirement for the building (108,758.35 kg/CO2/annum). This exceeds the 10% required by the Local Plan and is supported by officers.

132. The Utilities Statement provided in support of the application states that UK Power Networks (UKPN) have confirmed that they are able to provide the necessary peak power supply capacity to the site, and no improvements to the UKPN grid are anticipated resulting from development. A condition is recommended to secure the implementation of the renewable energy provision to reduce emissions as above, and to establish a protocol for the event of any grid capacity issues arising. Applicants advise that a Diesel Rotary Uninterruptable Power Supply (DRUPS) is proposed to provide resilience in the electrical infrastructure, given the operational sensitivity to power failures. Applicants advise the development does not rely on the DRUPS units and that its engines are not required to be used under normal circumstances, only being switched on for testing purposes and when there is a mains power supply failure.

133. Officers note that overall, building emissions are reduced by 25% using the energy hierarchy and that this represents an approach to energy and carbon reduction in keeping with the minimum requirements for a BREEAM 'excellent' building, which is supported. While the scheme has developed a bespoke

Sustainability Assessment Matrix as opposed to pursuing formal BREEAM certification, a BREEAM pre-assessment has been carried out showing that the building would be capable of achieving BREEAM 'very good' with 'excellent' credits achieved for energy use and carbon reduction. This approach is considered acceptable by the Council's Sustainability officer and is supported, subject to the condition recommended to secure the implementation of the measures outlined in the Sustainability Statement for the site.

Sustainable Design

134. The Sustainability Statement provided in support of the application sets out the development features which favour a more energy efficient building and the use of renewable energy, as previously discussed in the Design Quality section of this report. In addition to those, the Sustainability Statement sets out the commitments in terms of the sustainable materials and methods to be used in the proposed development, including material efficiency through standardisation and modular construction; the adoption of Circular Economy principles to incorporate recycled content where feasible. The design will be set out to allow for future flexibility to maximise useful life of the building and deconstruction for ease of end of life component and material recovery. In line with BREEAM, the proposal will deliver a Sustainable Procurement Plan to ensure responsible sourcing of construction materials and local sourcing where possible.

135. The proposed overall approach to integrating the principles of sustainable design and construction into the design of the buildings is supported by the Council's Sustainability officer. Officers acknowledge the bespoke Sustainability Assessment Matrix developed for the scheme incorporating principles from BREEAM and other assessment methodologies. The matrix focuses on seven sustainability objectives of land and nature; sustainable water; low carbon energy; sustainable materials; travel and transport; climate resilience and waste management. The implementation of the bespoke Sustainability Assessment Matrix is recommended to be secured by condition, which is supported.

Water demand

136. Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement (ES) submitted in support of the application deals with water resources and states that the uses of the buildings within the proposed development will lead to a significant increase in demand for water from the site once operational. Furthermore, the future cumulative potential effects may have an impact on the abstraction rates and local water table as a direct result, which can then result in negative effects for sites of biodiversity importance, by reducing the amount of ground water available for wetland habitats.

137. Cambridge Water (CW) as the supplier of water for the site has confirmed that the proposed water demand for the Huawei development can be accommodated, having regards to the current Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) published in 2019. CW states however that the demand from 2025 depends on the next WRMP to be published in 2022 and recommends on site water re-use and recycling to be a major consideration for this proposal.

138. The development proposal aims to achieve 3 BREEAM water efficiency credits, including measures such as the use of rainwater harvesting for toilet and urinal flushing, and water recovery for the ultra-pure water used in the manufacturing process. This equates to a 40% reduction in water use, as set out by the Sustainability Statement, which is above policy requirements. This is supported by the Council's Sustainability officer and a condition to secure the achievement of the water credits is recommended accordingly.

139. Whilst they can be captured by the WRMP to be published in 2022, officers acknowledge that the cumulative impacts from development could have an impact on the water table and increase the severity, occurrence, or duration of adverse effects on the local habitats, including the Dernford Fen SSSI and River Cam CWS. To address this matter, a proposal to prepare a Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (GQRA), which is supported by Natural England, is recommended to be secured by condition, covering the matters of controlled water, fauna and flora.

140. Further to the above, the measures outlined in the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) submitted with the application aim to contribute to the management of the sites of biodiversity importance. This is supported by the Council's Ecology officer, Natural England, and the Wildlife Trust and, in officers' views, the measures address concerns raised by CPPF and neighbouring residents. The measures have been incorporated into the draft LEMP, with further detail and implementation to be secured through a S106 agreement, should permission be granted.

Water Quality

141. The site lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 (SPZ3 or total catchment zone), with groundwater abstraction used for public water supply and, as such, is vulnerable to pollution from ground contaminants.

142. On the Fuel Storage Tanks Design Note dated 20 march 2020, applicants advise the operation of the facilities include processes that are sensitive to power failures and, for this reason, the proposal includes a diesel engine that can be operated in the event of a power outage. To allow the diesel engine to operate for any necessary period, fuel needs to be stored, which is proposed below ground at the north-eastern most portion of the site, outside the SPZ.

143. The Environment Agency (EA) in their response dated 11 February 2020 have highlighted that groundwater in this location is at shallow depth and these tanks are therefore likely to extend below the water table, which could result in the direct input of hazardous substances to groundwater. The Lead Local Flood Risk Authority (LLFA) in correspondence dated 19 February 2020 raised concerns over surface water and groundwater bodies being highly vulnerable to pollution and the impact of construction activities, noting it would be essential that the risk of pollution was considered and mitigated appropriately. The Authority highlighted in the correspondence the lack of treatment in some parts of the site, particularly at the service yard, something that had also been noted by the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer.

