

**Proposed Travel Hub, to include car parking, cycle, coach, and horse parking, travel hub building, photovoltaic panels, substation, lighting; significant infrastructure improvements to include road widening of the A10 along Cambridge Road, Hauxton Road and M11 Junction 11 north bound slip road, and a new dedicated busway to include strengthening of existing agricultural bridge; provision for a new Shared Use Path, including new bridge across the M11; with associated drainage, landscaping (including reconfiguration of bunds), biodiversity enhancement areas and infrastructure.**

**At: Land to the north/north-west of Hauxton Road (A10), to the north-west and north of Junction 11 of the M11 and to the west of Cambridge Road (A10) CB22 5HT (within the parish of Hauxton and partly within the parish of South Trumington).**

Applicant: Cambridgeshire County Council

Application Number: CCC/20/040/FUL

To: Planning Committee

Date: 29 July 2021

From: Assistant Director, Planning, Growth & Environment

Electoral division(s): Sawston & Shelford and Trumington

Purpose: To consider the above planning application

Recommendation: That subject to the matter being referred to the Secretary of State for further consideration and the application not being called in, permission is granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 11.1

Officer contact:

Name: Dallas Owen

Post: Development Management Officer (Strategic and Specialist)

Email: [Email address for Dallas Owen](#)

Tel: 01223 714722

## 1. Introduction / Background

- 1.1 This scheme is one of the key strategic projects that has been identified by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) as part of the Government's City Deal funding. This scheme has been designed to ease congestion into the City of Cambridge and reduce journey times and the number of cars travelling into both Cambridge city centre and to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. As set out in the applicant's submitted Planning Statement, the objective of the proposed Travel Hub is to ease pressure on the existing Trumpington Park & Ride facility and reduce traffic flow through the M11 Junction 11. The Travel Hub is therefore proposed to be complementary to the existing Trumpington Park & Ride facility, and the applicant has confirmed that it is not designed as a replacement facility to the current site. Cambridgeshire County Council will be responsible for the delivery of this project, which means that this proposal will be considered under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, as an application for planning permission by an interested planning authority for the development of land for transport purposes, where the authority intends to develop the land themselves.
- 1.2 This proposal has been brought forward by the applicant as one of a number of projects to complement and progress additional transport infrastructure in the GCP area. This proposal has been developed alongside some of the wider schemes set out in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's (CPCA's) Local Transport Plan (LTP) published in February 2020 and the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership Schemes through the City Deal funding. The CPCA's LTP identifies the many transport challenges within the area and the need to invest in improved infrastructure; which identifies the potential for additional park and ride capacity in this area (see Figure 3.2 in the LTP), whilst also providing opportunities for more walking and cycling. The proposals have been designed by the applicant in the knowledge of future transport developments being progressed such as East-West Rail, Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM), a new Cambridge South Railway Station to serve the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, proposed busways, and planned greenways in the local area; and has therefore been brought forward to assist with the modal shift aspirations in this area, whether such schemes come forward or not.
- 1.3 As the proposal is for development which does not accord with the provisions of the adopted development plan (South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018)), the Secretary of State has been notified on the basis that it is a departure from the development plan. This means that the Secretary of State has the opportunity to "call in" the proposal to assess the recommendation of the Planning Committee once made.

## 2. The Site and Surroundings

- 2.1 The largest part of the Scheme comprises the proposed Travel Hub. The main Travel Hub site, which contains the car parking area and associated building, solar panels and landscaping (hereafter referred to as the 'Travel Hub' site), is located on the west side of the M11 in the parish of Hauxton. However, the total red line area encompassing the whole Scheme area, as shown in Agenda Plan 1, spans both sides of the M11 (including the A10 approach on either side of the M11 junction 11 and north bound off-slip from the M11) to allow road widening works along the A10 and M11 northbound slip road, inclusion of an internal access route across the M11 for a dedicated busway public transport route with strengthening works to the existing agricultural bridge (also known as the 'accommodation bridge', a new bridge across the M11 for non-motorised users (NMUs), associated

landscaping, and a drainage outfall connection route to the River Cam (discussed in more detail in section 3 of this report below). The total red line area extends to approximately 46.65 hectares (approximately 115.3 acres) to take account of all the associated works and highway routes and upgrades proposed as part of this planning application, of which the Travel Hub site itself equates to approximately 29.5 hectares (approximately 73 acres).

2.2 The application red line area is situated mainly within South Cambridgeshire, with the dedicated public transport route falling into Cambridge City Council's administrative area. This results in the application red line area covering the parishes of Hauxton (to the west of the M11) and South Trumpington (to the east of the M11), or within land associated with the city of Cambridge which is non-parished. The main Travel Hub site is located entirely within the Parish of Hauxton; with the highway improvements, dedicated public transport route and drainage outfall connection route falling between the Parish of South Trumpington or in non-parished areas within the city of Cambridge. The proposed Travel Hub site comprises three agricultural fields (used for arable production), with no buildings or visible structures contained within them. The Travel Hub site is enclosed to the north western boundary by an existing cycleway, to the north east by junction 11 of the M11, to the south east by Cambridge Road (A10), and to the south west by arable fields. Beyond the farm track to the west is the River Cam.

2.3 In terms of planning constraints, the Travel Hub site is located within the Cambridge Green Belt; is within the Lords Bridge Radio Telescope Consultation Area (Area 1); and is in a Civil Aviation Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport for buildings, structures or work over 90 metres (295.3 feet) in height and for the Imperial War Museum at Duxford for buildings, structures or work over 45 metres (147.6 feet) in height. The Travel Hub site just falls outside the sand and gravel mineral safeguarded area defined by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan Document, but is adjacent to this planning constraint, with the drainage connection to the River Cam just entering into the safeguarded area. In respect of heritage constraints, there is an existing grade II listed milestone located adjacent to the Travel Hub NMU access site boundary, to the north of Hauxton Road (Hauxton Mill Bridge: List entry ref: 1127840), and a further grade II listed milestone located adjacent to the red line area on the public transport route towards the existing Trumpington Park and Ride site (Milestone about half a mile south of the junction with Shelford Road, Hauxton Road: List entry ref: 1226190). There are no other heritage assets located within or immediately adjacent to the Travel Hub site and wider red line area. However, there are three scheduled monuments, two conservation areas and a further ten listed buildings / structures within approximately 1 kilometre (approximately 0.62 miles) of the proposed Travel Hub site, the nearest of which is the grade II listed Hauxton Watermill (List entry ref: 1127839) approximately 150 metres (approximately 164 yards) to the south (taken from the Travel Hub NMU access site boundary adjacent to the A10). The Scheduled Monuments within close proximity to the Travel Hub site are as follows (with the wider heritage constraints evident in Agenda Plan 2):

- Romano-British settlement site south west of Trumpington – approximately 460 metres (approximately 503 yards) north of the Travel Hub site;
- Settlement complex north of Hauxton – approximately 700 metres (approximately 766 yards) south east of the Travel Hub site; and
- Settlement complex north east of Haslingfield – approximately 830 metres (908 yards) north west of the Travel Hub site.

2.4 The Travel Hub site is predominantly located within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore considered to be at a low risk from flooding. Only the far south-west corner of the Travel

Hub site is situated within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

- 2.5 The M11 motorway is located predominantly to the north of the Travel Hub site, with Junction 11 of the M11 to the north-east. Cambridge Road (A10) forms the south-eastern boundary to the site and there is an existing cycleway along the north western boundary that crosses the M11 and continues into Cambridge. To the west of the Travel Hub site are three Coprolite Ponds forming part of the Trumpington Meadows Country Park and nature reserve site. The country park and nature reserve share its boundary with the application site. Cambridge City Centre is situated approximately 5.2 kilometres (approximately 3.23 miles) to the north east of the Travel Hub site. The main vehicular access to the proposed Travel hub site is proposed from the A10, with the internal access road for the dedicated busway public transport route crossing the M11 towards the existing Trumpington Park and Ride site on Hauxton Road. The existing Trumpington Park and Ride site is located approximately 0.82 kilometres (approximately 0.5 miles) to the north-east of the proposed Travel Hub site. This facility has recently been expanded, with work completed in March 2020 to provide a total of 1,614 parking spaces. The existing Trumpington Park and Ride site to the north east is proposed to be run alongside the proposed new Travel Hub site.
- 2.6 The closest dwellings to the Travel Hub site are approximately 150 metres (approximately 164 yards) to the south (taken from the Travel Hub NMU access site boundary adjacent to the A10), which are located across the A10 at Hauxton Mill, which includes a range of new dwellings accessed from St Edmunds Way. The closest dwellings to the public transport route to the east of the M11 are the new dwellings currently being constructed at Trumpington Meadows which are approximately 408 metres (approximately 446 yards) away (approximately 712 metres (approximately 778 yards) from the centre of the Travel Hub site). Furthermore, the closest dwellings to the existing park and ride slip road that is proposed to be widened as part of this proposal, are the existing dwellings on the corner of Addenbrookes Access Road which are approximately 99.1 metres (approximately 108.4 Yards) away from the centre of the Travel Hub site).
- 2.7 The existing Trumpington Park and Ride site is within the ownership of Cambridgeshire County Council and has been identified in the blue line area for the purposes of this planning application, to demonstrate that it is land in control of the applicant. Further afield highway ownership of the guided busway route and county farms land adjacent to the Addenbrookes Access Road is also identified.

### 3. The Proposed Development

- 3.1 The application seeks full planning permission for a Travel hub site and associated infrastructure comprising the following:
- 2,150 car parking spaces inclusive of 108 Blue-Badge bays and 108 Electric Vehicle (EV) charging bays.
  - Designated drop off bays with capacity for circa 9 vehicles at any one time.
  - Bus interchange comprising 6 bus stops with covered waiting facilities for passengers.
  - 12 private coach spaces.
  - Initial provision for 326 cycle parking spaces comprising 160 covered Sheffield cycle stands, 16 covered 'M' stands for non-standard cycles, and 150 cycle parking lockers.
  - Equestrian parking area with attached horse corral.
  - A new 5 metre (5.47 yards) wide shared use path for non-motorised users (NMUs) with 0.5 metre (0.55 yards) grass verge for pedestrian, cyclists and equestrians.

- A new shared use NMU bridge over the M11 for pedestrian, cyclists and equestrians.
- A new site access from the A10 and local widening of the A10.
- A new off-line Public Transport route between the Travel Hub site and the A10 Hauxton Road / Addenbrooke's Road junction.
- Single storey building on the Travel Hub site with provisions including toilets, a help point, information displays, a cleaner's cupboard, an office and a kitchen, with a proposed footprint of 13.95 metres (45.7 feet) by 9.4 metres (30.83 feet) and 4 metres (13.12 feet) lowering to 3.13 metres (10.27 feet) in height.
- Lighting of the whole site for safety and security purposes, including low level lighting provided along the NMU route; and 8 metres (26.25 feet) high lighting columns within the Travel Hub site.
- Photovoltaic Panels over a third of the parking area of the site, with infrastructure to allow further additions in the future if required subject to the necessary planning permission consent.
- Provision for a Sub Station.
- Means of enclosure, to include Post and Three Rail Fencing, Post and Wire Fencing, and Stock Proof Fencing.
- Widening of A10 carriageway to create additional lanes and provision for road infrastructure.
- Widening of the M11 gyratory on the north bound western slip road.
- New access to the Country Park and nature reserve for the Wildlife Trust.

3.2 A soft landscaping strategy is proposed and ecological mitigation and enhancements which includes: native hedgerow and tree planting; and wildflower planting. Approximately 23 m of the existing mature hedgerow which crosses the Travel Hub site will be removed. In addition, approximately 500m of the hedgerow along the A10 will be removed to accommodate the widening of the road either side of the entrance to the Travel Hub. This hedgerow comprises newly established and newly planted hedgerow, described in the ecology chapter of the ES as species-poor hedgerows with some poorly established sections as a result of brown tail moth caterpillar damage. As part of the proposed landscape strategy for the site, approximately 1800m of new native species hedgerow will be planted as part of the CSWTH Scheme and a new woodland belt of native species along the A10 and A10/M11 boundary (minimum of 20m wide). The new hedgerow is shown on the planting proposals drawings 413752-MMD-LAN-XX-DR-LV-0001-0011. The species mix is as follows:

Species	Specification	Percentage mix (%)
<i>Cornus sanguinea</i> (common dogwood)	1+1: Branched:3 brks:BR:80-100cm	10
<i>Corylus avellana</i> (hazel)	1+1: Branched:3 brks: BR: 80-100cm	15
<i>Crataegus monogyna</i> (common hawthorn)	1+2: Transplant:3 brks: 80-100cm	40
<i>Ilex aquifolium</i> (holly)	1+2 5 brks:C:60-80cm	5
<i>Prunus spinosa</i> (blackthorn)	1+1: Branched:3 brks: BR: 80-100cm	20
<i>Rosa canina</i> (dog rose)	1+1: Branched:3 brks: BR: 80-100cm	10

3.3 A tree survey has also been submitted with the application that identifies there are no category A trees on the site, which are trees of high quality.

3.4 In addition to items listed in paragraph 3.1, hard landscaping is proposed to include; height restriction barriers along the proposed shared use NMU; tactile paving at crossing points; 3 metre (9.84 feet) high bus waiting shelters; permeable block paving within the parking bays;

blocked paved footway around the bus loop; pedestrian guardrail; deterrent paving; traffic lights; lockable bus barriers; electronically controlled gates; road signs within the Travel hub site and existing highway network; and picnic benches. (Agenda Plan 3).

## 4. Planning History

4.1 The proposed Travel Hub site is located on 3 farmed arable fields, that do not have any relevant planning history for consideration.

4.2 Wider developments at Trumpington Meadows, including the Trumpington Meadows Country Park, and improvements to the existing Trumpington Park and Ride site are relevant to the wider context of this development, including the need for any recommended planning conditions to work together, so these have been listed below for wider context purposes, which should be taken to include the associated condition and non-material amendment approvals:

- S/0654/00/CC & C/0315/00/CC – 1,500 Space Park and Ride Car Park, Erection of a One Storey Amenity Building, Creation of 2 New Vehicular Accesses and a Bus Only Access (Approved June 2001).
- S/1121/02/CC & C/0550/02/CC – Variation of Condition 21 of Planning permissions S/0654/00/CC & C/0315/00/CC to extend the use of the Park and Ride to include Sundays to operate between the hours of 0900 to 1900 (Approved September 2002).
- S/0054/08/O & 08/0048/OUT – Demolition of existing buildings and structure and Redevelopment for Approximately 600 dwellings. Land for a Primary School, Recreation / Leisure Uses including Change of Use from Agricultural to Public Open Space, Community and Other Local Facilities with Associated Parking, Infrastructure and Earthworks (Approved October 2009).
- S/1616/10 Formation of an Earth Bund adjacent to M11 (Discharge of Condition number 50 attached to S/0054/08/O), (Approved November 2010).
- S/2043/12/NM Amended details for formation of M11 Earth Bund (Condition 50 of S/1616/DC) of outline consent S/0054/08/O. (Approved January 2013).
- S/1323/15/DC Discharge of Condition 50 Earth Bund for S/0054/08/O for land to the North / East of the M11 Motorway West of Junction 11 (Approved July 2015).
- S/0107/16/RM Reserved matters for Phase 9 including 122 dwellings with associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space pursuant to outline planning approvals S/0054/08/O and 08/0048/OUT (Approved April 2016).
- S/0472/16/RM Reserved Matters application for final southern section of primary road and associated infrastructure pursuant to outline planning approval S/0054/08/O (Approved May 2016).
- S/2501/16/DC Discharge of Condition 50 (parts e and g – earth bund) of outline planning consent S/0054/08/O (Approved May 2016).
- S/2646/16/RM Reserved Matters for Phases 10 and 11 including 392 new dwellings (including 40% affordable housing) with associated internal roads, car and cycle parking, landscaping and open space pursuant to outline planning approval S/0054/08/O (Approved March 2017).
- C/5001/18/CC - Continued operation of existing Park and Ride Site on 24hr basis together with a proposed extension to accommodate 274 additional car parking spaces (including disabled parking bays); additional bus and coach stops and layout area; reconfiguration of existing car parking and the site entrance; provision of pedestrian and cycle links to Trumpington Meadows and replacement/new undercover cycle parking with associated infrastructure and landscaping (Approved November 2018).

## 5. Publicity and pre-application consultation

- 5.1 This proposal is an application for major development which does not accord with the provisions of the development plan. It has been publicised in accordance with Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The application was advertised by means of a notice in the Cambridge News on 7 July 2020. The Regulation 25 information required under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 was advertised in the Cambridge News on 4 January 2021. Both advertisements advertised the proposals as EIA development which would affect a public right of way, be development that affects the setting of a listed building and were proposals that did not accord with the provisions of the development plan (which are therefore considered to be a departure).
- 5.2 Five site notices were erected around the red line area on 2 July 2020 that advertised the proposals as EIA development which would affect a public right of way, be development that affects the setting of a listed building and were proposals that did not accord with the provisions of the development plan (which are therefore considered to be a departure). Site notice 1 was located at the main Trumpington Park & Ride Entrance; site notice 2 was located opposite the Addenbrookes access road junction; site notice 3 was located at the northern part of the Travel Hub site by the layby ahead of the M11 junction 11 roundabout; site notice 4 was located on the main frontage of the proposed site; and site notice 5 was located opposite the new Hauxton housing development that is accessed from Edmunds Way. Occupiers of properties adjacent to the red line area were notified by letter on 26 June 2020. The Secretary of State was also notified of the proposed development as it is located in the Cambridge Green Belt and will therefore be a departure from the development plan.
- 5.3 Following the submission of additional environmental information requested under Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, site notices were erected around the red line area on 22 December 2020 in the same locations as the original July 2020 site notices. Occupiers of the same properties adjacent to the red line area were also notified by letter of the Regulation 25 consultation on 21 December 2020.
- 5.4 The adopted Cambridgeshire County Council Statement of Community Involvement (January 2019) sets out that at pre-application stage applicants are encouraged to undertake pre-application discussions. Proposals are defined as either being 'Category A' developments requiring a high level of community involvement, or 'Category B' developments requiring a standard level of community involvement. Category A developments are defined as being applications with significant environmental effects or developments that are contrary to the development plan. The proposed application falls within a 'Category A' high level of community involvement as it is a proposal for a major infrastructure project within the Green Belt. The submitted Statement of Community Involvement produced by the applicant is dated April 2020.
- 5.5 Consultation by the applicant as part of the pre-application process included meetings with officers from Cambridgeshire County Council and Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service; the scheme was presented to the Joint Development Control Committee in July and December 2019; with a review undertaken by the Design Quality Panel in July 2019. Three public exhibition events were also held by the applicant in Autumn 2019 to inform the final submission proposals.

## 6. Consultation responses

- 6.1 The following paragraphs set out a summary of the consultation responses received, starting with confirmation of the final position after both rounds of public consultation, before setting out (where appropriate) the history of responses including any holding objections or concerns raised. The full responses are published on the Council's website. For ease of reference this section has been grouped as far as possible to link the responses into subject areas and/or the body providing them.
- 6.2 Greater Cambridge Shared Planning (GCSP) covering both South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Administrative Areas – Planning Officer: **No objection** subject to planning conditions. The GCSP planning responses received took account of the specialist consultee comments sought on Landscaping; Ecology; Environmental Health; Heritage; Sustainability; Air Quality and Contaminated land, which are set out separately within this officer report. Initially, GCSP planners confirmed that whilst they supported the principle of development, they found that additional information was required in respect of ecology and landscaping (including impact on the Cambridge Green Belt); which led them to place a holding objection on the application whilst emphasising that they were committed to working with county planners and the applicant to resolve the outstanding matters highlighted in their response. Following receipt of the Regulation 25 additional EIA information, the GCSP planners confirmed the Shared Service had considered the application and could confirm that there are no objections to the proposed development subject to a number of technical conditions listed in their response. This led to the removal of their holding objection and confirmation that they had no objection subject to the imposition of recommended planning conditions.
- 6.3 Greater Cambridge Shared Planning – Landscape: **No objection; whilst acknowledging the findings as reported in Chapter 10 and the Addendum do not mean that the development is acceptable or indeed unacceptable when considered against the relevant policies in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, which will be a matter for the overall planning balance.** Originally, in the absence of any assessment of the effect of the scheme on the Cambridge Green Belt openness and coordinated information and clarity regarding the extent and impact of the proposed earthworks and vegetation clearance, the GCSP landscape consultant confirmed that they were unable to fully determine the level of landscape and visual impact on the scheme, nor fully understand the design quality of the proposals. As such, whilst they acknowledged that some of these issues could be addressed by condition in the event that permission was granted, the lack of adequate Green Belt assessment was seen to be fundamental to understanding the impact of the scheme and conflicts with policy NH/8 (Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining the Green Belt). Consequently, they originally objected to the proposals on the basis of their conflict with NH/2 and failing to demonstrate meeting policy NH/8 (until further coordinated information and assessment had been submitted).
- 6.4 On receipt of the updated and additional information issued by the applicant's Agent, the GCSP landscape consultant provided comments that led them to withdraw their original objection, whilst leaving the harm against the relevant policies in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan to the overall planning balance. The GCSP landscape consultant acknowledged that the proposed creation of 1 metre high bunds and raising of levels by 300mm across proposed soft landscape areas is acceptable as an overall principle. However, they raised a number of comments relating to the suitability of using the topsoil in areas of species-rich



grassland and requested further detail and specification is required by condition should permission be granted. They confirmed that they continue to raise a design issue with the layout of part of the shared user path and the adjoining access road that unfortunately results in a lack of meaningful landscape treatment and poor amenity for users of the path where they pass through the main part of the travel hub site.

- 6.5 The GCSP landscape consultant acknowledged that the proposed Travel Hub is recognised as an important development proposal that has followed a structured site-selection and appraisal process and incorporates many positive Green Infrastructure and landscape design approaches that could deliver enhancement of some areas. Nevertheless, they are of the opinion that it is a proposal that would potentially be harmful to the local landscape character and visual amenity, including impacting upon the purposes and visual openness of the Green Belt. The identified harms should therefore be accordingly weighted in the planning balance. In the GCSP landscape consultants opinion, the proposal would give rise to a range of adverse landscape and visual effects that whilst on the whole could be mitigated, would also result in some residual effects on visual amenity to users of the local cycle route facilities. The Environmental Statement (ES) acknowledges that there would be adverse landscape and visual effects and that some would be residual, but considers that for the most part, these would be minor and ranked as being not significant in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms by Year 15. The GCSP landscape consultant confirmed that they did not take a fundamentally different position to that of the applicant in this regard.
- 6.6 The GCSP landscape consultant noted that the ES and Chapter 10 Addendum confirms that there would be adverse landscape and visual effects, albeit these are ranked in the ES as being not significant in EIA terms. However, the Policy NH/2 does not refer to significant harm, rather it is a test of new development needing to respect and retain or enhance the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and of the individual National Character Area in which it is located. The range of adverse impacts concluded in the ES Chapter 10 Addendum (LVIA) would suggest that the proposed development does not fully meet Policy NH/2. The landscape proposals and commitment to long-term management secured via a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, might be capable of offsetting some of the harm that would arise from the proposal, albeit the function, landscape character and appearance of this part of the local landscape would be markedly altered.
- 6.7 In conclusion, the GCSP landscape consultant accepted that whilst in Green Belt terms, the proposed development is considered to be 'not inappropriate' development by the applicant, the proposal is also considered to cause a degree of harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt such that the proposal conflicts with NPPF (2021) and Policy NH/8. As such, in the GCSP landscape consultant's view, the findings as reported in Chapter 10 and the Addendum do not mean that the development is acceptable or indeed unacceptable when considered against the relevant policies in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, and as such this must be a matter for consideration by South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) as part of the overall planning balance.
- 6.8 SCDC Environmental Health Officer (EHO) – **No objection subject to the imposition of the recommended planning conditions.** Whilst the EHO had no objections in principle to the proposals, he did acknowledge that the construction phase of the development will ultimately produce noise and dust which has the potential to adversely affect the nearest residential properties if not effectively mitigated. He also confirmed that he had studied the supporting information related to the intended artificial lighting and also noted that

Photovoltaic panels are proposed, with the latter mentioned by Trumpington Resident's Association as a potential source of glare which could impact on residents of Trumpington Meadows and Glebe Farm areas. The EHO therefore requested that appropriate conditions be imposed to ensure that noise and dust during the construction phase, and artificial lighting (including glare from the Photovoltaic panels) is suitably controlled; whilst noting that the EHO's comments on lighting only consider the effects of artificial lighting on humans such as residential receptors, and do not consider the impact on other environments such as businesses, other interested organisations such as Astronomy Organisations (sky glow), ecology (wildlife / animal behaviour), drivers on the public highway, landscape or secured by design requirements which are considered by other specialists in those areas.

- 6.9 The EHO also raised a number of issues that required clarification and suitable controls be put in place through the use of planning conditions. The following environmental health issues / health determinants need to be considered and effectively controlled in order to protect the quality of life / amenity and health of proposed and existing residential uses / premises and the wider community / environment and which are paramount in facilitating a sustainable high quality development:
- Noise / Vibration (including construction phase impacts of noise, vibration and dust; noise assessment; and off-site traffic noise impact on local roads through a Construction Environmental Management Plan);
  - Air Quality;
  - Artificial Lighting;
  - Contaminated Land;
  - Surface Water Drainage;
  - Renewable Energy Strategy / Report; and
  - General Informatives.
- 6.10 Greater Cambridge Shared Planning – Heritage: **No objection, subject to safeguarding of the two Grade II listed milestones.** The Historic Environment Officer confirmed that they were not commenting on archaeological aspects of the historic landscape as these have been dealt with by Historic England (HE) and County Archaeology responses to the consultation. They also noted that Historic England had also commented regarding the grade I Listed churches at Hauxton and Trumpington. Regarding potential impact of the proposals on the setting of Cambridge City, the Historic Environment Officer confirmed clearly the site's parking area location being beyond the M11 and south of Trumpington's historic core of settlement, is sufficiently distant from the Cambridge historic core that given the nature of development proposed on the application site, there is no visual impact on the historic core. In terms of the wider setting of the city, the proposed travel hub will result in a change to the landscape character from the loss of farmland. However, this area of farmland concerned is not known to make a particular contribution to the setting of the city in heritage terms (notwithstanding archaeology) and the development is likely to be perceived as part of the M11 infrastructure. The Historic Environment Officer noted that importantly, the proposals do not include surfacing or structures on the more immediate river corridor land to the west of the main site area.
- 6.11 The Historic Environment Officer confirmed that the designated heritage Listed buildings of Hauxton Mill are nearby to the south. Although there would obviously be a substantial increase in vehicle activity in the vicinity, the immediate environs of the mill are largely protected by woodland and the site proposals being across the A10 to its North do not harm

its setting in their opinion. Safeguarding of the two grade II Listed milestones are important that these are not harmed as part of approval of the scheme. Subject to these comments the Historic Environment Officer did not raise any objection to the scheme on heritage grounds.