144. Following review of revised documents and further information provided, the initial objections made by the Council's Drainage Engineer, the EA and LLFA have been removed. The LLFA is satisfied with the proposed separator within the drainage system to remove hazardous material before discharge from the site, to address high risk of pollution from areas with sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). The EA is content with the information provided about the underground fuel tanks at this stage. Officers agree and are of the view that the concerns raised by CPPF have been addressed by the further and revised information provided. Conditions relating with details of the implementation of the tanks and the surface water drainage system are recommended accordingly.

Flood Risk Management

145. The site levels generally fall in a northerly direction from around 21m AOD to levels of around 16.5m AOD in the central portion of the northern boundary and approximately 17.3m AOD in the north-eastern and north-western parts of the site. To the immediate north and west of the site is an existing drainage system, comprising of a rectangular pond (ditch) within the woodland area bounding the site, with a further drain to the west and a drain along the northern boundary of the site. Beyond is open agricultural land which extends west in a flood plain along the River Cam running in a northerly direction, at about 275m from the site.

146. The EA flood maps illustrate that the site is generally at low risk of flood from rivers and very low risk of flooding from surface water, this latter with a few scattered areas of low risk across the site, and more concentrated areas of low risk immediately outside the site to the north and at the western rectangular pond described above. A ground investigation has been undertaken confirming ground water strikes across the site, with levels being generally between 16m and 17m AOD, and lower levels recorded in some areas.

147. The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) submitted with the application sets out that the drain along the site's northern boundary has bed levels of 15.9m to 16.39m AOD.

The FRA concludes that groundwater levels are unlikely to be significantly above the site's levels under any circumstances as water would directly outflow to the drain along the northern boundary. The FRA therefore concludes that whilst groundwater is present at the site and may come close to the ground surface at times it is unlikely that groundwater would rise to surface levels, imposing any significant flood risk to the site. The application site being situated completely in Flood Zone 1 confirms the above findings and, furthermore, that the site is not at significant risk from flooding by any source.

148. The ground floor finished floor level (FFL) of the FAB is proposed at 18.5m AOD, which is an important element of the proposal to reduce the final building heights and thus the visual impact from the FAB. For this reason, water will need to be drained from the site with the use of resilient pumps with power supplies provided to avoid the risk of pumping failure, and in this case flood risk. Applicants have provided modelling of the pumping system demonstrating that none of the buildings will be flooded in any event, including in the event of pump failure, when the volume of ponding on site would be low. The Environment Agency and the LLFA did not object to the proposals and the LLFA acknowledges the need to use pumping systems as part of the drainage strategy for surface water. This is agreed and acceptable in this context.

Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

149. The drainage strategy provided in support of the application states that the greenfield runoff is calculated to be in total 25.2 litres/second for this application site, which would result in a total volume of storage of 3,163m3. This is proposed to be temporarily stored in permeable paving, swales, bioretention systems and underground tanks, with discharge into the existing drainage ditch west of the site.

150. As most of the site comprise SPZs, several levels of treatment are required to achieve adequate water quality before the runoff enters the drainage ditch. To ensure water quality is acceptable before discharge to ground, a minimum of one level of treatment of a suitable SuDS measure will be required, hence swales, permeable paving and bioretention systems are proposed to filter runoff. Another level of treatment in trafficked areas is proposed as a safety measure in case of

failure of SuDS, typically petrol interceptor or downstream defender to remove carbohydrates, sediments, and other pollutants from the surface water runoff. In the service yard, the primary treatment is proposed to be full retention separators, as a higher level of contaminants are expected to be present in the runoff from the area.

151. In response to initial comments by the EA and LLFA, the applicants have confirmed SuDS were incorporated to the proposed site where possible. Following review of the further information provided, the EA, the LLFA and the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer are supportive of the proposals as presented and are satisfied that surface water from the proposed development can be managed in terms of flow and pollution control. Conditions are recommended to secure details of a surface water drainage scheme, including infiltration systems, and maintenance arrangements.

Wastewater

152. Separate pipe systems are provided within the site for the surface water and the domestic foul and trade effluent systems. The potential peak foul water discharge that could result from the proposed development equates to 41.51 litres/second, considering domestic foul and trade effluent.

153. For the domestic foul water discharge, the connection has been identified under Mill Lane, directly connecting to the public sewer. The trade effluent will be discharged directly to the Sawston Water Recycling Centre (SWRC), following upgrading works to the SWRC. The SWRC is approximately 1.4km north-east of the site and hence a new sewer main must be constructed to establish the new connection, which is to be delivered with the proposed development. The connection to the SWRC will be designed and constructed under a Section 104 Adoption Agreement with AW, as set out in the Drainage Strategy submitted with the application.

154. AW did not object to the application and a condition to secure submission of a detailed scheme for on-site foul water drainage and implementation works, including connection point and discharge rate, is recommended accordingly.

Conclusion

155. Given the above and subject to the imposition of the conditions and planning obligations set out along this chapter, the proposals are considered in line with the sustainability and resources management requirements of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. Overall proposals are acceptable in terms of policies CC/1, CC/3, CC/4, CC/6, CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 of the Local Plan and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

Impact on Amenity

Health Impact Assessment

156. A Health Impact Assessment (HIA) was submitted with the application, following requirements of Policy SC/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. Overall, the conclusion is that the development would have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of the existing residents.

157. The Council's Health Development officer is satisfied that the obligations set out by the submitted S106 Heads of Terms (HoTs) support the Council's aims of Health and Wellbeing. In particular officers welcome: (i) the submission of an Active Travel Plan and appointment of Coordinator prior to first occupation; (ii) the provision of a woodland management plan, as there is a wealth of evidence which links access to open green space to positive mental wellbeing; (iii) the aims towards biodiversity net gain; and (iv) walking and cycleways improvement. These measures are

proposed to be secured by means of a S106 agreement, with the exception of the Travel Plan, which will be secured by condition.

Lighting Pollution

158. The External Lighting Statement provided with the application sets out the general principles of the external lighting design, proposing it will be limited in nature and will primarily be used for security and wayfinding purposes. External lighting around the building façade will be limited to lower floor levels and will be sensitive to the surrounding areas. Applicants advise that solutions which lead to light pollution of the surrounding area will not be used. Furthermore, the external lighting will be controlled using time switches, photo-electric and manual override control units to ensure the lighting only operates during hours when the natural daylight contributions fall below the required illumination levels for safe use of the external areas.

159. The exterior night-time appearance of the building will replicate the internal activity with the interior lighting providing a lantern type effect on the glazed opening. Appendix A of the assessment includes the site overview modelling of the effects of the proposed internal and external lighting, confirming that the edges of the site will generally receive reduced levels of lighting. The highest external lighting levels will be at the area immediately adjacent the northern part of the FAB, presenting levels above 50lux, however calculations demonstrate that the light spill into the surrounding habitat area on the northern and western aspects of the building is less than 1lux.

160. Following review of the External Lighting Statement, Environmental Health officers raise no objection to the proposals in terms of the effects on humans such as residential receptors, and the Designing Out of Crime officer is supportive of the proposed development, with no comments regarding community safety and vulnerability to crime. The Council's Ecology officer has raised no objection however requested a Construction Ecology Management Plan (CEcMP) and a lighting design strategy for biodiversity were secured by condition. This is supported and conditions are recommended accordingly.

Noise and Vibration

161. Policy SC/10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan requires planning permission not be granted for developments with an unacceptable adverse impact. This is particularly to the indoor and outdoor acoustic environment of existing or planned development or on countryside areas of tranquillity which are important for wildlife and countryside recreation. Furthermore, the Policy SC/10 requires noise from proposed commercial use does not cause any significant increase in the background noise level at nearby existing noise sensitive premises, including dwellings and educational establishments.

162. Environmental Health officers note the nearest existing noise sensitive receptors are residential dwellings situated over 700 m to the east of the development site, and which will be partially protected by existing buildings. Additionally, they are situated on the other side of the A1301 in relation to the residential areas, which also provides a degree of noise masking from any construction activities. Nevertheless, commercial units operating close to the application site will be exposed to construction noise, however transitory in nature. Environmental Health officers note this impact should be considered and controlled by a condition requiring details of a Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP), which is supported and recommended accordingly.

163. In relation to vibration, Environmental Health officers note the proposed use has been identified as being particularly vibration sensitive due to the nature of the equipment to be employed. Officers are of the view that the development is not likely to cause any vibration impacts to nearby sensitive receptors, particularly residential units. Environmental Health officers are in general agreement with the assessment methodology and findings of the Noise and Vibration Impact Report submitted with the application. However, officers note that the final selection of plant has not been made at this stage and consequently only guideline maximum noise levels for proposed plant have been proposed. To address this matter, officers recommend a condition in relation to plant and equipment requiring they comply with the noise level specifications, should permission be granted. This is supported and recommended accordingly.

Air Quality, Odour and other Emissions to Air

164. The development does not fall within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), and the nearest AQMA is Cambridge City, approximately 7km north of the site. The Air Quality Assessment submitted with the application confirms the estimated mean background NO2 and PM10 concentrations for the area where the site is located would be in 2019 well below the objectives of the Council's Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP).

165. The Air Quality Assessment provides a methodology for assessing impacts from demolition, earthworks, construction and track out activities which may be associated with a development. The assessment indicates that the standard criteria are not exceeded on any roads with relevant receptors, and therefore the impact from traffic emissions generated by the proposed development will be insignificant, with similar conclusion for the impact from all operational aspects of the development.

166. With regards to boiler and humidifier emissions, the Air Quality Assessment notes that the nearest sensitive receptor is the Dernford Fen SSSI, located approximately 500m northeast of the proposed boiler flue, with the nearest residential receptor located approximately 750m east of the proposed flues. Therefore taking into account the distance from receptors, the ultralow NOx (39mg/kWh) rating and size of the boilers and low NOx rating of the humidifiers (70mg/kWh), it is considered that the pollutant contribution at receptor locations would be minimal and therefore any impact resulting from boiler emissions could be ruled insignificant.

167. The Environmental Health officers are satisfied with the findings and have concluded the proposed low emission measures are acceptable in minimising the impact of the development on local air quality. The measures include the provision of: (i) a minimum of 15 car parking spaces with electric vehicle charging

infrastructure; (ii) 86 cycle parking spaces, with allowance for future provision for 40 additional cycle spaces; and (iii) Ultra-low NOx boilers and combustion plant.

168. The Air Quality Assessment submitted with the application sets out that the semiconductor fabrication process includes exhaust air streams that will be discharged through flues located 4.5m above roof level of the fabrication (FAB) laboratory. The process will be subject to Environmental Permitting Regulations and will therefore be required to utilise best available technology, with which the process exhaust would not have a significant impact on air quality. Environmental Health officers have confirmed an environmental licence from the Environment Agency will be required for the operational phase of the development.