- 6.12 Greater Cambridge Shared Planning - Sustainability: – **No objection as the proposed scheme is supported in sustainable construction terms.** From a sustainability perspective, the proposals are supported by the Principal Sustainability Consultant, and the consideration of climate change within the Environmental Statement is welcomed. The scheme itself is intended to facilitate the increased use of sustainable modes of transport, which is also welcomed. Provision has been made for electric vehicle charging, with 108 bays for EV chargepoints provided for initially, with the remainder of the spaces being provided with ducting allowing for 100% provision in the future. PV panels, provided on solar canopies on the north car park, are predicted to meet 31% of the sites forecasted energy requirements, saving 23 tonnes of carbon. This approach is supported.
- 6.13 The Principal Sustainability Consultant also noted that toilet provision will be made as part of the Travel Hub building being provided on site. As water use will be relatively low, she did not consider it necessary for water use to be conditioned for this proposal. However, she did recommend that water efficient sanitary ware be specified for the toilets in line with Part G of the Building Regulations. Furthermore, she noted that a Glint and Glare Assessment had been provided by the applicant which concludes that no overall impact is expected as long as proposed landscaping is maintained at an adequate height (same or higher than the height of the solar carport); albeit she acknowledged that reference to aviation activity at Cambridge Airport may need to be required in response to the representations from Cambridge Airport.
- 6.14 Greater Cambridge Shared Planning - Air Quality: **No objection.** The Scientific Officer – Air Quality acknowledged that the proposed development is a transport infrastructure aiming to reduce the impact of traffic on the area and therefore has an associated effect of reducing emissions and improving air quality by encouraging a modal shift from private car journeys to more sustainable modes of transport between the south west of Cambridge and the city centre. Whilst the Scientific Officer for Air Quality does not object to the proposed development, they emphasised the need to be placed to ensure careful consideration, support and delivery of the proposed Low Emission Strategy to reduce the emissions associated with the proposed site. Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment outlines the low-emission strategy for CSWTH to show how the Travel Hub can further contribute to sustainable journeys to/from Cambridge. Therefore, the Scientific Officer – Air Quality recommended that if planning permission is granted planning conditions should be added to implement the Low Emission Strategy measures proposed and requirements for a Construction Phase Dust Impact Management Plan to be submitted and agreed.
- 6.15 Greater Cambridge Shared Planning - Contaminated Land: **No objection.** The Scientific Officer – Contaminated Land confirmed that the only immediately evident environmental constraints that would attract a contaminated land condition was the presence of occasional areas of infilled land, associated with a history of coprolite mining within this area, immediately to the north west of the proposed development. However, she acknowledged that the proposed development is not particularly sensitive to the presence of contamination and therefore she recommended an informative be attached to any grant of consent to cover the eventuality of any unforeseen contamination. The Scientific Officer – Contaminated Land also acknowledged that the proposals would entail significant movement of material to facilitate the required earthworks. However, she noted the

recommendation for a condition requiring a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) by the EHO, where Part H of the proposed condition addresses the setting out of 'Measures for soil handling and management including soil that is potentially contaminated'. As such, no objection was raised.

- 6.16 Greater Cambridge Shared Planning – Ecology: **No objection subject to conditions.** The Ecologist acknowledged that the applicant had provided a response regarding biodiversity net gain which was welcomed. The response had given details of how the applicant intends to reach the desired condition within the time frame they have set out. The procedures they have set out do have the potential to provide the desired condition; however he would recommend that a monitoring programme for habitat creation and management is conditioned and reports submitted to relevant bodies at 2, 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 years post creation. Remedial actions should be required if conditions have not been reached within predicted timeframes.
- 6.17 The Ecologist is satisfied that issues regarding biodiversity net gain have been dealt with. Regarding increased visitor pressure, no further information has been received. He would therefore suggest that a monitoring programme of visitor numbers is conditioned and should visitor numbers significantly increase from baseline, a review of mitigation is triggered and remedial actions taken.
- 6.18 CCC Ecology – **No objection subject to planning conditions.** Originally objected to the proposed scheme until further details of the ecological assessment had been provided, in order to fully determine the level of impact of the proposals on biodiversity. This original objection was based on an incomplete ecological assessment; otter surveys; impact on Trumpington Meadows County Park; Highways scheme – mammal/otter passage; landscape scheme; drainage strategy; landscape and ecology management plan.
- 6.19 Upon receipt of additional ecological information to address the above concerns and the clarification letter provided by the applicant's Agent dated 24<sup>th</sup> February 2021 to clarify some of the points and objections raised to the submitted information, the Ecologist withdrew her holding objection subject to the imposition of planning conditions. In withdrawing her objection, she confirmed that she was satisfied that a measurable net gain in biodiversity value is possible as part of this scheme from her calculations, which would meet the necessary policy requirements. Nonetheless, she requested this biodiversity net gain was controlled through a suitable planning condition, that also secured the long-term management of the area. This was considered necessary, alongside the other landscape, biodiversity and ecology related conditions that were proposed in her original response.
- 6.20 Environment Agency – **No objection.** Confirmed they reviewed the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) prepared by Mott Macdonald, dated May 2020 with regard to fluvial flood risk and have no objection to the development on flood risk grounds. However, they noted that the proposed new outfall to the River Cam will fall under the terms of the Environmental Permitting Regulations (2016) and so a permit may be required from the Environment Agency for these works – to which they signposted the applicant to further information on their website to assist with this process.
- 6.21 Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) – **No objection subject to conditions.** They initially objected to the application for 7 reasons – namely concerns around the reduction of the coprolite pond and its impacts to the existing water system from the reduction; insufficient information to understand the maintenance access to drainage features, particularly taking account of the busway and a steep sloped mound; lack of detail for the pump overflow from

the coprolite ponds which could lead to wider impacts from the northern car parking area and public transport route, which required that the wider impacts must be demonstrated; the request for accurate data sets in FEH rainfall to ensure the hydraulic modelling is an accurate representation of the proposed network rather than the use of Flood Studies Report (FSR) rainfall data, which is now outdated; incorrect greenfield run-off rate calculations based on the whole site, including the public transport route and A10 widening scheme, rather than just the impermeable areas; insufficient demonstration that 5.0l/s is the minimum rate to avoid blockages; and further details required in relation to the M11 slip road drainage discharge point to demonstrate the impacts this may have on the receiving water body and controls in place to demonstrate where this outfalls and calculations to demonstrate there will be no downstream increased risk of flooding owing to the additional impermeable areas. They also requested 3 informatives on Water Quality, Ordinary Watercourse Consent, and Pollution Control. On the receipt of additional information to address these concerns the LLFA confirmed they were able to remove their objection to the proposed development subject to a condition securing a surface water drainage scheme, and two informatives on Ordinary Watercourse Consent and Pollution Control.

- 6.22 Natural England – **No objection.** Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites and as such does not object to the proposal. However, Natural England did note from the Planning Statement that the proposed development will result in the loss of circa 33 hectares of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land. They acknowledged that in response to the EIA scoping consultation they considered that impacts to BMV should have been included in the Environmental Statement to show how it had been considered in light of the Government's policy for the protection of BMV agricultural land as set out in paragraph 170 [now 174] of the NPPF [subsequently noting that Cambridgeshire County Council planning officers did not scope it into the final EIA development, so this omission was not incorrect]. They noted that in terms of EIA, BMV land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) system) is a receptor of very high or high sensitivity (depending on the ALC grades present) and loss of 20 hectares (or more) of BMV agricultural land that would typically give rise to a major (or very large / large) adverse impact (according to DMRB LA104/109 or EIA Handbook 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition significance methodologies) depending on the amount of the different ALC grades affected and any mitigating circumstances. As such whilst they initially advised that a detailed ALC field survey and an associated soil resource survey should be carried out, and the applicant should show how the BMV agricultural land circumstances and impacts on soil on the site are being considered and any adverse impacts minimised, in line with the NPPF and planning practice guidance, DEFRA Construction Code advice and local plan policies; in understanding that it was not scoped into the EIA by CCC planning officers they confirmed that it would be for the Local Planning Authority to ensure it had the necessary information for decision making.
- 6.23 In providing their responses, Natural England also confirmed that they are generally supportive of the biodiversity mitigation and enhancement proposals detailed in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and advised that delivery of the proposed measures should be secured through appropriate planning conditions. Further general advice on the consideration of protected species and other natural environment issues was provided in a separate annex provided (Annex A). The Annex A information provided confirmation that Local Planning Authorities are responsible for ensuring that they have sufficient detailed agricultural land classification information to apply NPPF policies (paragraphs 170 and 171 [now 174 and 175]) and signposted where this information could be sourced and guidance on soil protection. Annex A also confirmed that Natural England

encourages any proposal to incorporate measures to help improve people's access to the natural environment, which includes measures such as reinstating existing footpaths and bridleways and links to other green networks. Furthermore, their guidance encourages opportunities to secure net gains for biodiversity and wider environmental gains, as outlined in the NPPF (paragraphs 8, 72, 102, 118, 170, 171, 174 and 175 [now paragraphs 8, 73, 104, 120, 174, 175, 179 and 180]) and advises a mitigation hierarchy as set out in NPPF paragraph 175 [now 180]. Natural England confirmed they would be happy to comment further should the need arise but reiterated that they had no objection to the proposal.

- 6.24 CCC Historic Environment Team (Archaeology): **No objection subject to a planning condition.** The Historic Environment Team (HET) acknowledged that a field archaeological evaluation took place in August 2019, finding occupation evidence of Iron Age date (circa 6<sup>th</sup> – 4<sup>th</sup> century BC) and a small Anglo-Saxon cemetery of 6<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup> century AD. Subsequent discussions with archaeological consultants from Mott MacDonald have helped to refine a mitigation scheme, details for which will be required in advance of any development in this area. The HET do not object to this development but recommend that the mitigation strategy is secured by the use of an appropriate planning condition shown on any planning consent that may be granted.
- 6.25 Historic England – **No objection to the application on heritage grounds.** Historic England acknowledged that the site is situated midway between three scheduled monuments (Noted in the Environmental Statement as MM001, MM002 and MM003) and close to a number of other important heritage assets including the Grade I listed church of St Edmund at Hauxton (MM004) and the Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St Michael at Trumpington. They noted the Environmental Statement (ES) and the underpinning Desk Based Assessment (DBA) have assessed these assets and agreed that the weighting given was appropriate. The churches have high heritage values and the scheduled monument form an important group of designated buried archaeological remains. They also noted the impact upon the Church in Trumpington was included in the assessment following their previous advice and that further discussion was undertaken with regards to the safeguarding of the two grade II milestones. Overall, they noted the results of the impact assessment in relation to the designated heritage assets and did not wish to make any further comments in that regards. As such, they confirmed that Historic England does not object in principle to the scheme.
- 6.26 In addition to noting that they could not find any record of the consultation referenced in the ES. They confirmed that their one concern was that three designated assets (Scheduled Monuments) are evenly spaced around the area with the development roughly in the centre. In recent years the amount of development in the wider area has provided an unprecedented level of information about the historic landscape. They were very much of the view that there was clearly an important multi-period landscape in this area of which some discreet areas are designated, whilst much remains undesignated. As a landscape it needs to be considered more holistically and although mitigation by excavation and preservation by record is an appropriate response to the non-designated archaeological assets within the red line boundary they considered the ES lacks a broader level of understanding of the historic landscape. In dealing with assets only as individual sites does not establish the value of synthesis. They therefore confirmed that they would value further comment from the applicant as to how they plan to bring this matter to the fore, and how they will seek to balance the impact upon the heritage assets from the proposal. In particular, how they would seek to develop an understanding of the finding of the archaeological discoveries made as part of the work, linked to this wider archaeological landscape amongst the future users of the development.

- 6.27 On receipt of the Regulation 25 information, Historic England confirmed that they did not have any additional comments, and suggested that the officers continued to seek the views of specialist conservation and archaeological advisors, in particular with regards to the requirement for archaeological works and mitigation.
- 6.28 CCC Transport Assessment (TA) Team: **No objection subject to conditions.** Originally the TA Team objected to the application on the basis that there was insufficient information to properly determine the highway impact of the proposed development. However, upon receipt of additional information from the applicant's Agent, the TA Team confirmed that the proposed development was not anticipated to cause severe detriment to the capacity of the surrounding highway network and their holding objection was withdrawn subject to the inclusion of planning conditions in relation to the following:
- a detailed scheme for the implementation of the NMU route to be constructed between the A10 and the A1309 Hauxton Road, and the new NMU bridge to be constructed over the M11.
  - Ownership / Right of Way details of the new NMU route between the A10 and the A1309 Hauxton Road, in particular, the proposed section east of the new NMU bridge to the A1309 Hauxton Road.
  - the internal layout of the new Travel Hub site.
  - a scheme for the monitoring of cycle parking provision within the Travel Hub.
  - details of the bus and coach service provision, routes, and frequencies to serve the site.
  - a detailed scheme for the proposed signalled vehicular access junction off the A10 to the new Travel Hub site.
  - a detailed scheme for the proposed Public Transport Route between the new Travel Hub site and the A1309 Hauxton Road/Addenbrooke's Road signal junction, and improvement works to the existing accommodation bridge over the M11.
  - a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works on the A10.
  - a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works at the M11 Junction 11.
  - a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works on the A1309 Hauxton Road.
  - a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works at the A1309 Hauxton Road/Addenbrooke's Road signal junction.
- 6.29 CCC Highways Development Management: **No objection subject to conditions.** The Highways Development Management comments and conditions are set out in the TA Team response above.
- 6.30 Highways England: **No objection subject to planning conditions.** Highways England originally recommended that planning permission not be granted for a specified period (in line with Annex A – further assessment required). However, upon further information and discussions with the applicant they confirmed that they do not have any remaining objections subject to recommended planning conditions (in line with Annex A – Highways England recommended Planning Conditions). Highways England confirmed that they have worked closely with the applicant on the highway impacts of the proposed development and is content that the work undertaken is sufficient to understand the impact of the development on the Strategic Road Network. The proposals have been subject to extensive modelling which has enabled development of highway works to the M11 Junction which met

the required safety and design standards, sufficient to safeguard the performance of the highway in accordance with the requirements of the Highways Act 1980. Consequently Highways England confirmed they were able to remove their holding objection and recommended that conditions are appended to any consent before coming into beneficial use that will need to be completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the highway authorities. They confirmed that the design of the improvements shall be to the standards set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.

- 6.31 The recommended conditions put forward by Highways England included details for the (a) A1309 Hauxton Road Westbound approach to Junction 11 - Signalisation of the A1309 approach and corresponding carriageway; (b) M11 Northbound Offslip approach to Junction 11 - Widening of the approach to the nearside with three lanes at the stop line, with the third lane extending to approximately 80 metres in length. Revision to earthworks to accommodate widened carriageway; and (c) M11 Mainline north of Junction 11 - Provision of a new non-motorised user bridge over the M11 just north of the existing accommodation bridge. Revisions to existing accommodation bridge to provision for bus use and signalised shuttle working. An informative related to a Section 278 agreement was also requested.
- 6.32 Crime Prevention Design Team: **No objection.** The Designing Out Crime Officer confirmed that they had viewed the documents in relation to crime, disorder and the fear of crime in particular the drawing relating to CCTV that was submitted to address their original comments. They noted their previous comments and the addition of a plan covering CCTV which they confirmed would appear to be appropriate for this development. As mentioned previously they also acknowledged that it would appear that their early security recommendations had been implemented, so they did not object to the proposal.
- 6.33 Cambridge Airport Safeguarding: **No objection.** Cambridge Airport Safeguarding confirmed they have no objection to this proposal from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective as it does not conflict with their safeguarding criteria. They originally recommended three planning conditions – namely submission of a Bird Hazard Management Plan; Removal of permitted development (PD) rights for cranes and construction equipment; and PV Cells Glint and Glare. However, upon confirmation of further details supplied by the applicant's Agent, Cambridge Airport Safeguarding confirmed that these are no longer required.
- 6.34 Ministry of Defence (MOD) – **No objection.** The MOD confirmed that they do not have any safeguarding objections to this proposal.
- 6.35 Imperial War Museum, Duxford: **No objection.** The Imperial War Museum at Duxford confirmed they have no objection to this proposal from their aerodrome safeguarding perspective as it does not conflict with their safeguarding criteria. They were made aware of the responses provided by Cambridge Airport and the Ministry of Defence and confirmed that they agreed with their conclusions of no objection. However, they requested that the developer maintains contact with the airfield during the construction period in the case of any crane or drone usage, or road closures in case this effects their operations.
- 6.36 University of Cambridge (Estates Division) – **No objection subject to consultation on any material changes to the scheme and on the emerging technical designs.** The University of Cambridge's Estate Division Planning Manager confirmed that in principle the University is entirely supportive of the high-level project aspirations to improve sustainable transport solutions for Cambridge and the surrounding area. Having reviewed the proposals with specific regard to the potential impact upon the Lord's Bridge facility they welcomed the



fact that the issues they raised with the project team prior to the application had been taken into account. Of the information presented within the application, they confirmed they were comfortable that the designs have been prepared such that, provided they are implemented in the form shown, they will not pose a threat to the Lord's Bridge facility. However, they have requested that any changes to the scheme, such as lighting design or heights / materiality of the proposed structures etc. should trigger additional consultation with them to ensure their advice holds weight. Furthermore, further consultation should take place with regard to the emerging technical designs before they become embedded within the scheme, such as the convertors to be incorporated within the solar array and communication with buses etc. so that any required mitigation to control radio interference / suppression measures etc. can be incorporated within the design as it develops.

## 7. Representations

7.1 The following representations have been received in summary:

- 7.2 Hauxton Parish Council – **Object** on the basis of an increase in traffic and pollution. The parish council believes that this travel hub will create additional congestion on the A10, particularly during rush hours, which is already a problem through Hauxton and Harston. The Parish Council stated that they would like to see a longer slip road to ameliorate this during the morning peak period, and an exit which avoids M11 traffic having to go back onto the A10.
- 7.3 Harston Parish Council – **Concerns raised** regarding the traffic lights at this junction will disrupt the flow of traffic on the A10 and cause tailbacks towards Hauxton and Harston. They strongly recommended that a tunnel under the A10 is considered.
- 7.4 Trumpington Residents Association (TRA) – **Object** to the use of the existing agricultural bridge as the public transport route. The Association strongly supports the principle of establishing a new travel hub on land to the west of Junction 11 of the M11. In general, they confirmed that they are opposed to development in the Green Belt that remains between the Cambridge City edge and the neighbouring villages. However, they acknowledge that although a travel hub has adverse effects on the Green Belt it also has great benefits in much needed reduction of traffic on our roads, and is “not inappropriate development within the Green Belt” for the reasons given in the application, and offers significant mitigation in enhanced biodiversity and sustainable travel as identified in paragraph 7.11 of the Planning Statement. However, there is one aspect of the application to which they object strongly to and for which they believe there is a more effective alternative. This is the proposed use of the existing accommodation (former agricultural) bridge as the public transport route to provide access to and from the site across the M11. The Association's objection to this has been their consistent position throughout the development of the scheme but they consider their many representations have been set aside for reasons not shared with them. They provided 6 grounds of objection to the use of the agricultural bridge that broadly fall into environmental impacts; impact on the Country Park and the attractiveness of the area where the existing cycle route already runs; the adequacy of the proposed bridge for use by the Cambridge Autonomous Metro scheme which includes a one-way section that would slow transport down; and the lack of an alternative bridge for the buses to use without the restrictions imposed by the existing agricultural bridge. TRA consider the issues identified in their response are sufficient to refuse planning permission for this application, and to refer it back to the applicant for further consideration. They have stated that this consideration should include a full assessment of the proposed bus route which includes use of the

accommodation bridge against a segregated bus route using a dedicated bus bridge north of Junction 11 of the M11 and south of the agricultural bridge.

Other comments were also submitted by TRA that:

- raised concerns about the lit bollards proposed along the length of the shared use path from its entrance off the A10 across the new shared use bridge to the point where the path meets Hauxton Road at its junction with Addenbrookes Road, seeking a condition to assess other means of illumination such as studs set in to the path's surfaces.
- supported the installation of photovoltaic panels and commended that they are intended to "meet 31% of the forecasted energy requirements" of the Travel Hub and achieve "a 38% reduction in emissions" as set out in paragraph 6.68 of the Planning Statement. However, noting the intention that all of these panels are to be installed in the North Car Park by reason of lower ground levels and proximity to the M11, they raised concerns that the intention to angle them to obtain the maximum amount of energy, may be intrusive through glare to the Trumpington Meadows and Glebe Farm residential developments to which they are closest; suggesting that a planning condition should be imposed to satisfy that the positioning of the photovoltaic panels would have minimal adverse effect on said developments.
- noted that the proposed shared-use path is part of the wider Melbourn Greenway, and in line with consultation undertaken by Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) in 2019 GCP should develop a "rules of the road" or a code of conduct to manage the conflict between different users, particularly pedestrians and cyclists.
- stating that if planning permission is granted for the application in its current form, a feature of the existing planting on the slopes of the accommodation bridge across the M11 should not be overlooked. Dating it is assumed from the M11's construction in the 1970s, the slopes contain a host of plants not normally seen locally, including gorse and sea buckthorn. As these plants may be affected by earthworks, TRA ask that a way of preserving this valued feature is considered.

7.5 In response to the Regulation 25 consultation, TRA confirmed that they had additional objections to add to their original letter of 8th July 2020, whilst noting that their original objections on the use of the agricultural bridge had not been addressed and therefore remained unmet. They submitted that notwithstanding the additional information that has now been provided by the applicant, there remained gaps in the transport assessment information sufficiently important to warrant a further request to the applicant to fill the gaps outlined as follows:

- the serious issue of potential delay raised in the last sentence of the statutory consultee's comments  
[CCC\_20\_040\_FUL\_FROM\_TRANSPORT\_ASSESSMENT\_35807, page 7] had not been properly addressed by the applicant in the view of TRA. They identified that this is already a complex junction at a strategically important point in Trumpington's road network – officially designated as a junction "hotspot" - and a vital artery to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus including Addenbrooke's and Royal Papworth Hospitals, and to Cambridge City Centre – as well as to Trumpington Park & Ride. They considered it will become significantly more complex with the proposed two-way public transport access to Trumpington Park & Ride and with the scheduled opening in 2023 of the Trumpington Meadows southern access road, which serves only as access to a construction haul road at present. TRA queried whether current

delays be exacerbated or not by the proposed new public transport access, and what measures are to be taken to improve traffic flow so that delays do not increase? These questions have not been addressed to their satisfaction. Until there are adequate answers, despite their support for the provision of the new travel hub, they do not believe that the application should proceed.

- Identified the existing significant tree belt between the single lane access to the Park & Ride and Hauxton Road, which widens towards the Park & Ride main entrance off Hauxton Road. A single bus only lane continues after the car park entrance and joins the roundabout within the Park & Ride for buses to gain access to the bus stops for passenger drop off and pick up purposes. TRA note that the application proposes to widen this road along all of its length which will make significant inroads into the tree belt and may also adversely affect the tree / shrub line between the access road and the car park, possibly also reducing the gap between the access road and the as yet incomplete Trumpington Meadows development. [Shown in CCC\_20\_040\_FUL\_CCC\_HIGHWAYS\_RESPONSE\_TO\_TRANSPORT\_ASSESSMENT\_36937, Appendix B] And this in an area where the planting has already been reduced to allow construction of additional bus bays by removal of the wooded bund which used to exist between the access road and the bus bay area. TRA consider this could have a significant adverse effect on both landscape and biodiversity – and possibly also on the housing development and have questioned what is being done to minimise and mitigate this loss?
- highlighted that “The Arboricultural Report identified a number of trees and shrubs to be removed for construction of the extended bus lane. Vegetation removed during construction *will be replaced where practicable.*” (their emphasis) [Detailed Planting Plan Sheet 11 Part B, in the additional documents], which they do not consider is adequate. The landscape and biodiversity implications need to be made much clearer and action to mitigate these effects stated in some detail; and their concern about the potential impact on future Trumpington Meadows residents needs to be allayed. The tree belt in question not only screens Trumpington Park and Ride from the Glebe Farm estate and Bishop’s Road dwellings on the other side of Hauxton Road but also forms part of the green entrance from the new city edge to Trumpington village and onward into Cambridge centre.
- raised concerns about the impact of the above changes on the pedestrian and cycle route alongside Hauxton Road from the west side of the junction with Addenbrooke’s Road/Osprey Drive to the northern entrance into the existing Park & Ride site. This route crosses the one-way slip road into the Park & Ride. With the opening of the Travel Hub and the completion of the homes in the southern part of the Trumpington Meadows development, there is likely to be significant growth in the number of pedestrians and cyclists using this path, alongside the growth in traffic on the two-way slip road. Given the heightened risk that arises, it is essential that measures are taken to ensure it remains a safe route. TRA propose that the applicant should be asked to provide additional information explaining how the risk will be minimised so that cyclists and pedestrians are kept safe.
- raised concerns over the impact of the Applicant’s proposals on Junction 11 of the M11 and the lack of detail provided to address the over capacity comments raised by the statutory consultee [CCC\_20\_040\_FUL\_FROM\_TRANSPORT\_ASSESSMENT\_35807, page 11]. TRA confirmed that the proposed Travel Hub should not significantly impair traffic flow at Junction 11, and the eastbound access to the A10 eastbound is particularly important in the extended PM peak. The applicant should therefore be asked to respond with positive measures to reduce this operational over capacity.