169. Further to the above, Environmental Health officers note the general office extraction will not impact by way of odours and kitchen extraction is a standard issue that can be controlled by commercially available solutions depending upon likely impacts. Furthermore, officers would expect an appropriate level of filtration would be specified depending on the type of process taking place within the FAB and, having reviewed the submitted Ventilation and Extraction Statement, conclude the proposals would not raise any contentious issues.

170. Environmental Health officers recommend a condition to secure the implementation of the proposed low emission measures, and for permission to be required prior to any burning of waste on site during demolition and construction. This is supported and the conditions are recommended accordingly.

Contaminated Land

171. The site has a history of mixed land use and is bounded by an industrial area with some potentially contaminative use. As such, historical site investigations and desk studies have previously been reviewed and presented, concluding that a full phase 2 investigation is required to assess ground conditions, possible gas conditions and the potential for UXO, as stated by Environmental Health officers.

172. Having reviewed the application's documents, Environmental Health officers note that the need to include parts of the application site which have not been assessed. Considering this and other amendments suggested by the Environmental Health officers, a condition is recommended to take account of this information, a subsequent Verification Report in necessary and any unexpected contamination found on site.

Conclusion

173. Environmental Health officers have no objection in principle to the proposals, but state that the environmental health issues and health determinants need to be considered and effectively controlled with the imposition of recommended conditions. This aims to protect the quality of life and the amenity and health of proposed and existing neighbouring premises, the wider community and the environment, in line with policies SC/2, SC/9, SC/10, SC/11, SC/12, SC/13 and SC/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

Transport and Infrastructure

Sustainable Travel

174. The site is well connected and has potential for future opportunities for non-car travel in the area, given the current works and future plans for the area co-ordinated by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP). Information available indicates the development site will be in proximity to a new segregated Mass Rapid Transit route from the A11 via Sawston to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.

175. The National Cycle route NCN11 has been recently improved with the implementation of a segregated path along Cambridge Road, as part of the plans to implement the Sawston Greenway network. Improvements are planned for the implementation of a 3m shared pedestrian and cycle path along the A1301, to the west of the site's entrance at the bypass, providing a more direct route to Cambridge.

176. During consultation to both current and the withdrawn application (ref. S/2122/19/FL) for the development site, residents of the surrounding areas have expressed aims to see the site accessible to the public in general, and the connectivity between the villages of Sawston and Whittlesford improved. This has been addressed by the applicants with an indicative east-west pedestrian/cycleway linking the site access at the A1301 bypass where it adjoins the public footpath/ NCN11 running south, and Whittlesford Road at a point south of the lake.

177. This east-west pedestrian/cycleway is intended to be publicly accessible as set out in the Transport Assessment provided with the application. It is noted that the proposed east-west route connects to existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) networks and strengthen connections between Sawston and Whittlesford villages, in line with Policy TI/2 (2b) of the Local Plan.

178. Chapter 7 of the submitted Travel Plan (TP), indicates the specific measures to be implemented with the development, as required by Policy TI/2 (5). The TP targets are set out to provide a decrease in car driving mode of 15% over the 5-year period and an increase of 5% to each of the sustainable modes (by public transport, cycling and walking) over the same period. To achieve those targets, the TP measures include the provision of essential maintenance facilities such as bicycle pumps available for use by employees at the site; a 'Cycle to Work' scheme; travel information packs focusing on cycling to work and public transport; promotion of car sharing schemes; and the provision of 15 car parking spaces with active electric vehicle charging infrastructure and passive provision for the remainder of the spaces.

179. The targets and measures of the TP have been agreed by the Highways Authority, who recommends the TP to be secured by condition. The Highways Authority is supportive of the proposal and a planning obligation as part of a S106

agreement is recommended to secure the implementation of this route, which will be external to the application boundary, in the wider Huawei estate. Officers are also content that the proposals align with requirements of Policy TI/2 of the Local Plan, and the condition and planning obligations are recommended accordingly.

180. In addition to the above, the Highways Authority requires developers to provide details of the 3m wide shared pedestrian and cycle path linking the site to the A1301, which is proposed with the development. This is agreed and the provision of details is recommended to be secured by condition, should permission be granted.

Transport Assessment

181. The Transport Assessment (TA) submitted with the application includes the mode share, which shows that the vast majority of the forecasted trips to/from the development site will be done by car (79%) and car passenger (4.5%), followed by a much lower percentage of sustainable travels modes, including 7% cycle share and 5% walking, followed by 2.5% bus and 1% rail share. The Highways Authority agree with those mode shares and is satisfied that the assessment provided in the TA is robust.

182. On assessing the impact from development, the TA takes into consideration the extant permission (ref.: S/0750/01/F) that has been implemented (but not fully constructed), identifying the trips this development would generate, and assessing for the purposes of this application the net change in travel demand against the proposed development. By using this approach, the TA concludes that there will be a further 14 daily cycle trips with AM and PM peak hours as a reference, and the number of walking trips would effectively decrease in 26 daily trips. This approach and the assessment findings have been accepted by the Highways Authority.

183. In terms of vehicular traffic, the TA concludes that the A1301/A505 junction will be impacted, as all the modelling parameters will worsen with the development traffic on the A1301 northern arm in the PM peak. In 2023 and 2028 years the model

results show that the operation of this roundabout will be well above capacity, and in summary, when the modelling of the northern arm includes a small flare, it results in a significant increase on the junction capacity. The Highways Authority recommends therefore this flare should be provided with the proposed development, assuming no other improvements are forthcoming with development permitted in the area.

184. Further transport improvements were suggested during consultation on the application and were identified in the submitted Statement of Community Involvement. These included the creation of further foot/cycle paths, the implementation of a cycleway along A1301 linking Whittlesford and Stapleford and a bridge over the railway. Considering the outcome of the TA submitted with the application, it is considered that the provision of the east-west cycle/footpath would be sufficient to mitigate the impact from development and further requirements would not be proportionate to the proposed development in light of the extant permission, and unnecessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms.

185. Considering the relative impacts of the development on the A1301 corridor, the provision of a flare on the northern arm of the A1301/A505 junction is recommended to be secured by S106 agreement, with works to be undertaken by the applicant as part of a S278 works agreement. This is supported and necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, considering Policy TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

Highways Safety

186. Following review of the TA submitted with the application, the Highways Authority concluded that the existing highways accidents present a pattern or potential future issue, contrary to the conclusions inferred by the applicant in the assessment. According to the Highways Authority, the TA fails to address how pedestrian and cyclist, as most vulnerable highway users will cross the A1301.

187. On further correspondence, the Highways Authority although not objecting the approach to assessing 'net' impact from development as described in the previous section, notes a condition to implement highways safety measures had been imposed with the granted permission. Condition 4 of permission ref. S/0750/01/F required the completion of highway woks prior to occupation of the development, which included footway improvements and further works detailed on drawing B335/102A of the permission. In addition, the S106 agreement linked with the S/0750/01/F permission included an obligation for the owners to install, a variable message safety sign (VMS) on the bypass adjacent to the site, which should be operational to alert oncoming traffic if vehicles are queuing on the road.

188. On further correspondence, applicants have confirmed Condition 4 of the previous permission (ref. S/0750/01/F) has not been discharged. With regards to the planning obligation, applicants note the existence of a VMS on the A1301 northbound approach, approximately 170m south of the site access. This could be used to warn approaching traffic to slow down should queuing in the left turn slip lane build up. Applicants note that whilst the VMS is currently not switched on, it has been assumed the Highways Authority could potentially re-activate it following site occupation. This has not been confirmed by the Highways Authority by the time of this report drafting, but planning officers consider this to be a reasonably acceptable consideration.

189. A condition with similar requirements to condition 4 of the permission previously granted (ref. S/0750/01/F) is therefore recommended, should permission be granted to this application. The highway works should be carried out by the developers as in the previous permission and a condition has been recommended accordingly.

Parking provision

190. The car parking provision comprises 284 spaces at basement level for employees and 16 spaces at ground floor for visitors adjacent to the visitor pick-up/drop-off area proposed at the front of the main building. The TA submitted with the application notes this would be below the maximum car parking provision of 1,682 spaces, as per Policy TI/3 of the Local Plan, which states that a maximum of 1

space / 30m2  would be permitted for the proposed B1 use. Nevertheless, officers note that the Local Plan is clear in stating these as indicative standards and that the car parking provision should be tailored to reflect the specific development in terms of its location, along with measures to reduce the level of need for private car parking.

191. The provision of cycle parking is set out in the same proportion by Policy TI/3, but as a minimum standard provision, as the Local Plan aims to encourage more people to cycle to work. The proposal is for provision of 80 cycle parking spaces for staff and 6 for visitors, totalling provision of 86 cycle parking spaces, which is well below the 1,682 spaces set out as minimum provision by the Local Plan.

192. Applicants have advised that this provision represents approximately 22% of the estimated number of future employees, which can comfortably accommodate the current cycle mode share of 7%. The 22% provision would also accommodate any increase on the cycle share, predicted by the Travel Plan to increase to 15% over the 5-year plan period. Furthermore, applicants have confirmed that should any additional cycle parking be required, a further 40 cycle parking spaces can be accommodated on site. The Highways Authority did not object to this this approach and officers, having considered the above, consider the parking proposals on balance acceptable in planning terms.

Planning Obligations

193. The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to assess any planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the test, then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (b) directly related to the development; and (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

194. Policy TI/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan sets out that planning permission will only be granted for proposals that have made suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms. Furthermore, Policy TI/8 sets out that the nature, scale and phasing of any planning obligations and/or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions sought will be related to the form of the development and its potential impact upon the surrounding area.

195. In bringing forward the recommendation in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development officers have considered these requirements, and the full planning consent once approved should be subject to a S106 Agreement to secure the necessary mitigation as follows:

Transport

o Provision of a cycle/footpath across the site linking the A1301 site access to Whittlesford Road, to be publicly accessible and in accordance with the indicative route set out by the Transport Assessment/ Travel Plan. To be implemented prior to occupation and in accordance with details previously approved by the LPA. Arrangements for maintenance of the cycle/footpath to be included in the S016 agreement.

o Provision of a flare on the northern arm of the A1301/A505 junction. Works are to be undertaken by the applicant as part of a S278 works agreement should the flare or the signalisation or other improvements not be built by others prior to the occupation of the proposed development.

Landscape and Ecology

o Submission of a detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) for the management period of 30 years, to be approved by the LPA prior to the commencement of development. The LEMP must include the mitigation

measures, management prescription, process for monitoring and review and maintenance specification on the draft LEMP dated 18.05.2020.

Archaeology

o Submission of an Archaeological Conservation Management Plan and Community Outreach Plan (ACMPCOP) to include the principles and policies set out in the draft version dating March 2020 and included as part of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). To be approved by the LPA prior to the commencement of development.