- 7.6 Trumpington Meadows Community (TMC) as an amenity group – **Comments and concerns submitted neither objecting nor supporting the application.** Points made related to the effect on local ecology; distance to adjoining properties; conflict with local plan; an increase in traffic; and information missing from plans. TMC stated that the application site boundary shows a route running through the Trumpington Meadows park from the new shared use bridge to the river, which follows the route of an existing footpath but there is no indication of how its use would change. Also the busway or slip road would result in a serious intrusion into the park which is owned by the Wildlife Trust; in addition to the likelihood of an increase in traffic congestion from the additional use of junctions on Hauxton Road when the second access to Trumpington Meadows opens. Any development of the area from there to the M11 would create a volume of traffic that would be impossible to manage.
- 7.7 Wildlife Trust – **Object** and remain of the view that this proposal is the wrong scheme in the wrong place, that will put pressure on the adjacent Country Park and nature reserve area. However, noting that they consider it is highly likely to proceed they have confirmed that they have worked through the Landscape and Ecology Working Group (LEWG), to try to secure a scheme that minimises impacts and achieves the maximum enhancements for biodiversity; whilst acknowledging that as a Regulation 3 planning application a Section 106 cannot be obtained to provide the legal comfort necessary to remove their objection entirely.
- 7.8 The Wildlife Trust welcomed the intention of the applicant to appoint a specialist contractor to deliver the long-term management of the new habitats adjacent to and around the travel hub site. However, in order for this to be a success, they provided details of what mitigation they considered was necessary in relation to pressures on the Country Park and nature reserve outside of the red line application area and stressed the importance of a management plan to safeguard the long term management of the travel hub site that will need to complement the management of the adjacent Country Park and nature reserve e.g. in reinforcing current management approaches of hay cutting and grazing, and the dogs on leads policy that applies to the nature reserve part of the Country Park. To this end they confirmed the new land around the travel hub site will need to include dog walking routes and dedicated off lead areas to limit impacts on the adjacent nature reserve which should include dog bins. Furthermore a dedicated picnic area and clear signage on the travel hub site and within the adjacent Country Park and nature reserve informing visitors of the different nature and access zones was also seen as essential, particularly based on the full impacts that a 2000+ car park would place on this area, that they did not consider had been considered appropriately in the applicant's submitted information.
- 7.9 The Wildlife Trust proposed that the currently unfenced area of the meadow in the adjacent Country Park and nature reserve should be fenced to create two new grazing paddocks to help manage access and maintain the quality of the species-rich grassland that they have created. They also noted that their current ranger provision had been based on the Trumpington Meadows housing development and had not been based on additional visitors from what was effectively a large car park next to the nature reserve provision, so this pressure as a result of this proposal needed to be taken fully into account when assessing the scheme. As such, they recommended an access management and mitigation section should be incorporated into the landscape and ecology management plan that sets out the relationship with the adjacent Wildlife Trust Country Park and nature reserve land, and describes an access strategy and the desired recreational use of both the landscaped areas associated with the travel hub site and the adjacent land. This should include the

management measures, including any infrastructure and signage required to achieve the described access strategy.

7.10 Whilst the Wildlife Trust was broadly supportive of the measures included within the submitted Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, as a basis for the future management of the biodiversity net gain and greenspace areas, there was some disagreement around the timing of cutting practices and the length of time for the biodiversity net gain to be achieved on the site. In relation to biodiversity net gain, the Wildlife Trust also requested that a revised Appendix F-11 should be submitted with the correct version of Table 14 and the detailed biodiversity net gain calculations, which they considered was important so that an audited and agreed level of biodiversity net gain arising from this development is recorded in the public domain. However, when asked by planning officers if the submitted information was sufficient to be policy compliant, they did acknowledge that from the information submitted by the applicant it would be possible to achieve the minimum 10% biodiversity gain and whilst it was far from ideal, through control by planning conditions, this information could be secured as part of the pre-commencement conditions to be able to show this audit trail and final biodiversity net gain figure. However, if this planning condition route was recommended by planning officers the Wildlife Trust would request that the biodiversity net gain assessment is revised once a final scheme has been built and the areas managed for a minimum period of 30 years (and ideally secured in perpetuity) and monitoring reports to demonstrate continued success required at periodic periods throughout the 30 year management period. A monitoring programme should be included in the landscape and ecology management scheme as part of this request, which can also secure the final landscape and ecology proposals.

7.11 CPRE – **Raise concerns** surrounding the proposed development relating to:

- Car parking and electric charging – in particular the significant number of car parking spaces proposed (2,150) questioning if sufficient evidence existed to support them, and that only 108 of these car parking spaces were going to allow electric charging.
- Location and potential impacts – in particular that this is the ‘wrong scheme in the wrong location’ as it lies in the Cambridge Green Belt and adjacent to the Wildlife Trust Trumpington Meadows reserve, with potential impacts on both the Cambridge Green Belt and reserve through the development, with traffic, noise, light and air pollution, as well as an increase in footfall on the reserve and the impact that would bring to fragile habitats.
- Statutory Green Belt – in particular the erosion of the Cambridge Green Belt and the need to ensure significant weight is given to paragraphs 143 – 145 [now 147 – 149] of the NPPF, where they consider the “very special circumstances” required by paragraphs 143 and 144 [now 147 and 148] have not been demonstrated.
- Landscape and Biodiversity – in particular the ‘wide impact on the local valued landscape’, the loss of Green Belt land and erosion of openness; alongside concerns that safeguards need to be put in place to protect the biodiversity net gain with appropriate funding in perpetuity to include mitigation for the impacts on the adjacent nature reserve.
- Best and most versatile Farmland – in particular the need for best and most versatile land to be protected from development in accordance with the NPPF.
- Integration with wider local transport proposals – in particular concerns around how the proposal would integrate with other proposed transport schemes around Cambridge, including East-West Rail, the proposed Cambridge Autonomous Metro, the Travel Hub at Foxton, proposed busways, planned greenways etc.; and that as

well as being premature in advance of the CPCA new local Transport Plan, it is also heavily based on car travel.

7.12 Cambridge Past, Present and Future – **Object** as Cambridge PPF believes that this is the *‘wrong scheme in the wrong place’*. They also see it as a *‘short-term solution that will create a long-term impact’*. They therefore object to this application *‘because it will result in building over the green belt countryside in order to create a giant car park and associated roads and other intrusive infrastructure; even though the applicant admits that “it is estimated the use of the Travel Hub would result in an increase of carbon emissions over the next 60 years”.*’ They also note *‘that it will be at least 15 years before new trees/hedges grow sufficiently to mitigate the visual impacts of this scheme on the landscape’*. They consider this proposal *‘is contrary to national and local green belt policies because it has not demonstrated that a green belt location is needed’*. Whilst they are supportive of renewable energy, the provision of car ports on which to locate these panels will have an impact on the purposes of the Green Belt. They object to the use of lighting bollards on the shared use path because they will generate a visual intrusion which is completely unnecessary as they consider that stud lighting is equally effective.

7.13 After reviewing the Regulation 25 information and confirming that all the issues they raised in their previous response (set out in paragraph 7.12 above) still stand, they raised the additional information / concerns to add to their original objection:

- Impact on adjacent nature area in country park/biodiversity impacts – in particular concerns surrounding the consultants assessment that this proposal will have no influence on the visitor pressures experienced by the Park and that this element should have been scoped into the EIA assessment.
- Green Belt Policy & Landscape – in particular concerns that the proposal is an unacceptable intrusion into an area of the Cambridge Green Belt and its openness, so it should not be approved as it fails to demonstrate special circumstances and could be accommodated through an extension to the existing park and ride site or at Foxton which are outside the Cambridge Green Belt, making it contrary to national and local planning policy.
- Climate Change Policy – in particular the conflict with local policy to achieve net zero emissions by 2050 in response to the climate change crisis, as this application would lead to an increase in carbon emissions over the next 60 years.
- Traffic modelling based on pre-pandemic data – in particular the application is based on pre-Covid traffic modelling that has not taken into account new ways of working and potential demand forecasts, so they suggest this would be premature to approve such a contentious scheme which could easily prove to be a damaging ‘white elephant’.

7.14 Camcycle – **No objection**. Whilst Camcycle welcome application CCC/20/040/FUL and fully support the proposed NMU pathway and bridge, they remain neutral on the principle of a car park in this area, as they are concerned about the implied increase of car traffic in the vicinity of the site. Their original objection to a newly proposed additional staggered crossing stage on Hauxton Road that would turn the existing two-stage staggered crossing into a three-stage staggered crossing, has now been resolved by the applicant and was included in the Regulation 25 submission. Camcycle has confirmed that whilst they do have some lingering concerns about the potential spacing of bollards, design of any access control, and further detailed design that still has to be undertaken on the active travel route, as mentioned in the Transport Team response, Camcycle want to ensure that everything is

designed and built to be fully accessible, inclusive and in compliance with the government's latest policies and guidance. As such they confirmed that their concerns could be resolved and their original objection removed if a condition affirming the application of Local Transport Note 1/20 in the detailed design of the active travel route and any access control bollards: 'Details for the active travel/NMU route through the site, and any access controls for it, will be designed in accordance with Local Transport Note 1/20 and provided to the planning authority to be agreed prior to construction.' was applied.

7.15 Smarter Cambridge Transport (SCT) - **Strongly object** to this planning application on the grounds that it will:

- Undermine provision of rural bus services.
- Disadvantage people who depend on rural bus services because they do not have use of a car to access a Park & Ride.
- Increase rather than decrease carbon emissions, both in construction and use.
- Attract additional traffic to the local road network, exacerbating congestion on the A10 from Harston to M11 Junction 11.
- Have negative social benefit, i.e. will do more harm than good.
- Divert resources away from transport schemes and services that would provide wider social benefit.
- Undermine the business case and viability of CAM, envisaged as an extensive mass transit network, serving market towns and villages around Cambridge.
- Damage the ecology of land close to the River Cam and scar land that is protected by Green Belt status.

7.16 The SCT (a volunteer-run think tank and campaign group, formed in 2015 to advance sustainable, integrated and equitable transport for the Cambridge region; run by a team of around 30 people, with a wide range of expertise and interests – see [www.smartertransport.uk](http://www.smartertransport.uk)) consider the scheme is incompatible with the adopted Local Transport Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework, and the scheme's own objectives.

7.17 British Horse Society (Comments from East Regional Chair; County Access & Bridleways Officer for Cambridgeshire; Access Field Officer East; and Regional Manager for the Eastern Region) – **Support** the provision of horsebox parking within the Travel Hub which would allow access to the Trumpington Meadows Country Park, the rights of way network just off the A10 at Hauxton, the permissive bridleways linking to Great Shelford from the A10 and the permissive bridleways linking towards Granchester; which they consider aligns with the active travel provision promoted by [the former] Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mayor [James Palmer] that must be embedded in transport projects in the same way for all modes. They noted that with increasingly busy and fast roads, many equestrians now have to travel their horses to places where they can ride in relative safety, such as on the bridleways and country park accessible from this hub.

7.18 Having sought confirmation that erroneous references to 'shared' paths and 'cyclists and walkers' were not meant to exclude equestrian access and that the applicant was effectively proposing a non-motorised user (NMU) route, which included equestrian access over the 'shared bridge', that would be designed with an appropriate surface for all users as has already been the case with the greenways, they welcomed the proposals. However, in raising these initial concerns they also drew attention to the fact there was no reference to the permissive access from Great Shelford which joins the A10 opposite the NMU path in

the applicant's documentation, nor was there any reference to the bridleway network from the A10, which are all well used. Taking these concerns into account, they consider that before this project commences it is essential a safe crossing of the A10 for NMU's is provided to mitigate the danger from the construction and the ongoing travel hub traffic. This should be a Pegasus crossing located at the junction of the NMU path on the Country Path with the A10 just opposite the permissive bridleway to Great Shelford. As such, they consider the provision of the site safe crossing should be a requirement of the planning permission approval.

- 7.19 Swavesey & District Bridleways Association - **Support** the plans to include horsebox parking and safe link to the non-motorised user network as part of the Trumpington Park and Ride development. However, they would like the Scheme to include the provision of a Pegasus crossing on the A10, to mitigate the increased traffic levels experienced already from the housing growth on the A10.
- 7.20 Barton and District Bridleway Group – **Support** the provision of horsebox parking within the Travel Hub, the mounting blocks and inclusion of a non-motorised user route on behalf of the Barton & District Bridleway Group that has over 120 members. They see the scheme to be of great benefit to local horse riders who want to access Trumpington Meadows Country Park without having to ride on the road. They consider the proposals will also enable horse riders who cannot ride too far to access a new area to ride and provide an opportunity for riders from other areas to travel to meet friends. With the fragmented nature of the Bridleway network, and the fact that only 22% of Rights of Ways are Bridleways, schemes like this are very much needed and welcomed by horse riders. The position of the horsebox parking will also allow horse riders from other areas to access local Bridleways and the proposed Greenways. However, they considered it is essential that a safe crossing of the A10 for NMU's is provided to mitigate the danger from the construction and the ongoing travel hub traffic. This should be a Pegasus crossing located at the junction of the NMU path on the Country Park with the A10 just opposite the permissive bridleway to Gt. Shelford.
- 7.21 Deloitte on behalf of Grosvenor Britain & Ireland (Grosvenor) and Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) – **Support** the proposals for a new Park & Ride travel hub on land to the south of the M11; and have welcomed the thorough approach undertaken to consulting and engaging stakeholders given that the proposals will be developed partially on land owned by Grosvenor & USS. They acknowledged that they have held a number of meetings with the Applicant's consultant team in order to agree the details of the proposals relevant to their clients' site. They appreciate that a number of options for the busway route have been considered; and options assessed and eventually dismissed included provision for a tunnel under the A10 and a bus lane through the M11 gyratory. The preferred option was chosen on the basis that it was deliverable and will ensure the reliability and speed of journeys which they support.
- 7.22 They noted that the design of the site has taken into consideration its location within the Cambridge Green Belt and shared boundary with Trumpington Meadows Country Park, delivered by Grosvenor and USS as part of the housing development. Significant planting has been proposed to minimise the landscape and visual impact of the scheme which they welcome. They confirm that they have had extensive discussions on these points with the Applicant with respect to Grosvenor and USS's land and, in particular, in relation to the nature and location of the bunds which are being constructed currently as part of Trumpington Meadows. However, they raised two areas of the proposals that they wanted



to provide more detailed comments – drainage proposals and development in the Cambridge Green Belt.

- 7.23 In relation to drainage proposals they highlight the importance that the swales along the busway on the east of the M11 do not encroach on any realigned bunds and that both are the appropriate distance from each other. The bund profile should remain in line with the massing previously approved (and be no higher than 3.5 metres / 11.48 feet); and on the east side of the M11, the outfall that is being provided to the River Cam, which includes provision for a new swale into the existing Trumpington Meadows Country Park, should also not encroach on to the existing bund. Details of the interaction with the existing footpath, any reinstatement required, and planting should be provided as part of the conditions of any planning permission issued. They have requested that The Wildlife Trust, whose ownership the Country Park has transferred to, should be consulted on the access and maintenance implications of these drainage swales/pipes.
- 7.24 In relation to development in the Cambridge Green Belt, they support the approach the Applicant has taken in assessing alternative sites and the need for the facility. The existing Park & Ride at Trumpington Meadows has limited capacity and there is congestion in and out of the city at peak times. In concluding this work, they consider that it is clear that, in accordance with Para 146 [now 150] of the NPPF, there is a clear transport need for the Park & Ride location in close proximity to the M11 and that it will reduce the overall delays through the local network. The Green Belt Assessment prepared by Liz Lake Associates suggests that 'land to the east of the M11 provides a much stronger contribution to the immediate landscape of Cambridge compared to land west of the M11'. Whilst they do not disagree with this statement, they would highlight the changing nature of the area east of the M11 as a result of development. The Green Belt Assessment also suggests that the setting of Cambridge between the City and the M11 forms a 'very strong, distinct separation and overriding contribution to the Green Belt function'. They dispute this statement. As with the previous comment, they consider the Cambridge Green Belt in this location is changing and its function and role in relation to the openness and setting of the City should be considered in this context. Notwithstanding this, the busway located around the edge of the land allows for the setting and openness to be maintained in their opinion. As such they have requested that their comments are taken on board in consideration of this application.
- 7.25 Individual representations - There have been a total of 18 individual representations received, of which 3 are fully supporting the scheme, 9 are broadly supporting the scheme but raising additional requests or information to allow them to fully support the scheme, and 6 are totally opposing the scheme or raising concerns. The issues raised in the 18 representations received have been summarised into objections & concerns and then general support / further information or infrastructure requested as follows:

Objecting / raising the following concerns:

- A10 improvements not being made to accommodate this development
- Inappropriate for buses to use the existing agricultural bridge
- Convolved route for buses causing unnecessary delays and discomfort to passengers
- Seek a new bridge across the M11 for buses (rather than an upgrade to the agricultural bridge) as they requested during the applicant's pre-application consultation events

- New bridge across the M11 excluded from alternative options published in applicant's documentation
- Raised ramp taking shared use path to new bridge problematic for 3 reasons all relating to the proposed obstruction of access between the existing bridge and the existing concrete tracking heading south, running between the main coprolite ponds and the new park and ride site, and leading to the furthest four fields (the Water Meadow, Badgers Wood and the two grazing meadows of the Hauxton Corner
- Additional traffic and associated congestion, particularly through villages, as this scheme is effectively encouraging motor traffic with what is a huge park and ride in the green belt
- Question how much CO2 will the extra 2,000 car users create each year; how many will live within easy reach of this site and other existing park and ride sites; how many live within 4 miles of their destination being a suitable distance to cycle; and when all the Greenways are complete what is the expected trip rate and what percentage would have a) car available b) not drive and c) no car in household?
- Covid-19 implications and the 'new normal' not taken into account in modelling
- Potential implications for Greenways, particularly where increase traffic movements in villages will put people off cycling as an alternative to the car journey
- Increased pollution
- Visual impacts / blot on the landscape
- Impact on local ecology and adjacent Country Park, including impacts to historic coprolite ponds and surrounding mixed woodland that has been maturing for over 40 years
- Impact for foreseeable future, let alone the disruption during construction
- Loss of green belt and inappropriate development in the Cambridge Green Belt
- Intrusion of the adjacent Country Park during construction and operation
- Concerns over the southern most fields being cut off and taking too much land take based on proposed bus and cycle routes across the M11
- Close to adjoining properties
- General dislike of proposal
- Noise nuisance and loss of adjacent tranquil area in the Country Park
- Noise and light pollution
- Contrary to Climate Change Emergency declared, which the applicant acknowledges in the application with an increase in carbon emissions over the next 60 years
- No account of alternatives considered for the period up until the Cambridge South Station opens in 2025, the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM) scheme comes forward or the Foxton Travel Hub is progressed, which avoids this becoming a 'white elephant' that is contrary to sustainable development and the declared Climate Change Emergency
- No assessment to show investing in rural bus services wouldn't be a better and more sustainable option
- More information and alternatives should be sought as part of the Transport Assessment to take account of wider schemes promoted by the Mayor e.g. the cost of the scheme without maintenance would allow 10 – 15 years of bus subsidies to be made instead
- Out of keeping with character of area
- Over development and need basis not set out
- Missing information from plans and / or not clear where roads lead to entering the current park and ride site, so difficult to assess the implications
- Strain on existing community facilities

- Impact on property values

In support / raising requests for further information or infrastructure to gain full support:

- Support the scheme and the inclusion of facilities for horse riders, where specific horse box parking spaces and a safe tack up area are proposed which allow access to off road riding opportunities as a local community asset, particularly as there is now no access to such facilities in the immediate area
- Commend the application on setting a high example of the multi-use recreational amenities with inclusion of horse box parking and a corral for equestrian users
- Welcome safe routes for equestrians, including access to bridleways and the Country Park
- Request the inclusion of a Pegasus crossing on the A10 to make it safer for equestrians to cross
- Ask if signage can be erected to ensure horse box spaces are reserved for such a use?
- Although acknowledges outside of the current application, ask if a dedicated slip onto the M11 from Hauxton could be considered to avoid delays and blocking of the A10 access?

7.26 A copy of the full representations will be shared with members of the Planning Committee one week before the meeting.

## 8. Planning Policy

8.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 require that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The relevant development plan policies are set out in paragraphs 8.4 to 8.7 below.

8.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) sets out the Government's planning policies and how these are expected to be applied. At its heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11). It states that for decision-taking this means:

- c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or
- d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most relevant for determining the application are out of date, granting permission unless:
  - i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
  - ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of this Framework taken as a whole.

8.3 The following paragraphs within the NPPF (2021) are considered to be the most relevant to this application:

- Paragraph 2 - Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations

indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account in preparing the development plan, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Planning policies and decisions must also reflect relevant international obligations and statutory requirements.

- Paragraph 7 - The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. At a similarly high level, members of the United Nations – including the United Kingdom – have agreed to pursue the 17 Global Goals for Sustainable Development in the period to 2030. These address social progress, economic well-being and environmental protection.
- Paragraph 8 - Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):
  - a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
  - b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed, beautiful and safe places, and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and
  - c) an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.
- Paragraph 55 - Local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition.
- Paragraph 57 - Planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:
  - 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.
- Paragraph 92 - Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which:

a) promote social interaction, including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other – for example through mixed-use developments, strong neighbourhood centres, street layouts that allow for easy pedestrian and cycle connections within and between neighbourhoods, and active street frontages;

b) are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion – for example through the use of attractive, well-designed, clear and legible pedestrian and cycle routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas; and

c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs – for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.

- Paragraph 93 - To provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:

a) plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;

b) take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community;

c) guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs;

d) ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise, and are retained for the benefit of the community; and

e) ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.

- Paragraph 100 - Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.
- Paragraph 105 - The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.

- Paragraph 111 - Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- Paragraph 112 - Within this context, applications for development should:
  - a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;
  - b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;
  - c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;
  - d) allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and
  - e) be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.
- Paragraph 130 - Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:
  - a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
  - b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
  - c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
  - d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
  - e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
  - f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

- Paragraph 147 - Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
- Paragraph 148 - When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
- Paragraph 150(c) - Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:
  - c) local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
- Paragraph 151 - When located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.
- Paragraph 152 - The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.
- Paragraph 174 - Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:
  - a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);
  - b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;
  - c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;
  - d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;
  - e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever

possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and

f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

- Paragraph 180. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;

b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;

c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and

d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.

- Paragraph 183. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that:

a) a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. This includes risks arising from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation (as well as potential impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation);

b) after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and

c) adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is available to inform these assessments.

- Paragraph 185. Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:



- a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life;
- b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and
- c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.

- Paragraph 194 - In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.
- Paragraph 195 - Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
- Paragraph 196 - In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
  - a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
  - b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
  - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
- Paragraph 199 - When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
- Paragraph 202 - Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
- Paragraph 203 - The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets,

a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

### **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document – adopted July 2011 (M&WCS)**

8.4 The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document (M&WCS) was adopted in July 2011 and sets out the strategic vision and policies for minerals and waste across Cambridgeshire up to 2026. The following policy is of relevance to both the adjacent areas of the proposal and the drainage connection to the River Cam for sand and gravel deposits, that need to be considered in the determination process:

- CS26 – Mineral Safeguarded Areas

### **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan September 2018 (SCDCLP)**

8.5 The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (SCDCLP) was adopted in September 2018 and sets out the strategic vision, planning policies and allocations (excluding minerals and waste) for South Cambridgeshire to guide the future development of the district up to 2031. It includes policies on a wide range of topics such as housing, employment, services and facilities, and the natural environment. The following adopted Local Plan policies are of particular relevance to the proposals that need to be considered in the determination process:

- Policy LP/1: Superseded Policies referred to in Adopted Area Action Plans
- Policy S/3: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy S/4: Cambridge Green Belt
- Policy S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031
- Policy S/7: Development Frameworks
- Policy CC/1: Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change
- Policy CC/2: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation
- Policy CC/4: Water efficiency
- Policy CC/6: Construction Methods
- Policy CC/7: Water Quality
- Policy CC/8: Sustainable Drainage Systems
- Policy HQ/1: Design Principles
- Policy HQ/2: Public Art and New Development
- Policy NH/2: Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
- Policy NH/3: Protecting Agricultural Land
- Policy NH/4: Biodiversity
- Policy NH/6: Green Infrastructure
- Policy NH/8: Mitigating the Impact of Development In and Adjoining the Green Belt
- Policy NH/14: Heritage Assets
- Policy SC/2: Health Impact Assessment
- Policy SC/9: Lighting Proposals
- Policy SC/10: Noise Pollution
- Policy SC/11: Contaminated Land
- Policy SC/12: Air Quality
- Policy SC/14: Odour Impact Assessments and Other Fugitive Emissions to Air

- Policy TI/2: Planning for Sustainable Travel
- Policy TI/3: Parking Provision
- Policy TI/6: Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone
- Policy TI/7: Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope (Consultation Area 1)

### **Cambridge City Council Local Plan October 2018 (CCCLP)**

8.6 The Cambridge City Council Local Plan (CCCLP) was adopted in October 2018 and sets out the strategic vision, planning policies and allocations (excluding minerals and waste) for Cambridge City to guide the future development of the city up to 2031. It includes policies on a wide range of topics such as housing, employment, services and facilities, and the natural environment. The following adopted Local Plan policies are of particular relevance to the proposals that need to be considered in the determination process:

- Policy 1: The Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy 4: The Cambridge Green Belt
- Policy 5: Sustainable transport and infrastructure
- Policy 7: The River Cam
- Policy 8: Setting of the City
- Policy 18: Southern Fringe Areas of Major Change
- Policy 28: Carbon reduction, community energy networks, sustainable design and construction, and water use
- Policy 29: Renewable and low carbon energy generation
- Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle
- Policy 33: Contaminated land
- Policy 34: Light pollution control
- Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration
- Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust
- Policy 37: Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone and Air Safeguarding Zones
- Policy 39: Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge
- Policy 55: Responding to context
- Policy 56: Creating Successful Places
- Policy 59: Designing landscape and the public realm
- Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment
- Policy 69: Protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance
- Policy 70: Protection of priority species and habitats
- Policy 71: Trees
- Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development
- Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development
- Policy 82: Parking management

### **South Cambridgeshire District Council – Area Action Plan (2008):**

8.7 Policies in adopted Area Action Plans provide specific guidance for the areas that they cover, which are defined on the South Cambridgeshire District Council Policies Map. SCDCLP Policy LP/1 identifies where policies of the Local Development Framework referred to in adopted Area Action Plans are superseded by policies of the SCDCLP. The Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan (2008) (CSFAAP) was produced by SCDCLP noting that the urban extension crosses the South Cambridgeshire / Cambridge City boundary. It is part of the adopted development plan, which is of relevance for development

in this area. In particular the following policies of the CSFAAP are considered relevant to these proposals:

- CSF/1 The Vision for the Cambridge Southern Fringe
- CSF/2 Development and Countryside Improvement Principles
- CSF/5 (1b-e) Countryside Enhancement Strategy
- CSF/12 Landscape Principles
- CSF/14 Linking Trumpington West To Its Surroundings
- CSF/15 Enhancing Biodiversity
- CSF/16 Archaeology at Trumpington West
- CSF/18 Access to the Countryside
- CSF/22 Construction Strategy
- CSF/24 Management of Services, Facilities, Landscape and Infrastructure

### **South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council – Shared Supplementary Planning Guidance:**

8.8 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) are intended to expand upon policy or provide further detail to policies in the adopted development plan. The following SPDs have been adopted by both South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council to support the SCDCLP and CCCLP:

- Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD (November 2018 for SCDCLP and December 2018 for Cambridge City Council)
- Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – prepared jointly with Cambridge City Council (January 2020)

### **South Cambridgeshire District Council - Supplementary Planning Guidance:**

8.9 In addition to the above SPDs, as identified on South Cambridgeshire District Council's website, the following documents were adopted to provide guidance to support previously adopted Development Plan Documents that have now been superseded by the SCDCLP. However, these documents are still material considerations when making planning decisions, with the weight in decision making to be determined on a case by case basis having regard to consistency with national planning guidance and the adopted SCDCLP:

- Biodiversity SPD (July 2009)
- Landscape in New Developments SPD (March 2010)
- Trees and Development Sites SPD (January 2009)
- Public Art SPD (January 2009)
- Open Space in New Developments SPD (January 2009)
- District Design Guide SPD (March 2010)
- Health Impact Assessment SPD (March 2011)

### **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mineral and Waste – Emerging Local Plan**

8.10 The Council has been jointly preparing, with Peterborough City Council, a new Minerals and Waste Local Plan. This new Local Plan looks forward to 2036 and makes provision for new minerals and waste management development to support the growth of existing and new communities planned in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. It sets out policies by which planning applications for mineral and waste management development will be determined,

covering such matters as biodiversity, restoration and traffic and highways; whilst also protecting and safeguarding existing mineral and waste sites and important mineral resources and allocations from new development that would prejudice their use.

- 8.11 The Councils submitted the Local Plan, the supporting evidence, and all the representations received, to the Secretary of State for Examination on 24 March 2020. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan Independent Examination was held between 15 and 17 September 2020 and the Councils received the Inspector's findings on 26 March 2021, confirming that the plan was 'sound' subject to the main modifications set out in his report. Officers are currently seeking approval to adopt the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan, that will supersede the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted July 2011) and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document (adopted February 2012) once adopted. On the basis that the Local Plan may be adopted by both Councils just ahead of this application being considered, officers will provide an oral update at the meeting for the benefit of Members.

### **Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council – Emerging Local Plan**

- 8.12 Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are in the process of working together to prepare an updated joint Local Plan for the Greater Cambridge area. Consultation ended in February 2020 on the Greater Cambridge Local Plan – The First Conversation. This document sought to ask about the kind of place residents and businesses want Greater Cambridge to be in the future. It explored the 'big themes' – climate change, biodiversity, social inclusion and great places – that will influence how homes, jobs and infrastructure are planned, and where growth might go. They have processed the large volume of feedback and comments they have received and prepared a report on the consultation results and key findings, that was taken to their Members in June 2020. They have been developing the evidence base for the plan and testing possible growth levels and strategic spatial options for the Plan, and in November 2020 published a set of initial reports including a Sustainability Appraisal.
- 8.13 At present this emerging plan is at a very early stage and the timetable for plan making was agreed in line with the above June 2020 report and published in the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) which took effect on 13 July 2020. The LDS states that the next stage of development for the emerging Local Plan is the Preferred Option Consultation that is planned for Summer / Autumn 2021. As such, at this very early stage of plan making there are currently no emerging policies that need to be considered in relation to this planning application.

## **9. Planning Considerations**

- 9.1 The main planning considerations in relation to this planning application are:
- Principle of Need and Justification
  - Green Belt considerations, including alternative sites considered and whether the proposal should be considered as 'inappropriate development'
  - Landscape / townscape and visual impact
  - Heritage considerations, including the setting of the City of Cambridge

- Archaeology
- Protection of Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope
- Ecology and Biodiversity
- Best and most versatile Farmland
- Transport and Parking considerations, including consideration of COVID-19 on travel patterns and transport modelling for this proposal
- Highway improvements and wider highway considerations including possible future transport schemes
- Climate Change and Sustainability
- Residential Amenity
- Surface Water, Foul Water Drainage and Flooding (Flood and Water Management)
- Public Art
- Airport Safety
- Other issues, including air quality, health impact assessment and contaminated land

### **Principle of Need and Justification**

- 9.2 This Regulation 3 application for a Travel Hub in Cambridge South West is accompanied by a letter stating that it *"is proposed to create more car parking spaces at a new site in order to accommodate demand that is currently forecast in the medium to long term as the existing Trumpington Park and Ride site is currently full"*. This statement by the applicant made with the submission in June 2020 takes account of the expansion that has already been undertaken on the existing Trumpington Park and Ride site under planning permission C/5001/18/CC; where in order to facilitate that expansion to accommodate 274 additional car parking spaces, additional bus and coach stops and layout area etc., officers noted it needed to remove much of the landscaping, which also led to a replacement of the surface water attenuation pond with underground tanks, leaving further expansion within the site boundary limited.
- 9.3 Furthermore, whilst acknowledging that the COVID-19 pandemic has led to a change in the way the existing Trumpington Park and Ride site has been used over the last 12 months, officers acknowledge that the proposed Travel Hub at Junction 11 is one of the key strategic projects that has been identified by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) to ease congestion into the City of Cambridge and decrease journey times owing to significant growth within the surrounding area and to reduce the number of cars travelling into Cambridge city centre, and to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.
- 9.4 In addition to the above, planning officers have acknowledged the applicant's need for additional Travel Hub capacity along the Royston to Cambridge corridor that is documented and has been identified within the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan (2011 - 2031), and the Transport Strategy for Cambridgeshire and South Cambridgeshire (2014) that were undertaken to support the wider planning proposals and allocations in these areas, and more recently in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Local Transport Plan.
- 9.5 Given the justification provided by the applicant and that the need for additional Travel Hub capacity along the Royston to Cambridge corridor is identified within key Transport documents stated in paragraph 9.4, planning officers consider the proposed development would meet the demand in providing a sustainable transport solution offering additional capacity for the locality and the opportunity for a change in modal shift in accordance with paragraph 105 of the NPPF (2021), SCDCLP (2018) Policy TI/2 and CCCLP (2018) Policy

5, irrespective of whether wider schemes within this corridor come forward or not. Nonetheless, whilst the principle of development is supported in policy terms, it is necessary for the application to be considered against the wider development plan policies before reaching a final recommendation. These wider considerations are set out below.

**Green Belt considerations, including alternative sites considered and whether the proposal should be considered as ‘inappropriate development’**

- 9.6 Whilst the Cambridge Green Belt is a singular designation across both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire, the red line area of the proposals (as identified in Agenda Plan 1) cross the administrative boundary of both authorities, with the Travel Hub site itself sitting within South Cambridgeshire. Nonetheless, the full Green Belt designation and its purpose need to be considered in the context of these proposals, alongside whether the proposals for assessment purposes should be considered as ‘inappropriate development’ taking account of case law; and consideration of the ‘very special circumstances’ for the Green Belt, if officers consider the context to be set as inappropriate development; alongside any harm and visual impact. These are all set out and considered further below before officers provide their view on the weight to be afforded to this significant planning constraint in the planning balance before a decision is reached.

**Purpose of the Cambridge Green Belt**

- 9.7 The preservation of the Cambridge Green Belt within South Cambridgeshire is supported locally by SCDCLP (2018) Policy S/4 where it maintains a rural edge to Cambridge and protects key views, seeking to maintain and enhance the quality of its settings. The Green Belt also serves to protect the scale and rural character of Green Belt villages such as Hauxton by preventing them from merging with adjacent villages; and preserving the unique character of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre. The SCDCLP acknowledges a number of factors that define the special character of Cambridge and its setting, which include the following:
- Key views of Cambridge from the surrounding countryside
  - A soft green edge to the city
  - A distinctive urban edge
  - Green corridors penetrating into the city
  - Designated sites and other features contributing positively to the character of the landscape setting
  - The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages; and
  - A landscape that retains a strong rural character.
- 9.8 Similar preservation is also set out within the City of Cambridge and is supported by CCCLP (2018) Policy 4 where it seeks to align with national policy and preserve the unique setting and special character of the city which includes green corridors that penetrate deep into the urban and historic heart of Cambridge. As identified in the CCCLP (2018) supporting text, both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are keen to see the Green Belt as a positive rather than a purely negative planning tool. In stating this it is acknowledged that opportunities have been taken at Trumpington to shape a new Green Belt edge that enhances the landscape setting of the city, as well as enhancing opportunities for recreational access. The Cambridge Green Belt extends into

the countryside that surrounds Cambridge City and separates it from Hauxton village. Its total area is approximately 26,340 hectares (65,088 acres).

- 9.9 From a national planning perspective, the NPPF (2021) sets out in paragraph 137 that *'great importance'* is attached to Green Belts, with *'the fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence'*.
- 9.10 The purpose of the Green Belt is set out in paragraph 138 of the NPPF (2021) which states that the Green Belt serves five purposes:
- (i) to check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
  - (ii) to prevent neighbouring towns merging
  - (iii) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
  - (iv) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
  - (v) to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the use of previously developed sites.
- 9.11 In considering matters relating to the development taking place within the Green Belt it can be useful to consider the following questions, these are considered in turn in this report as part of this section: \_
- 1) Is the development inappropriate? How should effects on openness be considered?
  - 2) Would there be any other harm (ie non-Green Belt factors, for example to character & appearance), that weigh against the development?
  - 3) If the development is inappropriate, are there any 'other considerations' which would weigh in favour of it?
  - 4) If any 'other considerations' exist, do they clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm? (ie carry out the 'Green Belt balancing exercise').
  - 5) If 'other considerations' clearly outweigh the harm, do 'very special circumstances' exist?
- 9.12 Paragraphs 147 - 149 of the NPPF (2021), referenced in Section 8 of this report, establish the principle that development within the Green Belt that is considered to be *'inappropriate development'* which is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in *'very special circumstances'*. Certain other forms of development within the Green Belt are considered to be *'not inappropriate'* providing they preserve the openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it, which are set out in NPPF (2021) paragraph 150 (a-f). Local transport infrastructure developments within the Green Belt are included within paragraph 150 (c). It is on this basis that the applicant provided evidence to demonstrate why they considered the Travel Hub proposal was considered to be *'not inappropriate'* development as defined by the NPPF, which they supported by recent planning case law. They also provided the necessary evidence to demonstrate why the proposal within a Green Belt location was necessary and can be justified within the planning balance, as documented in paragraphs 6.38 to 6.47 of their Planning Statement. They also provided sufficient information to allow planning officers to determine if *'very special circumstances'* existed in line with NPPF paragraph 151 in the event that they did not consider that the openness was preserved or that the purposes of including the land within the Green Belt were not met, which included sufficient information to address the renewable energy infrastructure being considered as inappropriate under NPPF paragraph 151. In addition, the applicant provided a Planning Statement Addendum to address the landscape and visual concerns in the Green Belt raised during the consultation process to help the decision-making process.



Assessment of whether the proposals are 'inappropriate development' or not

- 9.13 As is acknowledged in the applicant's Planning Statement Addendum document in paragraph 3.2, the impact of a development on the openness of the Green Belt is a matter of planning judgement, not law. This was confirmed in a recent Supreme Court decision (Samuel Old Brewery v Yorkshire County Council) which was referenced in the applicant's Planning Statement. It is therefore for the decision maker to consider whether the proposal is 'inappropriate' or 'not inappropriate' in their planning balance as a material consideration, which includes the consideration of visual openness.
- 9.14 Having regard to the purpose of the Green Belt discussed in paragraphs 9.7 to 9.12 above, and the reference in paragraph 150 of the NPPF (2021) which states other forms of development that are '*not inappropriate*' in the Green Belt '*provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it*' (our emphasis), planning officers consider that the scale and nature of the development being considered here does not sit entirely comfortably with those purposes set out in NPPF paragraph 137 i.e. '*by keeping land permanently open*' and '*their openness and their permanence*'. Furthermore, the relevant case law examples provided by the applicant, whilst supportive of their approach, was not necessarily looking at the same scale and type of proposal being proposed here. This was particularly true in the case of the recent Supreme Court decision of Samuel Old Brewery v Yorkshire County Council, which related to a mineral site. Whilst mineral sites are often worked for substantial periods of time, they are nonetheless still considered to be a temporary use of land that is temporary in nature, which this application is not. As such, whilst planning officers can acknowledge these planning decisions and the guidance that was contained in the original Planning Policy Guidance 2 (PPG2) document on the Green Belt, which included reference to Park and Ride schemes; officers have for the purposes of this application chosen to conduct their planning balance assuming that it is inappropriate development that needs to demonstrate 'very special circumstances'. This aligns with a similar decision taken by South Gloucestershire Council on a smaller scheme in Yate (which lies in the Bristol/Bath Green Belt) in October 2020.
- 9.15 In reaching the above conclusion planning officers will consider paragraph 148 of the NPPF (2021) which states '*when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to the harm to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations*' (our emphasis). The following sections of this report take into account the weight and matters used by planning officers for the purposes of their planning balance, including the substantial weight given to the Green Belt. This has been provided to offer assistance to members of the Planning Committee, in helping them carry out a similar exercise before reaching a final decision.

Assessment of 'very special circumstances'

- 9.16 Although the applicant does not specifically set out a section on 'very special circumstances' within their submission documents, as they have used paragraph 150(c) for local transport infrastructure developments within the Green Belt which can be viewed as 'not inappropriate', planning officers are content that sufficient information has been supplied to assess if 'very special circumstances' exist in line with NPPF paragraph 148 and for the renewable energy infrastructure in line with NPPF paragraph 151. This has already been acknowledged in paragraph 9.12 of this report and the following takes

account of the information supplied in the applicant's Planning Statement and also in their Planning Statement Addendum, alongside the wider submission documents, which includes the Liz Lake Green Belt Options Assessment document.

9.17 Once decking of the existing Trumpington Park and Ride site was discounted based on its impact on the Cambridge Green Belt and inability to provide sufficient forecast capacity requirements, four different sites were considered in the A10/M11 area based on their proximity to that corridor and residential areas by Liz Lake Associates, with each assessed against the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt at National Level and the three Cambridge Green Belt purposes defined in the supporting text for SCDCLP (2018) Policy S/4 and CCCLP (2018) Policy 4 – namely to Preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre; Maintain and enhance the quality of its setting; and Prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the city. The Green Belt Assessment set out that the assessment of the four sites was a finely balanced exercise, with all four of the sites either having a very strong or positive contribution to Green Belt purposes and openness of the Green Belt. However, the chosen Travel Hub site was considered to contribute to the purposes of including land in the Green Belt to a lesser extent than the other three parcels of land (which were considered to be stronger overall by comparison) for the following reasons:

- It lies to the west of the detracting M11 corridor and has a more rural location than the other parcels (particularly those on the east side of the M11).
- The immediate but open landscape setting of Cambridge between the City and the M11 forms a very strong, distinct separation and overriding contribution to the Green Belt function at the south west of the City. Other parcels were therefore considered to have a stronger contribution to Green Belt purposes.
- The compact and dynamic nature of the historic City is more closely associated with land to the east of the M11.
- Land to the east of the M11 forms part of the distinctive gateway to the city focussed around high quality urban edges at Glebe Farm and Trumpington Meadows.
- Land to the east of the M11 provide a much stronger contribution to the immediate landscape setting of Cambridge, compared to land west of the M11, which forms part of the wider landscape.
- At a local level, the merging of village settlements is most apparently reliant on the other three parcels. The application site, which lies in the immediate setting of Harston is strongly reliant on the immediate landscape resource of the Cam Valley extending north to and bounded by the M11 and Cambridge Road. The other three parcels fall within the visual and spatial sphere of the historic core of one or more of Haslingfield, Hauxton and Shelford's. However, the application site is the parcel least washed over by the visual and spatial alignment associated with one or more of the 'string of villages' to the south west of Cambridge.

9.18 Each of the four parcels of land assessed by Liz Lake Associates were being considered to provide a Travel Hub with the potential to encourage modal shifts into Cambridge city centre and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including potential improvements to existing walking and cycling links and services). The Liz Lake Associates (2019) Cambridge Western Orbital, Green Belt Options Assessment. Prepared on behalf of Strutt and Parker for Greater Cambridge Partnership, February 2019 provides a detailed assessment of this process which was provided in full in Appendix B of the Applicant's Planning Statement. Each parcel or parcels were based upon key characteristics identified in the published

Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment, land use as well as clear physical features or readily identifiable boundaries, such as urban edge, roads, railways, streams, water features, belts of trees and woodland. The appropriate site needed to be able to provide sufficient space for the facilities to be provided and maximise interchange opportunities between modes of transport. It is also shown as important that any site must enable a reduction in traffic on the busy M11 Junction 11. All the options considered were within the Cambridge Green Belt.

- 9.19 The chosen site (Parcel C) is shown as supporting the key benefits being sought from the Travel Hub site, whilst also respecting the Cambridge Green Belt location. In particular this noted the slightly lower landform of this parcel of land, which along with the structural vegetative features, together with the role of the Cam valley corridor to the south west was considered by the applicant's consultants to provide better visual containment compared to the other sites. It is considered that the physical and visual integration of elements associated with the Travel Hub would be more successfully accommodated on the application site. In addition, as part of the Mott MacDonald Outline Business Case undertaken, having regard to a range of transport, economic, financial and environmental factors, it is noted that the application site scored well against the other three parcels of land, particularly having regard to meeting the transport objectives of the scheme. Key benefits identified by planning officers from the information provided by the applicant include:
- Evidence provided to demonstrate that in Green Belt terms the application site was chosen to assist in terms of minimising and reducing conflict with the purposes for including land within the Green Belt and seeking to preserve the openness of the Green Belt as far as possible.
  - The proposed Travel Hub scheme provides significant benefits in terms of cycling and walking. As set out in detail within the Transport Assessment, prepared by Mott MacDonald the proposals include provision for a new lit 5-metre-wide shared use NMU path to the north of the Travel Hub site. This path also includes provision for a new segregated 5 metre bridge over the M11, which connects up with wider cycling infrastructure routes.
  - As detailed within the Applicant's Transport Assessment the new site would provide the facility required to meet the identified modelling need of an additional 2,150 car parking spaces to be available by 2036. This is to provide capacity for the growth on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus; patients and visitors anticipated; the anticipated demand from key companies such as AstraZeneca and R&D arm MedImmune on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus; the arrival of the Royal Papworth Hospital; the identified growth of the Addenbrookes Campus; and the delivery of wider substantial growth in and around Cambridge, which will put further demand on people travelling to the City Centre for work and leisure.
  - Maximise the potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport.
  - Supporting section 9 of the NPPF which sets out detailed guidance in relation to the promotion of sustainable transport in terms of policy development and consideration of development proposals and paragraph 103 [now 105] of the NPPF which states that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth to promoting the objectives of sustainable modes of transport, to help to reduce congestion and emissions, which would improve air quality and public health.
  - Aligns with paragraph 110 [now 112] of the NPPF which states that applications for development proposals should give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements to facilitate access to and encourage the use of public transport; address needs for people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all transport modes; create places that are

safe, secure and attractive and respond to local character and design standards; allow provision for efficient delivery of goods, and access by services and emergency vehicles; and designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles, in safe, accessible and convenient locations.

- Policies 80 and 81 of the adopted Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018) and TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan (2018) set out support for the promotion for walking and cycling, infrastructure improvements and promotion of sustainable transport, which this Travel Hub proposal promotes.
- Scheme designed to reduce (or avoid a negative impact on) general traffic levels and congestion through reducing traffic north east of M11 J11 (along Hauxton Road and through Trumpington), by encouraging trips headed for the city centre and Cambridge Biomedical Campus to transfer to another mode; reducing traffic flow and delay at M11 J11, particularly in the AM peak, including reducing flows associated with non-motorway traffic that pass across the junction (A10-A1309); and reducing delays on the A10 through Harston and Hauxton, on the approach to M11 J11.
- Well placed to intercept car trips on the approach to the M11 Junction 11, without having to queue on the gyratory.
- The proposed improvements to the north bound slip of the M11 Junction 11 allow for ease of access to the site without the need to travel round the gyratory and queue on the approach to Hauxton Road.
- Although the proposed bus route, does also include a small proportion of land on the east side of the M11, the route selected, proposes to keep the bus route close to the M11 and Hauxton Road, as the applicant was advised by GCSP colleagues, with a large proportion of the route shielded by the existing bunds adjacent to the M11. Therefore, the open nature of the approach to Cambridge would be largely maintained as a result of the proposed development
- The Photovoltaic Cells, whilst not falling within the exceptions set out in NPPF paragraph 146 [now 150], are only proposed on the northern of the three car park areas, in a location that is on the lower part of the site and in closest proximity to the M11, providing provision for 108 bays with electric vehicle (EV) chargepoints provided initially. Whilst the provision of 4-metre-high PV Panels will have some impact on the openness of the Green Belt, the more sensitive and open areas of the existing site do not propose the provision for the Photovoltaic cells at this stage. The PV panels are considered to be ancillary to the transport infrastructure scheme and the design allows for these panels to meet 31% of the forecasted energy requirements of the site which would result in a saving of 23 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent over the lifetime of the Scheme which is estimated at 60 years. Furthermore, the design ensures that underground infrastructure (ducting) is provided allowing for 100% provision and further panels to be added in the future should permission be sought and granted to increase this energy generation capability.
- The car park has been broken up into three distinct areas, with extensive planting, including extensive woodland planting to the north-east and south east boundaries of the Travel Hub site in order to minimise the visibility of the Travel Hub on the wider landscape, with a real potential for biodiversity net gain.
- The road widening along the A10 and M11 north bound slip road utilise land immediately adjacent to the existing carriageway in order to minimise encroachment into the Green Belt.
- The proposed new NMU bridge over the M11, whilst will create a new physical structure in the Green Belt, has been located in close proximity to the existing agricultural bridge / accommodation bridge and in the context of the M11 which is already considered to be a visually detracting element within the existing Green Belt.

- The proposed Travel Hub building is situated in a location that is central to the Travel Hub car park. In addition, it is of a single storey scale and very modest size, with toilets and a small waiting area, to take account of its Green Belt setting.
- 9.20 It is also stated that the site is close to the Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Nature Reserve and also the River Cam, and with this in mind would remain as largely an open car park. Structures have been kept as low as possible and have been sited largely to the northern part of the site to be closer to the M11, to allow openness to be maintained across most of the site and landscaping to be provided to lessen the impact. However, this is considered in more detail below, including changes to the height of the land as part of the submitted proposals.

*Harm to the Cambridge Green Belt including visual impact*

- 9.21 The applicant's Planning Statement Addendum was produced to address concerns raised about what the level of harm to the openness of the Green Belt would be. This was considered to be pertinent given the location of the site and the edge of the Green Belt and urban boundary, where there is potential for new built development to reduce openness and contribute to urban sprawl. The impact of the proposal on the openness and rural character of the Cambridge Green Belt was therefore considered.
- 9.22 As acknowledged in paragraph 3.5 of the applicant's Planning Statement Addendum the assessment of openness is a planning judgement which is based upon matters of fact and degree. Officers acknowledge that in order to determine the degree of impact on openness of the Green Belt, it is important to understand the Green Belt context. A contextual assessment of the Green Belt functions for each site option under consideration was carried out in the Liz Lake Green Belt Options Assessment (February 2019) on behalf of the applicant.
- 9.23 As set out in the Liz Lake Green Belt Options Assessment document, in the context of openness the south-western edge of the City is defined by a new distinct edge formed by the southern extensions of Trumpington Meadows and Glebe Farm. The M11 also plays a significant role in defining landscape character with associated noise and lighting, which led to their conclusion that Parcel C (the Travel Hub site) was strongly influenced by the M11 corridor, provided a physical separation between the city, and therefore contributed the least to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt compared to the other Green Belt site options considered. However, in the Options Assessment document it is acknowledged that the Travel Hub site itself does have a '*significant contribution in terms of preserving the openness of the Green Belt*' and that '*Development of the parcel beyond the current land use, by its very nature would fail to safeguard the countryside from encroachment resulting in some effects on the openness of the Green Belt*'. Nonetheless it is accepted that '*the degree of effect will be dependent upon the scale of a new building and any associated structures, the extent of lighting and hard surfacing, which to a degree can be influenced by the design process*'.
- 9.24 The site is currently an arable field and whilst not overly prominent in the landscape being bounded by the Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Nature Reserve to the west, the M11 to the north, and Cambridge Road (A10) to the south east, the openness of the area would allow long views across to some neighbouring villages such as Haslingfield and land that runs adjacent to the River Cam, especially if the site is lit at night. A landscape strategy has been designed by the applicant which seeks to minimise the impact of the proposed development in the wider landscape, replacing existing hedgerow and providing additional

native shrub planting, trees and hedgerow as landscape screening. However, whilst such landscaping measures are acknowledged, these measures would not reduce the impact of the proposal or assist with the need to retain the 'openness' of the green belt. Even the applicant acknowledges that *'the proposed development will create significant new built form in the Green Belt and there will be a level of harm to Green Belt openness'*.