Other obligations

o S106 monitoring fees

The Planning Balance

196. The NPPF in paragraph 11 sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, with proposals that accord with the Development Plan to be approved without delay. The proposed development will provide a high-quality building for research and development functions, in accordance with the existing strategy for established employment areas set out in Local Plan Policy E/15.

197. The development scheme would have dis-benefits, including the significant harm caused to the setting of the scheduled Borough Hill marsh-fort, the moderate harm caused by the visual impact to neighbouring sensitive locations, and the limited harm caused by construction impacts, lower cycle parking provision, and the pumping system applied as part of the drainage method, as a less desirable method

of water discharge. The implications of these disbenefits, or harms, have been evaluated as part of this report and overall, it is considered that they are outweighed by the planning benefits that the scheme would bring, as set out below.

198. Substantial economic benefits locally will result from the proposed development, through the employment of between 350 and 400 people directly during operation only. The sustainable measures embedded in the building design will contribute to future water demand, with credits achieved above current policy requirements, which is considered a moderate benefit from the proposal.

199. Environmentally, the high-quality design of the building with carefully chosen finishing materials would improve the long views from relevant locations such as the Magog hills is a moderate benefit for the landscape character of this area. The conservation and management of the Borough Hill marsh-fort, with potential increase of public access to the scheduled monument is considered a substantial benefit of the proposal. This will be secured with the establishment of an Archaeological Conservation Management Plan and a Community Outreach Plan is considered a step change for keeping the significance of this rare historic asset. Similarly, the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan offer not only a co-ordinated approach to visual impact mitigation and ecological enhancement, resulting on a significant net gain in biodiversity and including proposals for the management of the Dernford Fen SSSI. These are demonstrably substantial benefits from the proposals, with an impact much beyond the application boundaries.

200. Socially, the improvements to the foul water network and improvements to the A1301/A505 roundabout are moderate benefits which will benefit not only the occupiers of the proposed developments, but other users of these important infrastructure and wider sewage and transport networks. The connectivity of the site with the neighbouring villages of Sawston and Whittlesford and the environment for pedestrians and cyclists will improve with the implementation of an east-west foot and cycle way across the wider estate, considered a moderate benefit from the proposal.

201. In terms of the balance these positive benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh the identified harm to heritage assets and visual impact. The lower

provision of cycle parking is compensated by the improvements on the cycling and pedestrian infrastructure brought with the development. The less desired drainage method has been justified by demonstration that applicants have explored alternative methods, and equally is compensated by other sustainable measures embedded in the design of the buildings and the expansion of the network outside the application boundary.

202. As such, it is recommended that the Full Application is approved subject to completion of the S106 Agreement and the following conditions:

# SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Thursday, 25 June 2020 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor John Batchelor – Chair
Councillor Pippa Heylings – Vice-Chair

Councillors: Anna Bradnam, Peter Fane, Judith Rippeth, Heather Williams, Nick Wright, Dr. Claire Daunton (substitute), Brian Milnes, Deborah Roberts, Dr. Richard Williams

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:
Christopher Carter (Delivery Manager - Strategic Sites), Richard Fitzjohn (Senior Planning Officer), Yole Medeiros (Principal Planner), Karen Pell-Coggins (Principal Planning Officer), Stephen Reid (Senior Planning Lawyer), Ian Senior (Democratic Services Officer), Michael Sexton (Senior Planning Officer), Luke Simpson (Senior Planning Officer) and Andrew Thompson (Principal Planning Officer - Strategic Sites)

## 1. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

For the benefit of members of the public viewing the live webcast of the meeting, the Chair introduced Committee members and officers in attendance. Councillor Richard Williams had recently been appointed to the Committee in place of Councillor Sue Ellington. The Chair paid tribute to Councillor Ellington and thanked her for her past contribution.

He explained that this meeting of the Planning Committee was being held virtually and asked for patience bearing in mind the challenges posed by the technology in use and by the new meeting skills required.

The Chair confirmed that the Planning Committee would continue with the practice of recording votes unless a resolution could be reached by affirmation. He explained the process he would follow in a virtual meetings environment.

He confirmed that the meeting was quorate but informed members of the public that, if a Committee member was absent for any part of the presentation of or debate about an agenda item then that member would not be allowed to vote on that item.

## 2. APOLOGIES

Councillor Dr. Martin Cahn sent Apologies for Absence. Councillor Dr. Claire Daunton was present as his substitute.

## 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor John Batchelor in relation to Minute 7 (S/4418/19/RM - Linton (Land South of Wheatsheaf Barn, Horseheath Road)) declared a non-pecuniary interest as he had been

present at Lintgon Parish Council meetings at which this application had been discussed. He was considering the matter afresh.

Councillor Anna Bradnam in relation to

- Minute 8 (S/2896/19/FL - Duxford (Imperial War Museum Royston Road, Duxford)) declared a non-pecuniary interest. In her capacity as South Cambridgeshire District Council's representative on the Board of Trustees to Denny Abbey and the Farmland Museum, she knows another Trustee on that Board, Michael Peirson, who is the Retail and Admission Manager for the Imperial War Museum at Duxford. While she and Mr Peirson had discussed the generalities of museum finances and strategies for the future, Councillor Bradnam confirmed that she had not discussed this application for a hotel at the Imperial War Museum, Duxford with Mr Peirson at any time. Councillor Bradnam was considering the matter afresh.
- Minute 11 (20/01005/FUL - Fen Ditton (1-3 and 2-28, Musgrave Way)) reminded those present that she was the Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Electoral Division of Waterbeach, which includes the northern part of Fen Ditton parish.