- 9.25 In assessing the degree of harm to the Green Belt openness and encroachment into the countryside, officers have considered the landscape and visual impact assessment produced by Mott MacDonald as part of the applicant's environmental assessment, which takes account of the context from the proposed development on the openness and purpose of the Green Belt. The visual impact is accepted by Mott MacDonald in their assessment, particularly that the Travel Hub site will be *'visible in clear and filtered close views from Trumpington Meadows Country Park, local cycle network between Harston and Trumpington and from the A10'* and will in effect introduce a substantial area of new built form within the Green Belt and includes ancillary items which will have a conflict with the openness of that area of Green Belt. The proposals will include the presence of a car park, solar panels above the parking bays, access road off the A10, the multi-user bridge over the M11, the bus route from the site to the existing Trumpington Park and Ride, the service building, boundary fencing, along with associated infrastructure including CCTV and lighting; alongside the amended levels of the site involving a degree of earthworks within the site and the car park being raised above existing ground levels by up to 2 metres (up to 6.56 feet) at their highest point (towards the west of the site). This is considered in more detail in the next section of the officer report, but from a Green Belt perspective the impact on the openness and countryside is acknowledged by planning officers and needs to be placed within the significant weight given to this designation by national and local planning policy.
- 9.26 The GCSP landscape consultant acknowledged that the proposed Travel Hub is recognised as an important development proposal that has followed a structured site-selection and appraisal process and incorporates many positive Green Infrastructure and landscape design approaches that could deliver enhancement of some areas. Nevertheless, as acknowledged in paragraph 6.5 of this report they are of the opinion that it is a proposal that would potentially be harmful to the local landscape character and visual amenity, including impacting upon the purposes and visual openness of the Green Belt. In the GCSP landscape consultant's opinion, the proposal would give rise to a range of adverse landscape and visual effects that whilst on the whole could be mitigated, would also result in some residual effects on visual amenity to users of the local cycle route facilities. The Environmental Statement (ES) acknowledges that there would be adverse landscape and visual effects and that some would be residual, but considers that for the most part, these would be minor and ranked as being not significant in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms by Year 15. The GCSP landscape consultant confirmed that they did not take a fundamentally different position to that of the applicant in this regard, which is what planning officers have used for the purposes of this assessment.
- 9.27 The GCSP landscape consultant also accepted that whilst in Green Belt terms, the proposed development is considered to be 'not inappropriate' development by the applicant, the proposal is also considered to cause a degree of harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt such that the proposal conflicts with the NPPF and Policy NH/8 (Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining the Green Belt). As such, in the GCSP landscape consultant's view, the findings as reported in Chapter 10 and the Addendum do not mean that the development is acceptable or indeed unacceptable when

considered against the relevant policies in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, and as such this must be a matter for consideration as part of the overall planning balance.

9.28 SCDCLP (2018) Policy NH/8 sets out the following 3 requirements to mitigate the impact of development in and adjoining the Green Belt:

1. Any development proposals within the Green Belt must be located and designed so that they do not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt.
2. Where development is permitted, landscaping conditions, together with a requirement that any planting is adequately maintained, will be attached to any planning permission in order to ensure that the impact on the Green Belt is mitigated.
3. Development on the edges of settlements which are surrounded by the Green Belt must include careful landscaping and design measures of a high quality.

Criterion 1 deals with the openness of the Green Belt, for which the applicant has demonstrated how the proposal has been developed and designed to work in this location. Landscaping and design have also been set out by the applicant and taken into account, so whilst planning officers agree that there is conflict with this SCDCLP (2018) policy and the NPPF (2021) guidance in relation to the purpose and protection of Green Belts, acknowledgement is also made to landscape and design elements that seek to mitigate this as far as possible, as required by criteria 2 and 3 of Policy NH/8.

9.29 CCCLP (2018) Policy 4 (The Cambridge Green Belt) seeks to ensure that new development in the Green Belt will only be approved in line with Green Belt policy in the NPPF (2021), which includes openness. Whilst CCCLP (2018) Policy 8 (Setting of the City) sets out in criterion (a) that development on the urban edge, including sites within and abutting green infrastructure corridors and the Cambridge Green Belt, open spaces and the River Cam corridor, will only be supported where it: responds to, conserves and enhances the setting, and special character of the city, in accordance with the Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment 2003, Green Belt assessments, Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and their successor documents. The reference to Green Belt assessments in criterion (a) refers to the LDA Design Inner Green Belt Study (and supplement) produced to support the local plan, which the applicant's consultants have referenced in their assessment of the Green Belt and the impact of the development on the purposes of the Green Belt.

### Green Belt conclusions

9.30 Substantial weight has been given to inappropriate development in the Green Belt by planning officers, that would by definition result in harm as set out in paragraph 148 of the NPPF (2021). This also takes account of the renewable energy infrastructure taken as inappropriate in relation to paragraph 151 of the NPPF (2021). It is noted that the Travel Hub site is located close to the settlement boundary of Hauxton and the wider red line area to the east of the M11 is adjacent to land being developed at Trumpington Meadows. It is also noted that the development would be adjacent to the Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Nature Reserve. However, by its nature, planning officers agree in part with the applicant that this site would have less physical impact upon openness than other uses and that some mitigation is possible through appropriate landscaping. Some limited weight has been given to these considerations in line with consultation responses received from relevant statutory consultees.

9.31 Of more significance, it has been shown through a site selection process by the applicant that the chosen Travel Hub site has been based on Green Belt considerations, as well as meeting the transport objectives being sought to allow a modal shift that can secure a reduction of traffic into the Cambridge city centre and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, including the Addenbrooke's complex, as well as a reduction of traffic on the M11 Junction 11 interchange. The benefits set out above in paragraph 9.19 are considered to be significant. Planning officers have therefore assessed the 'very special circumstances' and taking into account all the above factors it is therefore considered that very special circumstances have been demonstrated that can outweigh the harm caused by "inappropriateness" and therefore the proposal is considered to be acceptable in Green Belt terms. Therefore, having regard to SCDCLP (2018) Policy S/4 and NH/8; CCCLP (2018) Policy 4 and 8; alongside NPPF (2021) paragraphs 137, 138 and 147 - 151; the proposals are considered to be broadly acceptable in principle, subject to the remaining material planning considerations taken in the overall planning balance ahead of reaching a final decision.

### **Landscape / townscape and visual impact**

9.32 A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) was submitted by the applicant to set out a study of the landscape character of the area and an assessment of the likely nature and scale of the effects of the proposed scheme on landscape character and visual amenity during construction and operation, including impacts on the landscape and townscape which includes an assessment of the effects on the landscape as a resource in its own right and the visual impact on individual views. The extent of the study area was initially determined by the applicant by digitally mapping the zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) of the proposed Scheme. The study area for the proposal lies mainly within National Character Area (NCA) 87: East Anglian Chalk. The key characteristics of NCA 87 relevant to the study area that were drawn out by the applicant's submission include:

- The underlying and solid geology is mainly West Melbury Marly Chalk, with distinctive chalk rivers including the Rhee and Granta which flow in gentle river valleys across the NCA. The chalk aquifer is used to supply potable water in the area and supports flows of springs and chalk streams;
- The rolling downland, mostly in arable production, has sparse tree cover but distinctive beech belts along long, straight roads;
- Remnant chalk grassland, including road verges, supports chalkland flora and invertebrates, such as the chalkhill blue butterfly; and
- There are a number of expanding commuter villages generally within valleys.

The study area also includes the eastern edge of NCA 88: Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands, but as outlined in the applicant's submission exhibits fewer of its key characteristics. A National Character Area (NCA) is a natural subdivision of England based on a combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and economic activity. There are 159 NCAs and they follow natural, rather than administrative, boundaries. They are defined by Natural England, the UK government's advisors on the natural environment.

9.33 The importance of the landscape is reflected in national planning guidance with the NPPF (2021) stating that the planning system should contribute to and conserve & enhance the natural and local environment as set out in paragraph 174. In accordance with this theme, SCDCLP (2018) Policy NH/2 (Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character) sets out that *'Development will only be permitted where it respects and retains, or enhances the*



*local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and of the individual National Character Area in which it is located'. CCCLP (2018) Policy 59 (Designing landscape and the public realm) also sets out to ensure that the landscape elements of proposals are well considered and requires the following:*

*External spaces, landscape, public realm, and boundary treatments must be designed as an integral part of new development proposals and coordinated with adjacent sites and phases. High quality development will be supported where it is demonstrated that:*

- a. the design relates to the character and intended function of the spaces and surrounding buildings;*
- b. existing features including trees, natural habitats, boundary treatments and historic street furniture and/or surfaces that positively contribute to the quality and character of an area are retained and protected;*
- c. microclimate is factored into design proposals and that public spaces receive adequate sunlight;*
- d. materials are of a high quality and respond to the context to help create local distinctiveness;*
- e. an integrated approach is taken to surface water management as part of the overall design;*
- f. a coordinated approach is taken to the design and siting of street furniture, boundary treatments, lighting, signage and public art;*
- g. trees and other planting is incorporated, appropriate to both the scale of buildings and the space available;*
- h. species are selected to enhance biodiversity through the use of native planting and/or species capable of adapting to our changing climate; and*
- i. the design considers the needs of all users and adopts the principles of inclusive design.*

- 9.34 In relation to concerns raised as part of the initial consultation exercise, updated and additional information was submitted by the applicant to address the landscape and visual matters raised by the GCSP Landscape consultant. This included landscape design drawing sheets, technical note on updated earthworks information, figures showing the proposed cross sections and distribution of surplus topsoil and subsoil plans, and an addendum to Chapter 10 and Appendix H1 of the ES. Together these documents provided an assessment of the landscape value of the site and surroundings, which recommended measures to mitigate any negative impact from the proposal.
- 9.35 The GCSP landscape consultant noted that the ES and Chapter 10 Addendum confirms that there would be adverse landscape and visual effects, albeit these are ranked in the ES as being not significant in EIA terms. However, the GCSP landscape consultant drew attention to the fact that Policy NH/2 does not refer to significant harm, rather it is a test of new development needing to respect and retain or enhance the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and of the individual NCA in which it is located. The GCSP landscape consultant therefore acknowledged that there were a range of adverse impacts concluded in the ES Chapter 10 Addendum (LVIA) that would suggest that the proposed development does not fully meet Policy NH/2. Therefore in their opinion the landscape proposals and commitment to long-term management secured via a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, might be capable of offsetting some of the harm that would arise from the proposal, albeit the function, landscape character and appearance of this part of the local landscape would be markedly altered.

- 9.36 Following receipt of further information on the earthworks proposals on the Travel Hub site and adjustments made by the applicant to site levels to achieve a better balance of cut and fill material, the GCSP landscape consultant also acknowledged that the proposed creation of 1 metre (3.28 feet) high bunds, the spreading of 450mm (1.48 feet) depth topsoil in the planning beds in the Travel Hub site, and raising of levels by 300mm (0.98 feet) across proposed soft landscape areas is acceptable as an overall principle. However, the GCSP landscape consultant raised a number of comments relating to the suitability of using the topsoil in areas of species-rich grassland and requested further detail and specification in relation to a Soil Strategy and specification for stripping, storage and laying of topsoil to mitigate compaction, to be required by condition should planning permission be granted. The proposed areas of raised levels / bunding would need to be keyed in and smoothly marry to existing contours / landform, avoiding any artificial or engineered landforms that could impact on the visual amenity of this area. Works proposed to remove trees from land adjacent to the existing park and ride site to accommodate the new bus route as part of the wider proposals were also considered, and for the purposes of assessment officers have taken a worst-case-scenario on these all needing to be removed within the urban setting when assessing the visual impact. The impacts of removing, or potentially reducing this section of trees, is also discussed in more detail in the residential amenity section of this report (paragraph 9.111).
- 9.37 In addition to the points raised above, the GCSP landscape consultant also confirmed that they continue to raise a design issue with the layout of part of the shared user path and the adjoining access road that *'unfortunately results in a lack of meaningful landscape treatment and poor amenity for users of the path where they pass through the main part of the travel hub site'* in their opinion. The applicant acknowledged that the route of the path meant that a narrowing of landscaping was necessary in order to meet wider requirements such as drainage matters and that the path width was retained in line with local standards. Even with this design feature leading to a pinched layout along the eastern side of the non-motorised user (NMU) path, the applicant has confirmed that the landscaping proposed in this area would still be in the region of 0.5 metres (0.55 yards) and would therefore not be unacceptable in landscape design standards. Planning officers are of the view that the retention of the path width and wider constraints that have led to this decision by the applicant, make this reduction in landscaping acceptable, whilst acknowledging the concerns raised by the GCSP landscape consultant and the need to balance out all the material planning elements in making a final decision.
- 9.38 Planning officers acknowledge that the NMU shared user path pinches very close to the western edge of the proposed access road and perimeter road around the car park, where the verge tapers from 0.5 metres (0.55 yards) to 1.5 metres (1.64 yards) in width allowing grass and some tree planting to the wider areas, but also accommodating lighting columns (that have the potential to conflict with the tree locations in the south if not designed carefully at the final design stage) and road/pavement kerbs etc. As noted in paragraph 9.37 above, planning officers acknowledge that this space would provide a reduced edge treatment and buffer to the NMU path, where users could be exposed to close proximity views, noise and pollution from the adjoining vehicles. However, the applicant has confirmed that the route of the path has taken account of wider sensitivities, such as drainage matters, wildlife constraints in existing trees, whilst also considering the desire lines for cycling, which means that its alignment has been brought more into the more open parts of the proposal. In this regard, Viewpoint 6A of the LVIA is pertinent (albeit slightly further south along the path) which planning officers have considered following the response from the GCSP landscape consultant. From here, the GCSP landscape consultant confirmed that there would be more open views than those that appear to have

been considered in the assessment. Notwithstanding this, the GCSP landscape consultant confirmed that the LVIA concludes that those views would be subject to a major adverse magnitude of change during operation and residual (resulting in a moderate adverse significance of effect). In the round, the GCSP landscape consultant considered this to be a fair overall judgement. Clearly some localised improvement could have been achieved had more space for landscape treatments been made available in the layout in their opinion, but no objection was made to the proposals.

- 9.39 In providing their assessment of the applicant's proposal, the GCSP landscape consultant provided as a general comment, that they considered that similar to Chapter 10 of the ES, the Addendum provided in line with their concerns raised is largely clear and concise, which is to be welcomed. The methodology is considered to be generally compliant with the thrust of the guidance in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, and where appropriate, the third edition of the Guidelines for Landscape Visual Impact Assessment, and the minor queries that they previously raised have been addressed.
- 9.40 Whilst acknowledging that the proposals do not fully meet SCDCLP (2018) Policy NH/2 and CCCLP (2018) Policy 59, the landscape proposals and commitment to long-term management secured via a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, are considered by planning officers to be capable of offsetting some of the harm that would arise from the proposal, albeit the function, landscape character and appearance of this part of the local landscape would be markedly altered as acknowledged by guidance provided by the GCSP landscape consultant as a statutory consultee. As such, planning officers have acknowledged this conflict in the planning balance, alongside the Cambridge Green Belt issues set out above, to be weighed together before reaching a final conclusion.

### **Heritage considerations, including the setting of the City of Cambridge**

- 9.41 Chapter 16 of the NPPF (2021) seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF (2021) requires in *'determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance'*. Furthermore, paragraph 197 of the NPPF (2021) requires *'In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness'*.
- 9.42 In addition to the national guidance set out in the NPPF (2021) above, SCDCLP (2018) Policy NH/14 (Heritage Assets) sets out that *'Development proposals will be supported when they sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as appropriate to their significance and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly: c. Designated heritage assets, i.e. listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens; d. Non-designated heritage assets including those identified in conservation area appraisals, through the development process and through further supplementary planning documents; e. The wider historic landscape of South Cambridgeshire including landscape and settlement patterns; f. Designed and other landscapes including historic parks and gardens, churchyards, village greens and public parks; g. Historic places; h. Archaeological remains of all periods from*

*the earliest human habitation to modern times'. CCCLP (2018) Policy 61 (Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment) also sets out to ensure that the historic environment is protected stating that 'To ensure the conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment, proposals should: a. preserve or enhance the significance of the heritage assets of the city, their setting and the wider townscape, including views into, within and out of conservation areas; b. retain buildings and spaces, the loss of which would cause harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area; c. be of an appropriate scale, form, height, massing, alignment and detailed design which will contribute to local distinctiveness, complement the built form and scale of heritage assets and respect the character, appearance and setting of the locality; d. demonstrate a clear understanding of the significance of the asset and of the wider context in which the heritage asset sits, alongside assessment of the potential impact of the development on the heritage asset and its context; and e. provide clear justification for any works that would lead to harm or substantial harm to a heritage asset yet be of substantial public benefit, through detailed analysis of the asset and the proposal'.*

- 9.43 As part of the applicant's submission, heritage matters were included in Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement 'Historic Environment', where both temporary and permanent construction and operational effects on heritage assets were considered in the assessment. Temporary effects were considered from the construction-related activities, whereas permanent effects were considered as either physical effects on the integrity of the asset or effects on their setting, which includes the setting of the City of Cambridge. Baseline information was gathered from within a 1km study area around the Scheme area to establish the archaeological potential and undertake historic environment assessment within. The study area used seeks to provide a comprehensive assessment of designated and non-designated heritage assets that might be directly or indirectly affected either physically or through changes to their setting to aid the decision-making process in this regard. Whilst outside of the 1km study area the Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St Michael, Trumpington was also included in the applicant's assessment based on comments received from Historic England at the pre-application stage back in April 2019 relating to potential low-level harm to the Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St Michael, Trumpington, as a result of development to the south of the asset.
- 9.44 In assessing the applicant's Environmental Statement (ES), Historic England acknowledged that the site is situated midway between three scheduled monuments (Noted in the Environmental Statement as MM001, MM002 and MM003) and close to a number of other heritage assets including the Grade I listed church of St Edmund at Hauxton (MM004) and the Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St Michael at Trumpington. Historic England noted the ES and the underpinning Desk Based Assessment (DBA) have assessed these assets and agreed that the weighting given was appropriate. The churches have high heritage values and the scheduled monument form an important group of designated buried archaeological remains. They also noted the impact upon the Church in Trumpington was included in the assessment following their previous advice and that further discussion was undertaken with regards to the safeguarding of the two grade II milestones. Overall, they noted the results of the impact assessment in relation to the designated heritage assets and did not wish to make any further comments in that regards. As such, they confirmed that Historic England does not object in principle to the scheme.
- 9.45 Whilst confirming they did not object to the scheme, in providing their response Historic England confirmed that their one concern was that three designated assets (Scheduled Monuments) are evenly spaced around the area with the development roughly in the centre. In recent years the amount of development in the wider area has provided an

unprecedented level of information about the historic landscape. They were very much of the view that there was clearly an important multi-period landscape in this area of which some discreet areas are designated, whilst much remains undesignated. As a landscape they felt it needed to be considered more holistically and although mitigation by excavation and preservation by record is an appropriate response to the non-designated archaeological assets within the red line boundary, their view was that the applicant's ES lacked a broader level of understanding of the historic landscape. In dealing with assets only as individual sites does not establish the value of synthesis. They therefore confirmed that they would value further comment from the applicant as to how they plan to bring this matter to the fore, and how they will seek to balance the impact upon the heritage assets from the proposal. In particular, how they would seek to develop an understanding of the finding of the archaeological discoveries made as part of the work, linked to this wider archaeological landscape amongst the future users of the development.

- 9.46 To address the points made by Historic England in paragraph 9.45 above, the applicant's consultant provided an updated heritage and archaeological section in their resubmission. This acknowledged the importance of not only addressing the archaeology as per individual sites, but also for placing these sites within a wider archaeological and historic landscape context. They also referenced their technical appendix to the ES that sort to show this wider context and how the Travel Hub site is framed by the wider landscape. They confirmed that the research carried out across the immediate surrounding area was pertinent and was engaged with to inform the baseline for the assessment. Moreover, going forward they confirmed this baseline, in addition to the results of the pre-construction archaeological excavation, will be disseminated as part of a series of interpretation / information boards across the Scheme for end users to engage with the wider archaeological context. While the content of the information to be presented on the boards is yet to be confirmed, the idea was raised by, and discussed with, the Historic Environment Team at the County Council which is being secured by planning condition. Whilst the consideration of archaeology is discussed further in the next section of the report below, the Historic Environment Team has confirmed their support for this approach; and upon receipt of the additional information, Historic England confirmed that they did not have any additional comments, but suggested that officers continued to seek the views of specialist conservation and archaeological advisors, in particular with regards to the requirement for archaeological works and mitigation.
- 9.47 To ensure that the wider historic setting of the City of Cambridge was also given sufficient consideration in line with adopted local planning policies set out above, specialist advice was also sought from heritage colleagues via the GCSP team. As discussed in paragraph 6.10 of this report, confirmation was received that acknowledged that their comments did not address the archaeological aspects of the historic landscape that had already been dealt with by Historic England and the County Council's Historic Environment Team. However, regarding potential impacts on the setting of Cambridge City, they confirmed the site's parking area location being beyond the M11 and south of Trumpington's historic core of settlement, is sufficiently distant from the Cambridge historic core that given the nature of development proposed on the Travel Hub site, there is no visual impact on the historic core. In terms of the wider setting of the city, the proposed Travel Hub site will result in a change to the landscape character from the loss of farmland. However, in their opinion this area of farmland concerned is not known to make a particular contribution to the setting of the city in heritage terms (notwithstanding archaeology) and the development is likely to be perceived as part of the M11 infrastructure. Furthermore, given that the designated heritage Listed buildings of Hauxton Mill nearby to the south, are largely protected by woodland and the site proposals being across the A10 to its North, the increase in vehicle activity in the

vicinity should not harm its setting in their opinion. Safeguarding of the two grade II Listed milestones were considered to be the most important considerations that needed to be protected during the construction stage. As such, no concerns were raised in relation to the scheme on heritage grounds.

- 9.48 As demonstrated by the responses received by Historic England, the Council's Historic Environment Team and the GCSP Heritage Officer, the relevant information has been submitted to allow a decision to be taken in line with both national guidance and local planning policies.
- 9.49 Planning officers consider that sufficient information has been provided by the applicant to ensure that consideration of these points can be made. With the additional clarification and information supplied by the applicant to address the points raised, planning officers consider that the proposals address the national requirements and are in compliance with SCDCLP (2018) Policy NH/14 (Heritage Assets) and CCCLP (2018) Policy 61. Furthermore, with the mitigation measures secured, which includes the interpretation of the wider context of the historic environment (considered further below), officers are of the view that this has a potential benefit that should be acknowledged in the final planning balance.

### **Archaeology**

- 9.50 In addition to the historic environment considerations above, the Council's Historic Environment Team drew attention to paragraph 185 [now 190] of the NPPF which states that heritage features within a development site should be protected. SCDCLP (2018) Policy NH/14 (Heritage Assets) and CCCLP (2018) Policy 61 (Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment) both set out in the previous section of this report support this. A field archaeological evaluation took place in August 2019 by the applicant, finding occupation evidence of Iron Age date (c. 6th - 4<sup>th</sup> century BC) and a small Anglo-Saxon cemetery of 6th-7th century AD date (ref: Cox, N. 2020 Cambridge South-West Travel Hub, M11 Junction 11. Archaeological Evaluation Report Oxford Archaeology report no 2372. Cambs Historic Environment Record reference ECB5966). Subsequent discussions between the Council's Historic Environment Team and the archaeological consultants from Mott MacDonald have refined a mitigation scheme that will be required in advance of any development in this area.
- 9.51 Archaeological investigations have been undertaken on site, and whilst the Council's Historic Environment Team does not object to this development, it is recommended that the mitigation strategy is secured by the use of a planning condition. With the benefit of a planning condition to secure this requirement, the proposal is considered to be in full compliance with national guidance set out in the NPPF (2021) and SCDCLP (2018) Policy NH/14 and CCCLP (2018) Policy 61.

### **Protection of Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope**

- 9.52 SCDCLP (2018) Policy TI/7 (Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope) seeks to ensure that development is not granted that would result in any risk of interference to the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge. The policy sets out two consultation area requirements based on the Policies Map (Lord's Bridge Consultation Area 1 – that requires consultation with the University of Cambridge and account taken to the risk of interference to the equipment being used in the Observatory, with permission being refused where interference caused could not be overcome by conditions or planning obligations; and Lord's Bridge Consultation Area 2 – that requires development proposals for

telecommunications and microwave operations that could adversely affect the operation of the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge will be subject to consultation with the University of Cambridge, with permission being refused where interference could not be overcome by conditions or planning obligations). The Travel Hub site is within Lord's Bridge Consultation Area 1 for the purposes of SCDCLP (2018) Policy TI/7 and consultation has taken place with the University of Cambridge

- 9.53 CCCLP (2018) Policy 39 (Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge) also seeks to ensure that development proposals within the Lord's Bridge Consultation Area, covering the whole of Cambridge City Council's administrative area, which could adversely affect the operation of the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory will: a. be subject to consultation with the University of Cambridge; and b. only be granted planning permission where there is no harm to its scientific operation or where any harm can be overcome by measures secured by condition or planning obligation.
- 9.54 Both local policies acknowledge the international importance of Lord's Bridge and the need to ensure that it is protected from inappropriate development. In recognition of this protection the applicant undertook pre-application discussions with the University of Cambridge to ensure that the design being brought forward would be possible and demonstrated how their advice had been included in the planning application; which is acknowledged in the University's response set out in paragraph 6.36 of this report.
- 9.55 The University of Cambridge (Estates Team) confirmed that they were comfortable that the designs have been prepared such that, provided they are implemented in the form shown, they will not pose a threat to the Lord's Bridge facility. However, they have requested that any changes to the scheme, such as lighting design or heights / materiality of the proposed structures etc. should trigger additional consultation with them to ensure their advice holds weight. Furthermore, further consultation should take place with regard to the emerging technical designs before they become embedded within the scheme, such as the converters to be incorporated within the solar array and communication with buses etc. so that any required mitigation to control radio interference / suppression measures etc. can be incorporated within the design as it develops.
- 9.56 On the basis that both a planning condition and informative are recommended to safeguard the points raised by the University of Cambridge, the proposal is considered to align with the principles set out in SCDCLP (2018) Policy TI/7 and CCCLP (2018) Policy 39.

### **Ecology and Biodiversity**

- 9.57 Paragraph 180(d) of the NPPF (2021) requires proposals to demonstrate a net gain in biodiversity on the site and sets out that *'development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity'*.
- 9.58 SCDCLP (2018) Policy NH/4 supports development which preserves and enhances biodiversity with opportunities to be taken to achieve positive gain from the design of the development with priority given to those sites which assist in the achievement of targets in the Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) and aid delivery of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy. SCDCLP (2018) Policy NH/6 (Green Infrastructure) seeks to ensure that green infrastructure in the district is conserved and enhanced to ensure that there is no loss or harm to the network unless the need and benefits of the development demonstrably

outweigh any adverse impacts; that proposals to reinforce, link, buffer and create new infrastructure will be encouraged; the delivery of strategic green infrastructure and priorities will be supported; and that new developments contribute to the enhancement of the green infrastructure network, where contributions will be established for the enhancement and on-going management costs. Furthermore, in the surrounding context of the Travel Hub site the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan (2008) sets out the implementation of a Countryside Enhancement Strategy (which led to the creation of the Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Nature Reserve) and for the Travel Hub site itself Policy CSF/5 1(b) to (e) seeks the following:

- b) Hedgerow planting on field boundaries in the agricultural land between Hauxton Road and the Trumpington Meadows Country Park;
- c) New footpaths, cyclepaths and bridleways creating routes through the area from Hauxton Mill and linking to the Granchester Road;
- d) Measures to protect and enhance wildlife habitats, including managed public access to the river banks; and
- e) Noise attenuation on the northern side of the M11 through the creation of new landscape features which are compatible with the river valley character.

- 9.59 CCCLP (2018) Policy 69 (Protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance) seeks to protect existing local nature sites and where permission is permitted proposals must include measures to (a) minimise harm; (b) to secure achievable mitigation and/or compensatory measures; and (c) where possible enhance the nature conservation value of the site affected through habitat create, linkage and management. Whilst the Travel Hub site is not a site of biodiversity, it is adjacent to the Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Nature Reserve, which does need to be considered in the planning balance. As set out in supporting text to CCCLP (2018) Policy 69 *‘Proposals on or adjacent to a site of local conservation importance should not be granted without proper consideration of the potential to enhance the designated site’s biodiversity through enhanced management, habitat creation or the formation of new linkages with adjacent habitat areas’*.
- 9.60 CCCLP (2018) Policy 70 (Protection of priority species and habitats) is also relevant, where it states that *‘Development will be permitted which: a. protects priority species and habitats; and b. enhances habitats and populations of priority species’* and also CCCLP (2018) Policy 71 (Trees) that seeks to preserve, protect and enhance existing trees including the protection of potential root damage to trees of amenity or other value. Furthermore, The Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (January 2020) includes a section on Biodiversity and Geodiversity (Section 3.5) which sets out why biodiversity is an essential part of sustainable development and the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity should be considered as a key element of good design. Both the 2018 Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans, alongside national planning policy in the NPPF (2021), requires new development to protect and enhance biodiversity, giving consideration to the conservation status of species and habitats and recognising the role that a multifunctional approach to the design of developments has to play in helping to enhance biodiversity. Net biodiversity gain is an approach to development that aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than beforehand; and development that adopts a biodiversity net gain approach seeks to make its impact on the environment positive, delivering improvements through habitat creation or enhancement after avoiding or mitigating harm as far as possible. Consideration also needs to be given to the guidance in the Biodiversity (July 2009), Trees and Development Sites (January 2009) and District Design Guide (March 2010) supplementary planning guidance documents. However, given the age of the guidance documents very



limited weight has been afforded to them by officers, and the weight has instead been placed on the adopted local plan policies and guidance in the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (January 2020) and NPPF (2021) highlighted above.

- 9.61 To help support the proposals and demonstrate consideration of the protection afforded by both national and local planning policies the applicant submitted a Phase 1 ecology survey together with a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Mott Macdonald, 28 May 2020). Whilst further information and discussions needed to take place with the Ecology Officers from the County and District, alongside wider ecology groups, planning officers are content that all statutory consultee holding objections have been removed and subject to final design confirmation, the proposals are able to create appropriate biodiversity net gain to meet the requirements of both national and local planning policy. The mitigation measures set out in the Letter of Comfort dated 19 July 2021 and the pre-commencement conditions recommended to ensure the final details are agreed ahead of construction, ensure that the environmental net gain benefits are controlled and deliverable to protect the adjacent Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Nature Reserve.
- 9.62 Representations have been made regarding the loss of biodiversity from development of the site which comprises three arable fields. These concerns have been considered, and whilst the proposal would result in the loss of the existing fields the applicant has provided details which demonstrate that the proposal would also support and increase biodiversity on site. This would include the principles of reinstatement of native hedgerow species such as Hawthorn, Blackthorn and Field Maple around all site boundaries, the provision of ecological enhancement areas such as habitat areas, and tree planting across the site which would widen the diversity of vegetation at the site and provide micro habitats for species such as birds and insects. NPPF (2021) paragraph 180(d) encourages ecological enhancements which would provide a net gain in biodiversity on site. The applicant's ecologist has provided details of the proposed net gain, the principles of which will be used to inform the final designs. The CCC Ecology Officer has confirmed that the landscaping and mitigation proposed would ensure ecological enhancements at the site would provide a net gain in biodiversity on the site. However, to ensure that an appropriate baseline is agreed and that any changes to the final designs are used as a basis for this to be measured, a pre-commencement condition has been recommended to allow for any final changes to be made (if necessary) in line with the approved details set out in draft condition 3.
- 9.63 Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites and they are generally supportive of the biodiversity mitigation and enhancement proposals detailed in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Mott Macdonald, 28 May 2020). However, they advised that delivery of the proposed measures should be secured through appropriate planning conditions.
- 9.64 In considering the ecology and biodiversity impacts and mitigation measures put forward by the applicant to achieve a net gain in biodiversity, in line with both national and local planning policies, planning officers have also considered the potential pressures placed on the adjacent Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Nature Reserve (outside of the red line planning application area), resulting from placing a Travel Hub in this location. To help inform these considerations planning officers have undertaken discussions with a representative from the Wildlife Trust and the County Council's Ecology Officer, to ensure that a full appreciation of the concerns were understood; and the inclusion of the Letter of

Comfort dated 19 July 2021 has been brought forward as a result of this assessment to ensure that appropriate mitigation and monitoring is secured if planning permission is granted. Further detail on the final ecology and biodiversity (linked in with the landscaping schemes to be delivered) have been controlled by the draft planning conditions proposed by planning officers (that have been accepted by the applicant's planning agent) which will be informed by the final scheme designs and highway improvements to further safeguard the delivery of these improvements and long-term maintenance plans for the benefit of the natural environment.

- 9.65 In line with the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan (2008) the applicant has also sought to demonstrate compliance with Policy CSF/5 1(b) to (e) in proposing the retention of existing hedgerow where possible; the creation of the new NMU route that can be used as a bridleway to connect the area from Hauxton Mill to Granchester Road; putting measures in place to protect and enhance wildlife habitats, including providing mitigation to land outside the red line boundary area to manage public access to the river banks; and ensure that the Noise attenuation created on the northern side of the M11 is retained and re-profiled to allow for the bus route, whilst maintaining the height and approved profiles agreed under S/2501/16/DC Discharge of Condition 50 (parts e and g – earth bund) of outline planning consent S/0054/08/O (Approved May 2016). In the officer report for S/0054/08/O the principle of maximising the disposal of spoil arisings on site in an earth bund positioned on the boundary with the M11 is discussed, which acknowledged that the contours of the bunds extended towards the adjacent footpath with approved heights of up to 3.5 metres (11.48 feet) above surrounding land levels. What is being proposed by the applicant is consistent with this wider approval, but to ensure that this is confirmed in any final amendments that may come out of the final designs, this information will be required through the landscaping information. Furthermore, to ensure that the concerns raised by Deloitte on behalf of Grosvenor Britain & Ireland (Grosvenor) and Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) as landowners, in relation to the bunds, access to swales and re-instatement of the existing path down to the river for the drainage route proposed, safeguards are proposed in draft conditions 5 and 9 to ensure that these aspects are adequately controlled.
- 9.66 Whilst it is acknowledged that the long term maintenance of the proposals will be undertaken by the applicant through a commercial contract that will be let outside the remit of this planning application, which means that we cannot assume that it will be the Wildlife Trust managing this Travel Hub site, it does still need to be designed to complement the neighbouring land uses. As such, irrespective of who will be the successful management body, the proposed planning conditions, with the benefit of the applicant's Letter of Comfort dated 19 July 2021, are considered necessary, directly related to the development and reasonably related in scale and kind to meet tests for planning conditions set out in paragraph 57 of the NPPF (2021). In ensuring that such arrangements are put in place, planning officers consider that the long-term arrangements and mitigation measures sought by SCDCLP (2018) Policy NH/6 (Green Infrastructure) are appropriately controlled by the recommendations set out in this officer report.
- 9.67 Officers acknowledge the ecological enhancements to improve biodiversity on site and the demonstration of net gain to meet the minimum 10% required by planning policy. Furthermore, with the setting of a baseline biodiversity net gain assessment and further monitoring over the next 25 years (with a habitat monitoring scheme and reports submitted in years 2, 5, 10, 20 and 25 years, with remedial actions required if the desired outcomes are not achieved) as part of the proposed draft Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) condition, planning officers acknowledge as part of their planning balance that it is

likely that the proposals will exceed this minimum and have the potential to deliver real benefits to this area. As such it is considered that with the mitigation measures sought, the proposals are in compliance with SCDCLP (2018) Policies NH/4 and NH/6; CCCLP (2018) Policies 69, 70 and 71; Southern Fringe Area Action Plan (2008) Policy CSF/5 1(b) to (e); paragraph 180(d) of the NPPF (2021); and guidance in the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (January 2020). As such, subject to careful design and management controlled by the recommended draft planning conditions and the Letter of Comfort dated 19 July 2021 put forward by the applicant, planning officers consider the opportunities for biodiversity net gain and wider access to the neighbouring Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Nature Reserve should be seen as a benefit in the planning balance exercise.

### **Best and most versatile Farmland**

- 9.68 SCDCLP (2018) Policy NH/3 states that planning permission would not be granted for development which would lead to the irreversible loss of Grades 1-3a of agricultural land unless sustainability considerations and the need for development are sufficient to override the need to protect the agricultural value of the land (NH/3(1)(b)). Whilst paragraph 174 of the NPPF (2021) seeks to protect, conserve and enhance the natural environment by setting out the following:

*Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:*

*a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);*

*b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;*

*c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;*

*d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;*

*e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and*

*f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.*

- 9.69 From the Planning Statement (Strutt and Parker, May 2020) the applicant acknowledges that the proposed development would result in the loss of approximately 33 hectares (81.5

acres) of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land. The majority of which they confirm is Grade 2 Agricultural Land with a small portion of the overall site (approximately a third of the size of the southernmost field) is Grade 3 Agricultural Land (see Agenda Plan 4). The need for the development has been set out by the applicant and this is demonstrated in paragraphs 9.2 – 9.4. The applicant also notes that South Cambridgeshire has a significant resource of good quality agricultural land, particularly around Cambridge and the larger settlements which is where the most sustainable growth for development is located.

- 9.70 As already noted above, the proposal site would lead to the irreversible loss of approximately 33 hectares (81.5 acres) of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land, which must be assessed against both national and local planning policy. Natural England notes the loss of this BMV agricultural land for this development, and as acknowledged in paragraph 6.22 of this report, they highlighted their response to the EIA Scoping consultation (Natural England ref 289486) for this development where they advised that impacts to BMV land should be appropriately considered in light of the Government's policy for the protection of the BMV agricultural land as set out in paragraph 174 of the NPPF (2021). In terms of EIA, BMV land (Grades 1,2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification system ) is a receptor of very high or high sensitivity (depending on the ALC grades present) and the loss of 20 ha (or more) of BMV agricultural land would typically give rise to a major (or v large/large) adverse impact (according to DMRB LA104/109 or EIA Handbook 3rd Edition significance methodologies) depending upon the amount of the different ALC grades affected and any mitigating circumstances in their opinion. As such they recommended that soils should be considered in the context of the sustainable use of land and the ecosystem services they provide as a natural resource, as also highlighted in paragraph 174 of the NPPF. They emphasised that this information has not been provided within the Environmental Statement. However, as also noted in paragraph 6.22 of this report Natural England has accepted that this was as a result of planning officers not scoping BMV into the EIA rather than this being an omission by the applicant. As such, it is for the Council to demonstrate consideration of this matter in their planning balance to comply with paragraph 174 of the NPPF.
- 9.71 Officers have followed the guidance set out in Annex A of Natural England's response in relation to BMV land and have ensured a map of the ALC was sought to better understand the impacts of the proposed scheme. Having reviewed this in discussion with Natural England colleagues (noting that Grade 2 agricultural land is predominant in the area), and that the irreversible loss of agricultural land has been based on sustainability considerations and the need for development as set out in paragraphs 9.2 to 9.4, and the key benefits identified in paragraphs 9.19 and 9.20 that are considered sufficient to override the need to protect the agricultural value of the land (NH/3(1)(b)), officers consider the proposal is broadly compliant with policy NH/3 of the SCDCLP (2018) and in particular NH/3 (1)(b). Furthermore, sufficient evidence has been reviewed to demonstrate consideration of paragraph 174 of the NPPF where criterion (a) requires the protection and enhancement of *valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan)*; criterion (b) requires recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic *and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land*, and of trees and woodland; criterion (e) requires the prevention of new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, *unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability*; and criterion (f) requires the remediation and mitigation of *despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate*. As such, subject to the proposed draft Soil Strategy Plan

condition, discussed with Natural England colleagues, planning officers are content that the sustainable measures and need for development have been assessed appropriately to demonstrate compliance with both national and local planning policy.

**Transport and parking considerations, including consideration of COVID-19 on travel patterns and transport modelling for the proposal**

- 9.72 The NPPF (2021) requires that plans and decisions ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised, and that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts of development on the road network are severe in line with NPPF paragraph 111.
- 9.73 SCDCLP (2018) Policy TI/2 (Planning for Sustainable Travel) supports sustainable modes of transport, particularly for larger developments together with a subsequent reduction in car usage. The full requirements of the policy are reproduced below for ease of reference:
- 1. Development must be located and designed to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and promote sustainable travel appropriate to its location.*
  - 2. Planning permission will only be granted for development likely to give rise to increased travel demands, where the site has (or will attain) sufficient integration and accessibility by walking, cycling or public and community transport, including:*
    - a. Provision of safe, direct routes within permeable layouts that facilitate and encourage short distance trips by walking and cycling between home and nearby centres of attraction, and to bus stops or railway stations, to provide real travel choice for some or all of the journey, in accordance with Policy HQ/1;*
    - b. Provision of new cycle and walking routes that connect to existing networks, including the wider Rights of Way network, to strengthen connections between villages, Northstowe, Cambridge, market towns, and the wider countryside;*
    - c. Protection and improvement of existing cycle and walking routes, including the Rights of Way network, to ensure the effectiveness and amenity of these routes is maintained, including through maintenance, crossings, signposting and waymarking, and, where appropriate, widening and lighting;*
    - d. Provision of secure, accessible and convenient cycle parking in accordance with Policy TI/3; e. Securing appropriate improvements to public and community transport (including infrastructure requirements) in accordance with the aims of the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan and South Cambridgeshire Community Transport Strategy.*
  - 3. Developers will be required to demonstrate they will make adequate provision to mitigate the likely impacts (including cumulative impacts) of their proposal including environmental impacts (such as noise and pollution) and impact on amenity and health. This will be achieved through direct improvements and Section 106 contributions and/or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), to address transport infrastructure in the wider area including across the district boundary.*

4. Developers of 'larger developments'<sup>1</sup> or where a proposal is likely to have 'significant transport implications'<sup>2</sup> will be required to demonstrate they have maximised opportunities for sustainable travel and will make adequate provision to mitigate the likely impacts through provision of a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. All other developments will be required to submit a Transport Statement. Where a Transport Assessment / Statement or Travel Plan is required, a Low Emissions Strategy Statement should be integrated.

5. Travel Plans must have measurable outputs, be related to the aims and objectives in the Local Transport Plan and provide monitoring and enforcement arrangements. Planning obligations may be an appropriate means of securing the provision of some or all of a Travel Plan, including the requirement for an annual monitoring and progress report. Submission of area-wide Travel Plans will be considered in appropriate situations. Outline planning applications are required to submit a framework for the preparation of a Travel Plan.

9.74 SCDCLP (2018) Policy TI/3 (Parking Provision) seeks to ensure that car and cycle parking and related infrastructure e.g. electric charging point facilities are provided through a design led approach in line with the indicative standards set out in Figure 11 of the local plan. Criterion 2 of the policy requires that car parking provision needs to '*take into consideration the site location, type and mix of uses, car ownership levels, availability of local services, facilities and public transport, and highway and user safety issues, as well as ensuring appropriate parking for people with impaired mobility*'.<sup>3</sup> Whilst Criterion 3 of the policy confirms that the '*Council will encourage innovative solutions to car parking, including shared spaces where the location and patterns of use permit, and incorporation of measures such as car clubs and electric charging points*'.

9.75 CCCLP (2018) Policy 5 (Sustainable transport and infrastructure) has similar objectives to Policy TI/2 above. Whilst CCCLP (2018) Policy 82 (Parking Management) sets out parking standards in line with Policy TI/3 above. Colleagues in the Transport Assessment Team have considered the policy context when considering the transport information submitted as part of these proposals.

9.76 The Travel Hub site is proposed to comprise on-site car parking provision of 2,150 car parking spaces inclusive of 1,934 standard spaces, 108 designated Blue-Badge spaces, 670 solar carport spaces with ducting over the whole Travel Hub to allow the expansion of solar carports in the future if desired, and 108 'Slow EV' charging points.

9.77 The methodology to determine car parking provision is considered acceptable for use by the CCC Transport Assessment Team. It is proposed that in the opening year of 2023, the Travel Hub site will initially provide 326 cycle parking spaces inclusive of 160 cycle parking spaces in the form of Sheffield stands, 16 cycle parking spaces for non-standard cycles, and 150 cycle parking lockers. It is noted land will be safeguarded at the Travel Hub site to allow for on-site cycle parking provision to be expanded in the future to a maximum

---

<sup>1</sup> Larger development includes proposals of over 20 dwellings or 0.5 hectares for residential development and over 1,000m<sup>2</sup> or 1 hectare for other development.

<sup>2</sup> Developments with 'significant transport implications' are those: In particularly congested locations and/or generating larger numbers of trips; Where there are particular local travel problems; That will have an adverse impact on an existing, or will result in the declaration of new, Air Quality Management Area or an unacceptable adverse impact on local air quality.

<sup>3</sup> Minimum levels of car parking for people with impaired mobility will be required in accordance with national guidance.

provision of 538 cycle parking spaces inclusive of 204 cycle parking lockers. Cycle parking at the Travel Hub site is estimated to initially operate at 87% capacity. The initial on-site cycle parking provision is expected to cover the demand for spaces. On-site cycle parking provision will be monitored and managed and if additional cycle parking spaces are required, it is noted these will be delivered by the applicant. The applicant is happy to accept a 'monitor and manage' planning condition regarding the provision of on-site cycle parking should planning permission be granted.

- 9.78 In terms of the transport baseline data the Local Highway Authority has confirmed that they are satisfied with the baseline data obtained and used within the submitted transport assessment. The localised network peak periods identified as 07:00 - 08:00 in the AM peak and 17:00 - 18:00 in the PM peak are agreed by the CCC Transport Assessment Team; as are the 2018 baseline traffic flow diagrams for the AM and PM peaks. Assessment of collision data analysis has also been considered based on 60 months' worth of available access data obtained from the Council, based on the study area agreed by colleagues in the Transport Assessment Team. No accident cluster sites were identified that needed to be considered as part of this planning application.
- 9.79 The methodology used to determine the proposed trip rate for cars at the new Travel Hub site is considered acceptable by the CCC Transport Assessment Team, where the Travel Hub site is anticipated to generate 497 trips in the AM peak (495 inbound and 2 outbound) and 470 trips in the PM peak (11 inbound and 459 outbound). Transport officers have confirmed that the occupancy profiles and parking demand provided by the applicant's consultants are considered acceptable. It is noted that in the 2036 High Growth Scenario, maximum usage of the Travel Hub site car park is anticipated to reach 84% of its total capacity.
- 9.80 In assessing the proposals the Transport Assessment Team has noted in 2026 the proposed distributional split between the Travel Hub site and the existing Trumpington Park & Ride site will be 61% - 39% respectively; whilst in 2036 the proposed distributional split between the Travel Hub site and existing Trumpington Park & Ride will be 60% - 40% respectively, which is considered acceptable by the CCC Transport Assessment Team. At maximum occupancy, the Travel Hub site is anticipated to generate 510 boarders and 27 alighters in the AM peak, and 31 boarders and 245 alighters in the PM peak. The 510 boarders in the AM peak and 245 alighters in the PM peak can be accommodated by the 12 services per hour proposed assuming a typical vehicle capacity of 50-60 passengers. The majority of private coach trips generated by the Travel Hub site are anticipated to occur outside the peak periods, where on-site provision of 12 coach parking spaces has been taken into account.
- 9.81 In providing their assessment of the application, the Transport Assessment Team noted that circa 317 non-motorised user's (NMUs) will travel on the new NMU path in the AM peak and circa 275 NMUs will travel on the new shared-use path in the PM peak. The proposed footway/cycleway is considered suitable to accommodate this future demand by transport colleagues.
- 9.82 In looking at the traffic impact assessment, colleagues in the Transport Assessment Team noted that bus journey times are expected to be reduced in both the AM and PM peak post-development. In the AM peak period, the VISSIM traffic modelling outputs highlight that average bus service journey times will be reduced by circa 9 minutes. In the PM peak period, it is anticipated that average bus journey times would be reduced by circa 12

minutes. Given the new Travel Hub site is proposed to add 6 additional services towards the City Centre, the average waiting time is expected to be reduced as well.

9.83 The following junctions were assessed by colleagues in the Transport Assessment Team as part of the junction capacity assessment, and are considered acceptable:

- Trumpington Park & Ride access junction (signal junction)
- Addenbrookes Road/Hauxton Road junction (signal junction)
- M11 Junction 11 (signal junction)
- Proposed Travel Hub site access/A10 junction (signal junction)

9.84 The Local Highway Authority is satisfied that the development will have an improvement to the capacity at the M11 Junction 11 as a whole in both the AM and PM peaks, and thus overall the junction is acceptable. However, both the Local Highway Authority and Highways England recognise that further tweaks may be required at the detailed stage, which is why further information is sought to build on the detail set out in draft condition 3, to ensure that the planning permission reflects the wider safety audit and highway approvals obtained for the build.

9.85 In assessing the South West Travel Hub development the Transport Assessment Team has considered the following mitigation package put forward by the applicant, which they consider to be acceptable, subject to detailed design:

- A new lit 5 metre wide hard surfaced NMU route over the M11 between the A10 and the A1309/Hauxton Road, including a new purpose-built bridge over the M11.
- A new off-line Public Transport route between the Travel Hub and the A10 Hauxton Road / Addenbrooke's Road junction.
- 326 cycle parking spaces to be provided initially (176 spaces and 150 chargeable lockers), with on-site space safeguarded to allow for a maximum provision of 538 spaces (334 spaces and 204 chargeable lockers), with a 'monitor and manage approach' to be adopted.
- Improved signage and wayfinding along the NMU route, including travel times on signage to key destinations such as Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Cambridge city centre to help encourage further uptake of trips.
- 12 new public transport vehicles an hour serving the new Travel Hub; 6 routing via the Cambridge Guided Busway and serving the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Cambridge Railway Station; and 6 routing towards the City Centre along Trumpington Road.
- 12 parking spaces for private coaches.
- 108 'Slow EV' charging points included within the on-site car parking provision.
- Circa one third (670) of the total new Travel Hub spaces will be solar carport spaces situated underneath a photovoltaic (PV) panel, with ducting supplied to the whole Travel Hub site, to allow for future provision subject to necessary planning consent (with the solar power generation from the panels forming part of the energy supply for the Slow EV charging points).
- Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras to be installed on the new two-lane bus only route.
- A new signalled site access from the A10 and local widening of the A10.
- Local widening of the A1039 Hauxton Road.
- Improvements to the M11 Junction 11.
- Improvements to the A1309 Hauxton Road / Addenbrooke's Road signal junction.