Councillor Dr. Claire Daunton in relation to

- Minute 10 (20/01004/FUL - Teversham (1-4 and 17-28 Ferndale)) and
- Minute 11 (20/01005/FUL - Fen Ditton (1-3 and 2-28, Musgrave Way))

reminded those present that she was one of the local District Council Members.

Councillor Peter Fane in relation to Minute 6 (S/0158/20/FL - Sawston (Former Spicers Site, Sawston Bypass)) declared a non-pecuniary interest as one of the local Members for the neighbouring Ward of Shelford where discussions and exhibitions had taken place in respect of this application.

Councillor Brian Milnes in relation to Minute 6 (S/0158/20/FL - Sawston (Former Spicers Site, Sawston Bypass)) declared a non-pecuniary interest as this application had provoked a significant amount of discussion in Sawston, for which parish he was one of the local Members. He was considering the matter afresh.

Councillor Richard Williams in relation to

- Minute 6 (S/0158/20/FL - Sawston (Former Spicers Site, Sawston Bypass)) and
- Minute 8 (S/2896/19/FL - Duxford (Imperial War Museum Royston Road, Duxford))

Declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Whittlesford Parish Council where both applications had been discussed. He was considering both matters afresh.

Councillor Nick Wright in relation to

- Minute 6 (S/0158/20/FL - Sawston (Former Spicers Site, Sawston Bypass)) and
- Minute 8 (S/2896/19/FL - Duxford (Imperial War Museum Royston Road, Duxford))

declared a non-pecuniary interest. As a former Planning Portfolio Holder at South Cambridgeshire District Council, Councillor Wright had been involved in discussions about both proposals but was now considering both applications afresh.

## 4. MINUTES OF A PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee authorised the Chair to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2020.

## 5. S/2423/19/DC - LONGSTANTON (NORTHSTOWE PHASE 2)

The case officer made a detailed presentation of the up-to-date situation and addressed Members' concerns, including those relating to employment levels, the Market Hall,

outdoor space for assemblies, and leisure.

Members expressed views both against and in support of the latest concept.

By nine votes to one with one abstention, the Committee **discharged** Condition 14 of Outline planning permission S/2011/14/OL requiring further detail of the early phases of the development of the town centre to ensure that services and facilities could be delivered. The discharge would include text in the following terms

1. That the submitted Town Centre Strategy provided a suitable basis for the early delivery of community buildings (known as the Civic Hub) and the first commercial building (the Market Hall) and in particular Stage A of the submitted Strategy in accordance with the requirements of Condition 14 of S/2011/14/OL.

2. That indicative floorspace figures provided an initial basis for consideration of the capacity of the town centre but with appropriate flexibility in the delivery to allow for changes in technology and new uses as well as delivering significant employment provision. The town centre would be capable of accommodating the level of comparison retail floorspace under planning reference S/3187/18/FL in a sustainable town centre location. The proposals would also deliver other aspects including community uses, residential, public realm, leisure and other commercial floorspace through promoting flexibility in uses. The town centre strategy was consistent with the creation of the education campus.

3. The town centre strategy provided the opportunity to deliver a range of uses and temporary facilities to create new markets and provide innovation and enterprise, particularly to the Small and Medium-sized Enterprise market.

4. Discharge of the condition would not grant Reserved Matters or detailed consent for any building but rather agreed a Strategy for early phases which would build on the approved outline planning permission, and should be read in conjunction with the Town Centre Strategy approved as part of outline planning permission reference S/2011/14/OL.

(Councillors John Batchelor, Bradnam, Faunton, Fane, Heylings, Milnes, Rippeth. Richard Williams and Wright voted to discharge the Condition. Councillor Heather Williams voted against discharge. Councillor Roberts abstained.)

## 6. S/0158/20/FL - SAWSTON (FORMER SPICERS SITE, SAWSTON BYPASS)

The Delivery Manager (Strategic Sites) acknowledged that this application had attracted a lot of local, national, and international interest recently, mainly for security reasons. He reminded Members that their responsibility as a Planning Committee was to restrict themselves to matters of a planning land use nature and material considerations arising therefrom, and to disregard the identity of the applicant, which was not material. He also reminded Members to base their comments on the Development Plan, South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework.

Henk Koopmans (Chief Executive Officer, Huawei) and Councillor Barbara Kettel (Stapleford Parish Council) addressed the meeting.

Members focussed their debate on

- Water supply issues, including potential impact on the water table
- Landscaping and design

- Concern about the apparent lack of cycling connectivity with nearby villages, although officers explained that current proposals were proportionate to the application being considered, and that further opportunities would arise in future as the site was developed
- Biodiversity issues that had been addressed by statutory consultees
- Clarification that the proposal site was not in the Green Belt
- Prematurity
- The need for a Masterplan
- Issues surrounding 'high end' employment, housing, and sustainable transport

Councillor Deborah Roberts proposed deferral on the grounds that the application was premature, would impact adversely on water supply, and should form part of a Masterplan. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Heather Williams and, upon a roll call being conducted, was **lost** by eight votes to three. Councillors Roberts, Heather Williams and Richard Williams voted for deferral. Councillors John Batchelor, Bradnam, Daunton, Fane, Heylings, Milnes, Rippeth and Wright voted against deferral.

Following further debate, including discussion about Conditions and a Travel Plan, the Chair welcomed the application as an excellent use of a brownfield site that complied fully with the Local Plan, and delivered several benefits for the local area.