- 9.86 It is anticipated that the bus services which will serve the Travel Hub site will be an extension to the existing services to Trumpington Park & Ride instead of a completely new route and service as initially proposed. The applicant has informed highway colleagues that initial discussions have taken place with Stagecoach who have confirmed their acceptance of the scheme. With regards to the service provision, routes and frequencies anticipated for the new travel hub site, an agreement will look to be negotiated with Stagecoach by 2022 by the applicant, with a proposed opening year of 2024 if planning permission is granted. This is confirmed as acceptable by the CCC Transport Assessment Officer. Furthermore, access for private coaches into the Travel Hub site would be taken from the A10 and a separate coach parking area is proposed to be delivered as part of the proposals with a capacity for 12 coaches to park; 6 designated coach spaces and 6 coach spaces parallel to the carriageway which forms a loop around the 6 designated coach spaces. It is noted that the operation of coach parking at the Travel Hub site is proposed to mimic the existing operation at Madingley Road Park & Ride site, which is used by private coaches for a charge of £10 per day. Informal observations made by the applicant at Madingley Road Park & Ride showed that no private coaches arrived prior to or during the AM peak period. The applicant therefore considers that it is unlikely private coaches will arrive during the AM peak at the new Travel Hub. This is confirmed as acceptable by the CCC Transport Assessment Officer. Coach parking at the new Travel Hub is proposed to be controlled via a manually controlled electric barrier.
- 9.87 Whilst the mitigation measures and principles of the proposals as an extension to the existing Trumpington Park and Ride Site from a transport assessment perspective are accepted, as acknowledged above, it is also noted by planning officers that the internal site layout details inclusive of the internal access road, equestrian access, 'left-in left-out' junction, internal site access roundabout, and the NMU route still need to be finalised and agreed with Local Highway Authority Development Management Officer and other appropriate teams at the detailed design stage of the proposals, as discussed in more detail in the Highway improvements and wider highway considerations section below. The internal landscaping arrangements of the Travel Hub site are also likely to be influenced by the final approved highway designs, alongside input from the successful management company being appointed for the future management of the site (as discussed under paragraph 9.67 of this report) which is why draft condition 14 has been recommended to ensure that all relevant statutory consultees are able to input into any final proposals. Furthermore, it is noted that to prevent unauthorised use of the Travel Hub site, including vehicles parking overnight on the land surrounding the site, a ditch is proposed to surround the internal access road and height restrictions will be in place at certain accesses to the site, details of which will need to be checked before finalising the internal layout and wider landscaping proposals.
- 9.88 Whilst acknowledging that the transport information has been accepted by the Transport Assessment Team in principle, subject to final design checks, officers are also aware of the concerns that have been raised by some objectors in relation to the recent COVID-19 pandemic. In particular concerns that, as a result of COVID-19, travel patterns of users and behaviours used to forecast the demand for the scheme have changed; that may have impacted the basis of need since this application was first submitted. Whilst both highway colleagues and planning officers acknowledge the impact that COVID-19 has had on travel behaviours, particularly with more staff choosing to work from home; they also acknowledge that both the existing and future expansion of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus supports various roles, many of which cannot easily be undertaken at home. Such demand is also the case for patients and visitors to some of these facilities, many of which are yet to open to pre-covid appointment levels. Moreover, the Travel Hub site has also been modelled to

assist with a modal shift in journeys not only to these facilities, but also to Cambridge city centre. As such, whilst the impact that COVID-19 has had on travel behaviours should not be ignored, the extension of the existing park and ride provision is considered to complement the existing services to cater for staff, patients and visitors to these facilities that hold not only a national, but also international, reputation; whilst also supporting opportunities for access to alternative modes of sustainable transport.

- 9.89 The proposal has been assessed and is considered acceptable to the Transport Assessment Team and the Local Highway Authority as it would not contribute to unsustainable levels of additional traffic on the local highway network or create an additional highway hazard. Furthermore, an appropriate NMU route and highway mitigation measures have been proposed by the applicant to help mitigate the development and ensure that cycle parking and on site drop off facilities are in place to encourage travel by more sustainable modes of transport. Planning officers have recommended planning conditions that allow the applicant team to progress the Section 278 works required with highway colleagues (as discussed further below) to ensure that the necessary highway improvements are agreed ahead of construction and delivered prior to use, if planning permission is granted. Acceptance of the demand placed on the area by the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (and the future expansion of the site anticipated) alongside the desired access to Cambridge city centre, mean that officers are comfortable with the demand for a Travel Hub site in this location, even taking account of the recent COVID-19 pandemic and changes to travel patterns. As such, the proposals are considered to be compliant with SCDCLP (2018) policies HQ/1, CC/6, TI/2, and TI/3; and CCCLP (2018) policies 5 and 82.

#### **Highway improvements and wider highway considerations including possible future transport schemes**

- 9.90 As already noted in paragraph 9.72 above, the NPPF (2021) requires that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts of development on the road network are severe in line with NPPF paragraph 111. The transport modelling and assessment work considered in paragraphs 9.72 to 9.89 above, have been used to inform the level of highway improvements required, which also take account of cumulative developments and wider committed transport schemes. The Letter of Comfort dated 19 July 2021 has also been obtained from the applicant team, to ensure that committed sums are agreed for future maintenance as a result of this proposed development.
- 9.91 Vehicular access to the Travel Hub site is proposed to be taken off the A10 in the form of a new signalised T-junction, located circa 550 metres (601.49 yards) to the south of the M11 Junction 11. The A10 is proposed to be widened locally to accommodate the signalised site access junction. The proposed junction is noted to include the following features, which need to be agreed with both Highways Development Management and the Council's Signals Team at the detailed design stage of the development:
- Two-lane exit from the Travel Hub site access road onto the A10 of which one lane will be signalised at the stop line for vehicles turning right onto the A10 southbound, and the second lane will be a slip lane for vehicles turning left onto the A10 northbound. The exit slip lane from site will merge with the two ahead lanes on the A10 circa 100 metres (109.36 yards) north of the Travel Hub site access junction.
  - Two lane entry into the Travel Hub site from the A10 of which one lane will be a dedicated right turn lane for vehicles turning right from A10 southbound, and the second will be an un-signalised slip lane for vehicles turning left into the site from the A10 northbound. The entry

slip to the Travel Hub site from the A10 northbound will extend circa 250 metres (273.4 yards) south of the access junction.

- Three-lane approach to the junction on the A10 northbound, with two signalised ahead lanes and the un-signalised left-turn slip lane into the Travel Hub site on the nearside as described above.
- Two-lane approach to the junction on the A10 southbound, one ahead lane and one right turn lane into the Travel Hub site, both of which will be controlled by the signals.

9.92 The impact of the additional traffic on the network and junction capacity has been assessed above and has been confirmed as acceptable by the Council's Transport Assessment Officer and that the site access junction will be able to accommodate the development for all future year assessment scenarios. The applicant has also had extensive discussions with Highways England in relation to the proposals and mitigation measures being put forward, including potential impacts with the placement of a new bridge over the M11 which is likely to need to go in overnight if planning permission is granted. Final detailed designs will be subject to the separate S278 agreement, which are recommended to be linked into draft condition 14 to ensure that all changes are considered for the scheme as a whole.

9.93 The new segregated Public Transport route is proposed to run from the Travel Hub site, over the upgraded accommodation bridge to the A1309 / Addenbrooke's Road / Trumpington Meadows signalised junction, allowing buses to either continue onto the Guided Busway, to Trumpington Park & Ride, or along Trumpington Road for journeys to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Cambridge city centre. To accommodate the Public Transport route north of the A1309 / Addenbrooke's Road junction, the existing Trumpington Park & Ride slip road and bus-only route is proposed to be widened to accommodate two-way flow of buses into and out of the Trumpington Park & Ride site. Owing to width constraints on the proposed northbound approach of the Public Transport Route, and the existing northbound slip road from the junction into Trumpington Park & Ride, the A1309 / Addenbrooke's Road signals will be altered as part of the proposals to accommodate movement from the proposed Public Transport route to the existing Trumpington Park & Ride slip road in both directions in order to prevent buses from waiting to cross each other where the road section into / out of the Trumpington Park & Ride site narrows to one lane. The above junction design has been modelled and is noted by CCC Transport Assessment Team to operate within capacity for all assessment scenarios. Amendments were also made by the applicant to take account of concerns raised by CamCycle. Consideration of the wider impacts of these works around the existing Park and Ride site, including tree removal works to accommodate the widening works, are also considered separately in this officer report to take account of residential and visual amenity.

9.94 To take account of discussions with Highways England and also the Local Highway Authority for traffic flows predicted in this area, modelled under the 'Do something' assessment scenario, the applicant has also included some off-site highway improvements which comprise the following:

- M11 Junction - Widening the northbound off-slip to accommodate two ahead lanes and one dedicated left-turn lane for the A10 which will all be subject to signal control. The widening will continue for approximately 30 metres (32.81 yards) beyond the signals to accommodate left-turn traffic onto the A10. Signals are also proposed for both the A1309 Hauxton Road southbound approach to J11 and the circulatory flow on the approach to this arm, to allow traffic to leave Cambridge.

- A1309 Hauxton Road / Addenbrooke's signal junction - Works to accommodate the proposed Public Transport Route joining the junction at the northbound A1309 approach. The proposed Public Transport Route will increase the lanes on the northbound A1309 approach within the junction vicinity to six lanes. The stop line and traffic signals for the Public Transport Route will be set back from the junction by approximately 70 metres (76.55 yards).
  - A1309 Hauxton Road - Widening the existing two-lane exit from J11 of the M11 onto the A1309 Hauxton Road to accommodate four lanes (two ahead and two left-turn approximately 20 metres (21.87 yards) upstream). The nearside lane adjacent to the verge will be designated for traffic ahead into the existing Trumpington Park & Ride site. A further 70 metre (76.55 yards) upstream, it is proposed to widen the A10 further into the nearside verge to accommodate another A1309 ahead lane. Compared to the existing layout which widens from three lanes (labelled Park & Ride, ahead and left-turn lane) to five lanes (two of each ahead and left-turn lane) approximately 100 metres (109.36 yards) to the south of the Addenbrooke's Road junction, the proposed layout will widen to five lanes approximately 280 metres (306.21 yards) to the south of the Addenbrooke's Road junction.
- 9.95 The junction capacity assessments considered by highway colleagues show the A1309 Hauxton Road / Addenbrooke's Road signal junction post-improvement works will be able to accommodate the development for all future year assessment scenarios. The applicant has confirmed detailed design of the A1309 Hauxton Road / Addenbrooke's Road signalised junction improvement scheme will be agreed with both Highways Development Management and the Council's Signals Team at the detailed design stage of the proposals. Works to the proposed M11 junction 11 have also been confirmed as acceptable by Highways England subject to the final design details being set.
- 9.96 As part of the construction works for the above mitigation measures and highway improvements, planning officers have noted that the construction activities will need to be carried out using "Best Practical Means" to prevent unnecessary nuisance and adequately control impacts that will result from those activities. Furthermore, whilst the recommended draft condition restricts work to daytime hours only, it will be expected that certain activities can only be carried out at times when traffic flows allow closures and diversions, such as the bridge placement over the M11, that also need to be in place for health and safety reasons. It would be expected that these times are likely to be at night and any request for night-time working for health and safety reasons would be considered sympathetically. Additionally, given the distance from residential properties and the already relatively high background noise levels at this location, the small increase in working times requested are likely to be acceptable. Nonetheless, an informative has been recommended setting out what information would need to be produced for such operations to be considered in consultation with the Environmental Health Officer. This aligns with other projects in the area to provide a consistent approach and expectation on the applicant.
- 9.97 In addition to the highway works set out above, a new NMU route is also being proposed, in addition to the retention of the existing path in this area. The alignment of the NMU route put forward by the applicant has taken account of the desire line of users creating a shorter distance, but also the need for lighting to be placed along the route for safety reasons (as discussed with the Police Architectural Liaison Officer) that would not be appropriate along the existing path route that is close to trees used by bats. Furthermore, providing an alternative NMU route as part of the design allowed the applicant's initial proposals of a 3.5 metre (11.48 feet) NMU route to be widened to the 5 metres (16.4 feet) included in their submission. Planning officers have acknowledged that the applicant's proposed layout has been designed to reflect the consideration of environmental, ecological, operational, lighting

and security factors, as well as making a more direct route for all non-motorised users, which is in line with both national and local planning policy. The existing path will remain in place and will still be used by the Wildlife Trust and can be used as needed or desired for leisure purposes as is currently the case.

- 9.98 Whilst the proposals have received a wide range of support from equestrian users, particularly when confirmation that references to 'shared use' by the applicant were effectively for all non-motorised users which includes horses, and the design was to include for horse box provision, parking and related infrastructure (including horse corral and the re-use of mounting blocks at the bridge location) and an appropriate surface for all users as is already the case for the wider greenways in the area; some concerns have been raised around the lack of references to the permissive access from Great Shelford which joins the A10 opposite the NMU path and the bridleway network from the A10 which are well used, and concerns surrounding safety without the installation of a Pegasus crossing. Many representations felt that before this project commences it is essential a safe crossing of the A10 for NMU's is provided to mitigate the danger from the construction and the ongoing travel hub traffic in the form of a Pegasus crossing located at the junction of the NMU path on the Country Path with the A10 just opposite the permissive bridleway to Great Shelford. However, as a crossing in this location has never been intended for this scheme and therefore is outside the scope of the project, an audit for the junction has not been undertaken. Additionally it should be noted that no statutory consultee has requested that such a crossing should be provided in this location either as it is not necessary to make the development acceptable which means that it does not meet the necessary planning tests set out in paragraph 56 of the NPPF (2021).
- 9.99 Whilst acknowledging that the highway works have been accepted by the Local Highway Authority and Highways England in principle, subject to final design checks, officers are also aware of the concerns that have been raised by some objectors in relation to the wider transport schemes that may come forward in the future, and how such schemes would impact on the viability of these proposals. In particular reference has been made to the possible Foxton Travel Hub proposal (as a scheme outside of the Cambridge Green Belt and placed on the A10 corridor); the Cam Metro (that may now be reviewed given the recent election of a new Mayor); and the East / West Rail proposals. Given the current uncertainty of the above schemes and the need to assess the proposals in front of us in line with the adopted development plan, officers are unable to give any weight to these alternative schemes; and having looked into each, are content that they do not directly conflict with what is being proposed at the Travel Hub site. Furthermore, policy support for modal shift, expansion of park and ride provision and support in the local transport plan for provision in this area all need to be taken into account in the planning balance.
- 9.100 The highway works and mitigation proposals put forward by the applicant have been assessed and are considered acceptable to the Local Highway Authority and Highways England, subject to final detailed design. As already noted in paragraph 9.89 Planning Officers have recommended planning conditions that allow the applicant team to progress the Section 278 works under the Highways Act 1980 required with highway colleagues to ensure that the necessary highway improvements are agreed ahead of construction and delivered prior to use, if planning permission is granted. Acceptance of the proposed highway mitigation measures based on the Travel Hub site are considered to be compliant with SCDCLP (2018) policies HQ/1, CC/6, TI/2, and TI/3; and CCCLP (2018) policies 5 and 82.

## **Climate Change and Sustainability**

- 9.101 SCDCLP (2018) Policies CC/2 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation) and CC/3 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments) support proposals which can demonstrate mitigation against climate change and low carbon developments which use renewable energy technologies; and policy CC/4 (Water Efficiency) supports proposals which are water efficient. Such developments for renewable and low carbon sources are supported in principle by SCDCLP (2018) Policy CC/2 criterion 1 subject to (a) the development not having unacceptable impacts on heritage and natural assets, high quality agricultural land, the landscape or amenity of nearby residents; (b) the energy generated being linked to infrastructure or used for on-site needs; (c) subject to decommissioning, including the removal of facilities and restoration of the site when the energy generation equipment is no longer required; and (d) applicants have engaged effectively with the local community and local authority; whilst SCDCLP (2018) Policy CC/4 criterion 2 seeks for proposals for non-residential development to demonstrate a water conservation strategy.
- 9.102 CCCLP (2018) Policies 28 (Carbon reduction, community energy networks, sustainable design and construction, and water use) 29 (Renewable and low carbon energy generation) and Policy 31 (Integrated water management and the water cycle) support proposals which can demonstrate mitigation against climate change and low carbon developments which use renewable energy generation and are water efficient, including the re-use of water and the management of surface water. Policy 28 seeks development to demonstrate (a) adaptation to climate change; (b) carbon reduction; (c) water management; (d) site waste management; and (e) use of materials. Such developments for renewable and low carbon sources are supported in principle by CCCLP (2018) Policy 29 subject to (a) the development not having unacceptable adverse impacts on the environment, including local amenity and impacts on the historic environment and the setting of heritage assets, have been minimised as far as possible; and (b) that where any localised adverse environmental effects remain, these are outweighed by the wider environmental, economic or social benefits of the scheme (excluding wind turbines); whilst CCCLP (2018) Policy 31 criterion (c) seeks for proposals to demonstrate that water is seen as a resource and is re-used where practicable, offsetting potable water demand, and that a water sensitive approach is taken to the design of the development.
- 9.103 Whilst it is acknowledged that the Travel Hub site building does not directly trigger the climate change requirements for all the policies set out in paragraphs 9.101 and 9.102 above; on the basis that the County Council declared a climate change emergency in May 2019 and are seeking through other committees to reduce the Council's carbon footprint in line with the Council's Climate Change and Environment Strategy that was approved by Full Council in May 2020, officers have considered it appropriate to include this assessment in their planning balance. Officers within the Climate Change and Energy Service are aware of this proposal and they have worked with the applicant team to ensure that inclusion of solar panels and the future proofing of this site from a sustainability perspective have been included within the planning proposals. The proposed Travel Hub building will need to be undertaken through Building Regulations requirements which already seek to ensure energy efficiency measures for non-residential properties under the Nearly Zero Energy Buildings (NZEB) regulation.
- 9.104 With the inclusion of solar panels and underground infrastructure to allow additional electric charging provision in the future (subject to planning consents that would take account of any implications to the Cambridge Green Belt setting), it is considered that this element of the scheme will not conflict with the Council's aspiration to produce renewable energy and

are therefore in the spirit of the energy generation climate change work being done by the Council. Furthermore, the aspirations of the applicant in the development of this scheme to provide a Travel Hub to encourage opportunities for a modal shift that allows more sustainable travel options into Cambridge city centre and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, including Addenbrooke's complex, are also in line with the broad aspirations of the Council's climate change policy and work to achieve net zero by 2050, which come with associated air quality benefits. As set out in paragraph 9.88 whilst the pre-COVID modelling is likely to see a change to future working methods, this is less likely for the Cambridge Biomedical Campus where surgeons, doctors, nurses, cleaners and support staff etc. do not have the opportunity to work from home in the same way as other sectors of the business community.

- 9.105 In addition to the Council's own climate change agenda and input, the Travel Hub site proposals were also considered by the Sustainability Officer on behalf of the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Team, where it was acknowledged that from a sustainability perspective the proposals were supported (as set out in paragraphs 6.12 and 6.13 of this officer report). Reference was made to the intention to facilitate the increased use of sustainable modes of transport and the provision of electric vehicle charging (with ducting providing for 100% provision in the future) and the use of PV panels on site to meet approximately 31% of the site's energy requirements. Furthermore, whilst noting that the toilet provision will be made as part of the Travel Hub building will be a relatively low water user, it was recommended that water efficient sanitary ware be used for the toilets in line with Part G of the Building Regulations; and that the Glint and Glare Assessment had concluded no overall impact so long as the proposed landscaping is maintained at an adequate height (same or higher than the height of the solar car port). To take account of these comments planning officers have recommended that an informative is added to any decision, if planning permission is granted, to take account of the comments made by the Sustainability Officer in relation to water usage, and have also sought to control the layout of the solar panels and also the height of planting around them to take account of potential glint and glare impacts.
- 9.106 Whilst a transport scheme that contains parking will always come with concerns of encouraging car usage, that is contrary to the climate change agenda, the design of this Travel Hub is seeking to take existing trips and provide a modal shift opportunity that aligns with local transport and climate change aspirations, including the provision of energy generation and future infrastructure to expand on this in the future, in line with local and national policies. As such, based on the recommended informative and planning conditions linked to the creation of a NMU route and other sustainable methods of transport, including cycling provision, and the provision of energy generation to support electric charging points on the site, with the related decommissioning of energy infrastructure if no longer required in the future, it is considered that the proposals are compliant with SCDCLP (2018) policies HQ/1, TI/2, TI/3, SC/12, CC/2, CC/3 and CC/4; and CCCLP (2018) policies 5, 28, 29, 31 and 82, that provide opportunities and benefits to be placed in the planning balance.

### **Residential Amenity**

- 9.107 SCDCLP (2018) policies HQ/1 (Design Principles), SC/9 (Lighting Proposals), SC/10 (Noise Pollution), SC/12 (Air Quality), SC/14 (Odour and Other Fugitive Emissions to Air), and CC/6 (Construction Methods) state that planning permission will not be granted where the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the health and amenity of occupiers and surrounding uses from development that is overlooking, overbearing, or results in a loss of daylight or development which would create

unacceptable impacts such as noise, vibration, odour, emissions and dust. CCCLP (2018) policies 34 (Light pollution control), 35 (Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration), and 36 (Air quality, odour and dust) offer similar protection.

- 9.108 South Cambridgeshire District Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has considered the impact of the proposals on the health and amenity of occupiers and surrounding uses in terms of noise, vibration and dust, burning of waste, and lighting implications on behalf of both South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council residents. Having assessed the documentation the EHO considers that the proposals are acceptable subject to appropriate conditions including the submission and approval of a detailed Construction Environmental management Plan (CEMP) and controls over no burning of waste.
- 9.109 The impact of the submitted Lighting Assessment prepared by Skanska (Report Ref: SIS/5020323/Street Lighting Assessment Rev E) has been assessed and confirmed as acceptable in principle by the EHO. However, given the final designs are yet to be confirmed, planning officers have recommended conditions are attached to any grant of permission to ensure that the final lighting design is submitted and assessed by the EHO on the health and amenity of occupiers, alongside colleagues from an ecology perspective to ensure that the final details safeguard the amenity of both humans and animals.
- 9.110 The Cambridge South West Travel Hub Transport Assessment (dated 28 May 2020) prepared by Mott MacDonald Document reference: 413752-MMD-TRA-XX-RP-TA-0002. submitted by the applicant considers environmental/operational impacts from changes in transportation modes. The effect of increased vehicle movements on surrounding roads has been considered by the EHO in relation to possible increased noise levels. However, it should be noted that generally the baseline noise climate is already dominated by transportation sources (i.e. traffic). The traffic data obtained indicates that road traffic noise from the A10 and on routes through these receptor groups would result in negligible changes (i.e. noise level increases or decrease of less than 1dB). This development has a relatively small contribution to the overall increase in noise levels resulting from the increase in traffic forecasted and is considered acceptable by the EHO. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the applicant is looking to ensure the existing noise attenuation created on the northern side of the M11 is retained and re-profiled to allow for the bus route, whilst maintaining the height and approved profiles agreed under S/2501/16/DC Discharge of Condition 50 (parts e and g – earth bund) of outline planning consent S/0054/08/O as set out in paragraph 9.65 of this officer report. As such, appropriate mitigation for noise impacts are considered secured and protected through the appropriate use of planning conditions.
- 9.111 Concerns have been raised by Trumpington Resident's Association (TRA) about the area close to the existing Trumpington Park and Ride site, where proposals for the bus route are seen to have an impact to the existing landscape and biodiversity areas, as identified in paragraph 7.5 of this officer report. In particular TRA is concerned that the tree belt in question not only screens the existing Trumpington Park and Ride site from the Glebe Farm estate and Bishop's Road dwellings on the other side of Hauxton Road, but also forms part of the green entrance from the new city edge to Trumpington village and onward into Cambridge city centre. Planning officers have noted the reduction in the tree belt on the existing Trumpington Park and Ride site from the recent expansion plans permitted under planning permission C/5001/18/CC approved November 2018, and from the experience of that development have assessed the proposals on the worst case scenario of all these trees needing to be removed and limited opportunities for replacement planting to exist in this area. Whilst the applicant is committed to retaining as much of this tree belt as



possible, the assessment on visual impact and residential amenity has been considered on a substantial loss as noted above. In doing so, it is acknowledged that the Glebe Farm and Bishop's Road residents would have clearer views into this urban area, but given the changing nature of this urban area and gateway into Cambridge, with the existing A1309 Hauxton Road already acting as a separation, the implications of this reduction is not considered significant enough to warrant a recommendation of refusal. The applicant's proposals are also identifying a net gain in biodiversity which is being controlled by conditions to ensure that this is adequately controlled to offset this loss.

- 9.112 Subject to the recommended planning conditions put forward by the EHO, with the related informatives to guide the submissions, the proposal is considered acceptable and in accordance with SCDCLP (2018) policies HQ/1, SC/9, SC/10, SC/12, SC/14 and CC/6 and CCCLP (2018) policies 34, 35 and 36.

### **Surface Water, Foul Water Drainage and Flooding (Flood and Water Management)**

- 9.113 SCDCLP (2018) policies CC/7, CC/8, and CC/9 state that water quality should be protected with proposals demonstrating adequate water supply, sewerage and land drainage systems with sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) incorporated to manage water drainage at source, protect water quality from pollution run off with details of management/maintenance of SUDS provided. The proposal should also contribute to an overall reduction in flood risk. SCDCLP (2018) Policy CC/9 states that proposals would only be supported where there is no increase to flooding. The site is located within Flood Zone 1 which indicates a low risk of flooding.
- 9.114 CCCLP (2018) policies 28 and 31 also seek to ensure that new development should take the available opportunities to integrate the principles of sustainable design and construction into the design of proposals so that they do not exacerbate Cambridge's severe water stress. Indeed, all new development is required to meet minimum standards of sustainable construction, carbon reduction and water efficiency, unless it can be demonstrated that such provision is not technically or economically viable. Furthermore, controls on surface water, and groundwater protection are also required as part of these policy requirements.
- 9.115 The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has advised that the submitted documents demonstrate that surface water from the proposed development can be managed through the use of permeable paving over the car parking spaces with an integrated swale network through the site. Surface water is proposed to be stored in an attenuation basin in the centre of the site and on the west of the site before discharge to the existing surrounding watercourse network at 63.1 l/s. Surface water from the public transport route will drain to a swale, carrying surface water to the River Cam where the surface water will be discharged at the equivalent greenfield rates. It has been agreed that the Coprolite Ponds require additional water within the system and therefore the northern car parking area is proposing to discharge the majority of surface water into Coprolite Pond X following further treatment in a grassed swale. A pumped overflow is provided in the event that the Coprolite Ponds fill in storm events, pumping surface water to the downstream extents of the existing surface water system. Surface water runoff from the additional slip road works from the M11 are proposed to be connected to the wider M11 drainage network. Water quality has been adequately addressed when assessed against the Simple Index Approach outlined in the CIRIA SuDS Manual.
- 9.116 On the basis that the LLFA has confirmed that the surface water drainage layout would ensure that the proposal would not give rise to any drainage or flooding risks; and Anglian

Water has not objected to the proposal in relation to the limited use of water by the proposed Travel Hub site building, the proposals are considered to be compliant with SCDCLP (2018) policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 and CCCLP (2018) policies 28 and 31.