Upon a roll call being conducted as to the substantive motion, and by nine votes to one, the Committee **approved** the application subject to

1. The prior completion of a Legal Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing mitigation measures relating to
    a. Transport
    b. Landscape and ecology
    c. Archaeology
    d. Section 106 monitoring fees

    as referred to in more detail in paragraph 195 of the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development;

2. The Conditions and Informatives set out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development including specific additional Condition regarding the permission time limit, additional wording to Condition 6 to require consultation with Natural England, and additional wording to Condition 25 to include mention of re-use and recycling of water, such additional wording to be agreed by officers in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee.

(Councillors Bradnam, Daunton, Fane, Heylings, Milnes, Rippeth, Heather Williams, Richard Williams and Wright voted to approve the application. Councillor Roberts voted to refuse it. Councillor John Batchelor had missed several elements of the debate due to technical issues. Having taken advice from the Senior Planning Lawyer, Councillor Batchelor did not vote.)

**At this stage the meeting had lasted four hours. By affirmation, and in accordance with Standing Orders, the Committee agreed that the meeting should continue.**

## 7. S/4418/19/RM - LINTON (LAND SOUTH OF WHEATSHEAF BARN, HORSEHEATH ROAD)

Councillor Enid Bald (Linton Parish Council) addressed the meeting. A written statement from Councillor Henry Batchelor (a local Member) was read aloud to Committee members.

The case officer highlighted the footpath to the south west of the site. Currently there was no link between that footpath and Martins Lane across third party land but, he said, such a link might be negotiated in the future if there was sufficient local demand. The Senior Planning Lawyer informed the Committee that the question of land ownership was not an issue at this Reserved Matters stage. Outline consent had been granted on appeal, but Linton Parish Council was now out of time for challenging that decision. Members noted that the developer had relocated the fence along the western site boundary so that none of the third party land formed part of any of the properties along that boundary,

Committee members appreciated the way in which the developer and Parish Council had worked together to produce a high-quality scheme. However, Members expressed concern about the abrupt nature of the boundary, and also sought to minimise loss of the hedge along the frontage to the site.

By affirmation, the Committee gave officers **delegated authority to approve** the application subject to

1. The Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Conditions associated with, and attached to, the Outline planning permission S/2553/16/OL;

2. An Informative advising the applicant that, as part of any discharge of conditions application to condition 14 of outline consent S/2553/16/OL (survey for retention of existing trees and hedges), the hedgerow on the northern edge of the site adjacent to Horseheath Road should be retained where it is practicable to do so. precise wording to be agreed by officers in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee; and

3. The Conditions and Informatives set out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

## 8. S/2896/19/FL - DUXFORD (IMPERIAL WAR MUSEUM ROYSTON ROAD, DUXFORD)

In response to concern raised by Members, the case officer was satisfied that Thriplow Parish Council and residents in Heathfield had been consulted but had not responded. Officers took the view that the public benefit in securing the viability of the Imperial War Museum significantly outweighed the harm caused by the proposal. They considered that the impact on heritage assets was less than substantial and that it was for the Committee to achieve a planning balance.

Andrew Bennellick (agent) addressed the meeting. A statement from Councillor Peter McDonald (local Member) was read out to the Committee.

The Senior Planning Lawyer advised the Committee that it would be possible to adhere to planning time limits and check on the consultation issue by delegating any approval to officers. In any event, a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 had yet to be finalised and signed. If consultation had been carried out satisfactorily. Then consent would be granted. If consultation had been defective then the

proposal would be brought back to Committee for determination.

Members' discussion focussed on

- Landscaping
- Design, massing, materials, and colour
- Impact on the Conservation Area
- Viability of the Museum
- Economic development benefits for South Cambridgeshire
- Renewable energy
- Potential light pollution
- The principle of development

The Delivery Manager (Strategic Sites) confirmed that, in the absence of a Viability Assessment having been submitted with the application, Members were unable to give any weight to that topic.

By seven votes to two, the Committee gave officers **delegated authority to approve** the application subject to

1. Officers being satisfied that all appropriate public consultation had been carried out. If not so satisfied, then the consultation exercise would be carried out, and the application again presented to Committee for determination.

2. The prior completion of a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing a commuted sum towards maintenance of the 'keep clear' markings on the M11 Junction 10 roundabout.

3. The Conditions and Informatives referred to in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development plus additional wording added to the materials condition in relation to the use of toned down colours and the landscaping condition to secure a hedge along the eastern boundary adjacent to the M11 slip road.

(Councillors John Batchelor, Bradnam, Daunton, Fane, Heylings, Milnes and Wright voted to approve the application. Councillors Roberts and Heather Williams voted for refusal. Councillors Rippeth and Richard Williams were not present and did not vote.

## 9. S/0185/20/FL - GAMLINGAY (GRAYS ROAD)

Referring to paragraph 11 of the report, the case officer said that the land jn fact was owned by South Cambridgeshire District Council and not by Cambridgeshire County Council.

By affirmation, the Committee **approved** the application subject to the Conditions and Informative set out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

Councillors Rippeth and Roberts were not present and did not form part of the affirmation.

## 10. 20/01004/FUL - TEVERSHAM (1-4 AND 17-28 FERNDALE)

By affirmation, the Committee **approved** the application subject to the Conditions set out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

Councillors Rippeth and Roberts were not present and did not form part of the affirmation.

**11. 20/01005/FUL - FEN DITTON (1-3 AND 2-28, MUSGRAVE WAY)**

By affirmation, the Committee **approved** the application subject to the Conditions set out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

Councillors Rippeth and Roberts were not present and did not form part of the affirmation.

---

**The Meeting ended at 5.25 p.m.**

---