### **Public Art**

- 9.117 SCDCLP (2018) Policy HQ/2 expects the Council to “encourage” the provision of public art for major development proposals or to make a financial contribution to support public art initiatives. Whilst technically the scheme does not trigger this requirement as it is not proposing in excess of 1,000 square metres (1,196 square yards) of floorspace, officers have considered this requirement as part of the overall consideration of the proposals. In doing so it is acknowledged that the provision of this has to be balanced with the other mitigation requirements for the proposal.
- 9.118 Taking account of the positive amendments made to the scheme by the applicant team during the planning process, and taking account of the heritage boards and opportunities being discussed with the Historic Environment Team, the proposal is considered acceptable without the need for public art. When taken as a whole, it is considered by officers to be in accordance with the spirit of SCDCLP (2018) Policy HQ/2.

### **Airport Safety**

- 9.119 SCDCLP (2018) Policy TI/6 relates to the Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone. This makes reference to the safety zones for Cambridge Airport (as set out in Figure 12 of the SCDCLP) and the Imperial War Museum at Duxford (as set out in Figure 13 of the SCDCLP). As identified in paragraph 2.3 of this report, the proposal site falls within protected zones shown on Figures 12 and 13 of the SCDCLP (2018) that restrict development to 90 metres (295.3 feet) and 45 metres (147.6 feet) respectively.
- 9.120 CCCLP (2018) Policy 37 also relates to the Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone and Air Safeguarding Zones and like the SCDCLP (2018) policies discussed above seeks to protect the airport from inappropriate development.
- 9.121 Given that the proposals have been designed to limit the height of any structures within the Cambridge Green Belt and the application included a glint and glare assessment to take account of the solar panels proposed, neither Cambridge Airport nor the Imperial War Museum have objected to the proposals, albeit the latter has asked for further consultation on certain aspects of the project, particularly at the construction stage, which is why officers have recommended an informative should planning permission be granted. As such, subject to the proposed informative, and the control of the solar panels to align with the glint and glare assessment carried out (draft condition 27) the scheme is considered to comply with the safety requirements set out in SCDCLP (2018) Policy TI/6 and CCCLP (2018) Policy 37.

### **Other issues, including air quality, health impact assessment and contaminated land**

#### *Air Quality*

- 9.122 SCDCLP (2018) Policy SC/12 covers air quality, which states *development will be permitted where: a. It can be demonstrated that it does not lead to significant adverse effects on health, the environment or amenity from emissions to air; or b. Where a development is a sensitive end use, that there will not be any significant adverse effects on health, the*

*environment or amenity arising from existing poor air quality.* Furthermore, SCDCLP (2018) Policy TI/2 (Planning for Sustainable Travel) also requires a site based Low Emission Strategy to be submitted for larger developments, to ensure the implementation of suitable mitigation measures. CCCLP (2018) Policy 36 (Air quality, odour and dust) also seeks to protect air quality issues in a similar manner, which states that *development will be permitted where it can be demonstrated: a. that it does not lead to significant adverse effects on health, the environment or amenity from polluting or malodorous emissions, or dust or smoke emissions to air; or b. where a development is a sensitive end-use, that there will not be any significant adverse effects on health, the environment or amenity arising from existing poor air quality, sources of odour or other emissions to air.*

9.123 Guidance was sought from GCSP colleagues on air quality in line with the recommendation provided by the Environmental Health response received. In responding the GCSP Scientific Officer – Air Quality confirmed that whilst they didn't object to the proposed development, they emphasised the need for a careful consideration, support and delivery of the proposed Low Emission Strategy to reduce the emissions associated with the proposed site. Attention was drawn to Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment which outlines the low-emission strategy for the Travel Hub that can further contribute to sustainable journeys to/from Cambridge. Therefore, planning conditions were recommended, should planning permission be granted, for implementation of the Low Emission Strategy and a Construction Environmental Management Plan to cover dust measures.

9.124 Given the guidance provided by Scientific Officer – Air Quality, officers are content that subject to draft conditions 4 and 17 the proposals meet the requirements set out in SCDCLP (2018) Policies SC/12 and TI/2 and CCCLP (2018) Policy 36.

#### *Health impact assessment (HIA)*

9.125 SCDCLP (2018) Policy SC/2 covers the requirement for a Health Impact Assessment (HIA), which states that new development should have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of new and existing residents. However, it is acknowledged that technically the Travel Hub proposals do not trigger the need for this requirement.

9.126 Irrespective of the triggers noted above, guidance was sought from GCSP colleagues on the HIA, in addition to consultation carried out with public health colleagues at the County Council, in line with the recommendation provided by the Environmental Health response received. However, no specific comments were received in this regard from either the county public health colleagues or the GCSP Public Health Officer, who confirmed that she had comments to make having reviewed the documentation.

9.127 Given that no specific concerns were raised by any of the relevant specialist consultees, officers are content that the submission is in line with the requirements set out in SCDCLP (2018) Policy SC/2.

#### *Contaminated Land*

9.128 SCDCLP (2018) Policy SC/11 covers the need to ensure that contaminated land is assessed appropriately, which states that where *development is proposed on contaminated land or land suspected of being impacted by contaminants the Council will require developers to include an assessment of the extent of contamination and any possible risks. Proposals will only be permitted where land is, or can be made, suitable for the proposed use.* CCCLP (2018) Policy 33 seeks to protect any contaminated land issues in a similar

manner, which states *development will be permitted where the applicant can demonstrate that: a. there will be no adverse health impacts to future occupiers from ground contamination resulting from existing/previous uses of the area; b. there will be no adverse impacts to the surrounding occupiers, controlled waters and the environment from suspected/identified ground contamination from existing/previous uses, caused by the development; and c. there will be no impact to future and surrounding occupiers from on-site and off-site gas migration.* Furthermore that *where contamination is suspected or known to exist, an assessment should be undertaken to identify existing/former uses in the area that could have resulted in ground contamination.*

- 9.129 Guidance was sought from GCSP colleagues on land contamination, in line with the recommendation provided by the Environmental Health response received. In responding the GCSP Scientific Officer (Contaminated Land) confirmed that the only immediately evident environmental constraints that would attract a contaminated land condition is the presence of occasional areas of infilled land, associated with a history of coprolite mining within this area, immediately to the north west of the proposed development. However, the proposed development is not particularly sensitive to the presence of contamination and therefore she recommended an informative be attached to any grant of consent to cover the eventuality of any unforeseen contamination. Furthermore, it was acknowledged that the proposals will entail significant movement of material to facilitate the required earthworks. However, it was noted that a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) had already been recommended by Environmental Health, where part H of the proposed condition addresses the setting out of 'Measures for soil handling and management including soil that is potentially contaminated'.
- 9.130 Given the guidance provided by GCSP Scientific Officer (Contaminated Land) and the Environmental Health Officer, officers are content that subject to draft conditions 4 and 13 the proposals meet the requirements set out in SCDCLP (2018) Policy SC/11 and CCCLP (2018) Policy 33.

#### *Non-material considerations*

- 9.131 Other comments were also received in relation to impacts to house prices that are not material considerations in the assessment of this development.

## 10. Conclusion

- 10.1 As set out in paragraph 8.1 of this report, applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The current proposal is on an unallocated site within the SCDCLP (2018) and CCCLP (2018) development plan areas and is in conflict with NPPF Policy advice with regards to protecting the Green Belt and local landscape. All of which has been taken into account in the planning balance by officers.
- 10.2 It is clear from the officers' report that there have been a number of representations made by people who are concerned with some aspects of the proposed Travel Hub (including the use of the existing agricultural / accommodation bridge) with regards to the loss of and visual impact on the Green Belt, impact on the surrounding landscape and amenity of sensitive receptors, the need for the development, loss of agricultural land, pressures on the adjacent Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Nature Reserve, impact on existing ecology and biodiversity in the area, traffic congestion and air quality concerns. The development plan

supports the potential for opportunities to provide a modal shift and sustainable transport in the area, particularly where a range of users would benefit from an enhanced public right of way network. However, the proposed development is considered to conflict with national policy and development plan policies that seek to protect the Green Belt, the protection of best and most versatile land, and local plan policy which seeks to protect the character and appearance of the local landscape.

- 10.3 It is clear in paragraph 147 of the NPPF (2021) that *“inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”*. Local Authorities are advised in paragraph 144 that, *“when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of appropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations”*. Furthermore, paragraph 149 states that *“a local authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt”* and states a number of exceptions to this. The proposed Travel Hub does not fall within any of the exception categories stated in NPPF paragraphs 149(a-g) and is therefore by definition ‘inappropriate development’, unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and other harm resulting from the proposal is clearly outweighed by other material considerations.
- 10.4 When taking into account what considerations and key benefits identified by planning officers in paragraph 9.19 could outweigh the harm to the Green Belt (including visual impact) that have been discussed in paragraphs 9.21 to 9.29 of this officer report; it will also be important for Members to consider paragraphs 100, 105 and 112 (a-e) of the NPPF (set out in more detail in paragraph 8.3 of this report), where support is provided for proposals that protect and enhance public rights of way, provide a genuine choice of transport modes, and encourage public transport, with pedestrian and cycle links, and designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.
- 10.5 Taking into account the material planning considerations discussed in section 9 of this report, officers are of the view that the ‘appropriateness’ of the site has been demonstrated and the potential harm to the Green Belt, when weighed against all other assessment considerations is finely balanced in favour of the proposal. This takes account of the substantial negative weight given to the harm to the Green Belt and the Landscape / Visual impacts, and the negative weight provided to the loss of Best and Most Versatile Farmland; the neutral weight given to Lord’s Bridge, Residential Amenity, Public Art, Surface Water, Airport Safety, and other matters including Air Quality, Health Impact Assessment and Contaminated Land that are capable of being controlled by planning conditions in line with paragraph 55 of the NPPF; and the positive weight given to the need and justification of providing a modal shift opportunity close to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus to complement the existing Trumpington Park and Ride Site, the key benefits highlighted by officers in paragraph 9.19 of this report, Ecology and Net Gain commitments, Heritage and Archaeology with interpretation benefits, and the climate change and sustainability measures designed to run alongside the modal shift benefits.
- 10.6 Therefore based on the planning balance undertaken by officers, it is considered that, when material considerations are taken into account, the proposal although finely balanced meets the general principles of the NPPF (2021). Essentially it is for members to strike a balance between the benefits of the development in meeting the demand for sustainable travel, improvements to the public right of way network, and providing a genuine choice of transport solutions to encourage a modal shift in travel, alongside the benefits to supporting the

Cambridge Biomedical Campus, including the sustainability of the development and matters given positive weight by officers, balanced against the harm to the Green Belt, impact on Best and Most Versatile Farmland and local landscape. Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan discussed in paragraph 8.1 of this report, the policies in the NPPF (2021), the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, officers have sought to reach a sound planning judgement. This decision takes account of the views and the valid concerns put forward by the Wildlife Trust and other historic and natural environmental groups, the local Parish Councils and Resident Associations / Amenity Groups, Cam Cycle, and the neighbour representations received regarding the impacts on the existing cycle commuter route, use of the existing agricultural / accommodation bridge, traffic, air quality, green belt, amenity, flooding and biodiversity; and the general support provided by the British Horse Society and local Bridleway Associations and Groups. Officers have given considerable importance and weight to the policy considerations of the local adopted development plan and national NPPF (2021) policies on an unallocated site within the Cambridge Green Belt and balancing the potential harm against the 'very special circumstances' (see paragraphs 9.21 to 9.29 for the harm and paragraphs 9.16 to 9.20 in relation to the very special circumstances in this report), and positives demonstrated in relation to need and justification, ecology and biodiversity, heritage and archaeology, and climate change and sustainability measures.

- 10.7 In conclusion, officers consider the proposals in the planning balance just tips in the favour of the development and therefore officers recommend that there is a balanced justification to support the development of the South West Travel Hub as proposed in this application; subject to the planning conditions set out in section 11 of this report, the undertakings set out in the Letter of Comfort, and agreement by the Secretary of State as a development contrary to the adopted development plan.

## 11. Recommendation

- 11.1 It is recommended that, subject to the matter being referred to the Secretary of State for further consideration and the application not being called in, planning permission is granted subject to the following conditions:

### **Advisory Note**

The Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires the Planning Authority to give reasons for the imposition of pre-commencement conditions. Conditions 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 22 below all require further information to be submitted, or works to be carried out, to protect the environment and ensure sustainable methods of operation during the construction of the development and are therefore attached as pre-commencement conditions. The developer may not legally commence development on site until these conditions have been satisfied.

### **1. Commencement of Development**

The development hereby permitted shall be commenced not later than 3 years from the date of this permission. Within 14 days of the commencement of the development hereby permitted, the County Planning Authority shall be notified in writing of the date on which the development commenced.

**Reason:** In accordance with the requirements of section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and in order to establish the timescales for those details provided by conditions and to enable monitoring of the development.

## **2. Opening/occupation of Development**

Within 14 days of the travel hub first being brought into public use, or occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted whichever is the sooner, the County Planning Authority shall be notified in writing of the date on which the development was first opened or occupied.

**Reason:** In order to be able to establish the timescales for the approval of details reserved by conditions.

## **3. Approved Plans and Documents**

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the application dated 3 June 2020; the following approved plans and documents (received 11 June 2020 unless otherwise stated); and as amended by the information approved as required by the following conditions:

- Travel Hub & Highways Red Line Boundary (Including Construction Boundary), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-GEN-ZZ-DR-CH-0001-S4 Rev P09, dated May 2020;
- Travel Hub General Arrangement Plan, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-GEN-ZZ-DR-CB-0700-S4 Rev P13, dated 25 September 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- General Arrangement Shared Use Bridge, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-SBR-XX-DR-CB-1000-S0 Rev P04, dated 6 March 2020;
- Shared Use Bridge Section, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-SBR-XX-DR-CB-1002-S0 Rev P01, dated 6 March 2020;
- Travel Hub Building Floor Plan (General arrangement), Skanska Technology, ref: H1953200-CSWTH-LO-1101 Rev P05, dated 18 February 2020;
- Travel Hub Buildings Sections, Skanska Technology, ref: H1953200-CSWTH-LO-1701 Rev P03, dated 18 February 2020;
- Travel Hub Building Elevations, Skanska Technology, ref: H1953200-CSWTH-LO-1751 Rev P03, dated 18 February 2020;
- Travel Hub Sections (Solar car ports), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-GEN-ZZ-DR-CH-0702-S4 Rev P04, dated 19 March 2020;
- Travel Hub Sections, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-GEN-ZZ-DR-CH-0703-S4 Rev P03, dated 13 March 2020;
- Travel Hub Sections, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-GEN-ZZ-DR-CH-0704-S4 Rev P04, dated 28 May 2020;
- Travel Hub Sections, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-GEN-ZZ-DR-CH-0708-S4 Rev P05, dated 13 March 2020;
- Drainage Strategy Report, SKANSKA Technology, ref: SIS/5020323/CSWTH Rev A, dated: 1 June 2020;
- Travel Hub Proposed Drainage Strategy Layout Site Overview, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HDG-ZZ-DR-CD-0500-S4 Rev P04, dated 6 August 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Travel Hub Proposed Drainage Strategy Layout Sheet 1 of 5, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HDG-ZZ-DR-CD-0501-S4 Rev P03, dated 6 April 2020;

- Travel Hub Proposed Drainage Strategy Layout Sheet 2 of 5, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HDG-ZZ-DR-CD-0502-S4 Rev P02, dated 6 March 2020;
- Travel Hub Proposed Drainage Strategy Layout Sheet 3 of 5, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HDG-ZZ-DR-CD-0503-S4 Rev P02, dated 6 March 2020;
- Travel Hub Proposed Drainage Strategy Layout Sheet 4 of 5, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HDG-ZZ-DR-CD-0504-S4 Rev P02, dated 6 March 2020;
- Travel Hub Proposed Drainage Strategy Layout Sheet 5 of 5, Skanska technology, ref: H19532-SKA-GEN-ZZ-DR-CD-0505-S4 Rev P04, dated 6 August 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Travel Hub Existing Drainage Areas Copralite Ponds, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HDG-ZZ-DR-CD-0506-S4 Rev P01, dated 6 March 2020;
- Travel Hub Proposed Drainage Areas Overall Site Breakdown, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HDG-ZZ-DR-CD-0507-S4 Rev P01, dated 6 March 2020;
- Travel Hub Proposed Drainage Areas Discharging to Copralite Ponds, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HDG-ZZ-DR-CD-0508-S4 Rev P01, dated 6 March 2020;
- Travel Hub Drainage Sections Section 01, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HDG-ZZ-DR-CD-0509-S4 Rev P02, dated 17 April 2020;
- Drainage Access / Maintenance Route Plan, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0701-S4 Rev P13 dated 25 September 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Flood Risk Assessment, Mott MacDonald, ref: 413752-MMD-ENV-XX-RP-EN-0017 Rev B, dated 28 May 2020;
- SUDS Drainage Strategy, Jenkins & Potter Consulting Engineers, ref: 24404-0001REP Rev 1, dated 14 May 2020;
- SUDS Drainage Strategy, Jenkins & Potter Consulting Engineers, ref: 24404-0002REP Rev 0, dated May 2020;
- Travel Hub Swale Bridges, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-SBR-XX-DR-CB-1801-S4 Rev P01, dated 13 March 2020;
- Travel Hub Culvert C1 Details, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-SBR-XX-DR-CB-2501-S4 Rev P01, dated 27 March 2020;
- M11 Overbridge to A1309 Hauxton Road Public Transport Route Drainage Layout, Jenkins & Potter Consulting Engineers, ref: 24404 01 Rev F, dated 13 May 2020;
- A10 Cambridge Road Travel Hub Entrance and M11 Slip Road Highway Widening Drainage Layout, Jenkins & Potter Consulting Engineers, ref: 24404 03 Rev C, dated 6 May 2020;
- Public Transport Route Drainage Details Sheet 1, Jenkins & Potter Consulting Engineers, ref: 24404 100 Rev A, dated 14 May 2020;
- Travel Hub Proposed Re-Graded Ditch C (Sheet 1 of 3), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HDG-ZZ-DR-CE-0617-S4 Rev P02, dated 12 March 2020;
- Travel Hub Proposed- Re-Graded Ditch C Sections Views (Sheet 2 of 3), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HDG-ZZ-DR-CE-0618-S0 Rev P01, dated 6 March 2020;
- Travel Hub Proposed Re-Graded Ditch C Sections Views (Sheet 3 of 3), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HDG-ZZ-DR-CE-0619-S4 Rev P01, dated 6 March 2020;
- Earthworks Calculations and Review of Assessments Technical Note, Mott MacDonald, dated 1 December 2020 (received 4 December 2020);
- Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, Mott MacDonald, ref: 413752-MMD-ENV-XX-RP-EN-0014 Rev 3, dated 11 June 2020;
- Landscape Design Location Plan (Sheet 1 of 11) (Included in Volume II: Appendices to the Environmental Statement Appendix H.9), Mott MacDonald, ref: 413752-MMD-LAN-XX-DR-LV-0001 Rev P4, dated 25 August 2020 (received 21 October 2020);



- Landscape Design (Sheet 2 of 11) (Included in Volume II: Appendices to the Environmental Statement Appendix H.9), Mott MacDonald, ref: 413752-MMD-LAN-XX-DR-LV-0002 Rev P4, dated 25 August 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Detailed planting proposals (Sheet 3 of 11) (Included in Volume II: Appendices to the Environmental Statement Appendix H.9) Mott MacDonald, ref: 413752-MMD-LAN-XX-DR-LV-0003 Rev P4, dated August 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Landscape Design (Sheet 4 of 11) (Included in Volume II: Appendices to the Environmental Statement Appendix H.9), Mott MacDonald, ref: 413752-MMD-LAN-XX-DR-LV-0004 Rev P5, dated 3 December 2020 (received 4 December 2020);
- Landscape Design (Sheet 5 of 11) (Included in Volume II: Appendices to the Environmental Statement Appendix H.9) Mott MacDonald, ref: 413752-MMD-LAN-XX-DR-LV-0005 Rev P5, dated 3 December 2020 (received 4 December 2020);
- Landscape Design (Sheet 6 of 11) (Included in Volume II: Appendices to the Environmental Statement Appendix H.9) Mott MacDonald, ref: 413752-MMD-LAN-XX-DR-LV-0006 Rev P5, dated 25 August 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Landscape Design (Sheet 7 of 11) (Included in Volume II: Appendices to the Environmental Statement Appendix H.9), Mott MacDonald, ref: 413752-MMD-LAN-XX-DR-LV-0007 Rev P4, dated 25 August 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Landscape Design (Sheet 8 of 11) (Included in Volume II: Appendices to the Environmental Statement Appendix H.9) Mott MacDonald, ref: 413752-MMD-LAN-XX-DR-LV-0008 Rev P4, dated 25 August 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Landscape Design (Sheet 9 of 11) (Included in Volume II: Appendices to the Environmental Statement Appendix H.9), Mott MacDonald, ref: 413752-MMD-LAN-XX-DR-LV-0009 Rev P4, dated 25 August 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Landscape Design (Sheet 10 of 11) (Included in Volume II: Appendices to the Environmental Statement Appendix H.9), Mott MacDonald, ref: 413752-MMD-LAN-XX-DR-LV-0010 Rev P4, dated 25 August 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Landscape Design (Sheet 11 of 11) (Included in Volume II: Appendices to the Environmental Statement Appendix H.9), Mott MacDonald, ref: 413752-MMD-LAN-XX-DR-LV-0011 Rev P4, dated 25 August 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Highways Finished Ground Levels – Key Plan (Sheet 1 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0751-S4 Rev P03, dated 15 September 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Highways Finished Ground Levels (Sheet 2 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0752-S4 Rev P02, dated 27 May 2020;
- Highways Finished Ground Levels (Sheet 3 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0753-S4 Rev P02, dated 27 May 2020;
- Highways Finished Ground Levels (Sheet 4 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0754-S4 Rev P02, dated 27 May 2020;
- Highways Finished Ground Levels (Sheet 5 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0755-S4 Rev P02, dated 27 May 2020;
- Highways Finished Ground Levels (Sheet 6 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0756-S4 Rev P02, dated 27 May 2020;
- Highways Finished Ground Levels (Sheet 7 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0757-S4 Rev P02, dated 27 May 2020;
- Highways Finished Ground Levels (Sheet 8 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0758-S4 Rev P03, dated 15 September 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Highways General Arrangement (Sheet 1 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0759-S4 Rev P03, dated 25 September 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Highways General Arrangement (Sheet 2 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0760-S4 Rev P02, dated 25 September 2020 (received 21 October 2020);

- Highways General Arrangement (Sheet 3 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0761-S4 Rev P01, dated 4 June 2020;
- Highways General Arrangement (Sheet 4 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0762-S4 Rev P01, dated 4 June 2020;
- Highways General Arrangement (Sheet 5 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0763-S4 Rev P01, dated 4 June 2020;
- Highways General Arrangement (Sheet 6 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0764-S4 Rev P01, dated 4 June 2020;
- Highways General Arrangement (Sheet 7 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0765-S4 Rev P01, dated 4 June 2020;
- Highways General Arrangement (Sheet 8 of 8), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0766-S4 Rev P02, dated 15 September 2020 received 21 October 2020;
- CCC Adoption Plan, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-LLO-ZZ-DR-CH-0001-S4 Rev P01, dated 6 May 2020;
- Park and Ride Longsection Sheet 1 of 1, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-GEN-ZZ-DR-CH-0738-S4 Rev P02, dated 15 September 2020 (received 21 October 2020);
- Highways Bus Route Longsection (Sheet 1 of 4), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0745-S4 Rev P02, dated 21 May 2020;
- Highways Bus Route Longsection (Sheet 2 of 4), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0746-S4 Rev P02, dated 21 May 2020;
- Highways Bus Route Longsection (Sheet 3 of 4), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0747-S4 Rev P02, dated 21 May 2020; and
- Highways Bus Route Longsection (Sheet 4 of 4), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-HGN-ZZ-DR-CH-0748-S4 Rev P02, dated 21 May 2020.

**Reason:** *To define the permission and protect the character and appearance of the locality in accordance with policies CC/6, HQ/1, NH/2, NH/8 and NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policies 8, 29 and 34 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018).*

#### **4. Construction Environmental Management Plan**

No development shall commence until a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The detailed CEMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a. Contractors' access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel including the location of construction traffic routes to and from the site, details of their signing, monitoring and enforcement measures;
- b. Details of haul routes within the relevant parts of the site;
- c. A plan specifying the area and siting of land to be provided for parking, turning, loading and unloading of all vehicles visiting the relevant parts of the site and siting of the contractors compound during the construction period to be agreed on a phased basis;
- d. Dust management and wheel washing or other suitable mitigation measures such as lorry sheeting, including the consideration of construction / engineering related emissions to air, to include dust and particulate monitoring and review and the use of low emissions vehicles and plant / equipment;
- e. Noise and vibration (including piling) impact / prediction assessment, monitoring and recording protocols / statements and consideration of mitigation measures in accordance with the provisions of BS5228 (2009): Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open site – Part 1 and 2 (or as superseded);

- f. Where relevant results of a noise assessment of the potential impact of construction noise on nearby residential properties and details of suitable noise mitigation measures as appropriate (in accordance with relevant standards and best practice);
- g. Details of best practice measures to be applied to prevent contamination of the water environment during construction;
- h. Measures for soil handling and management including soil that is potentially contaminated;
- i. Details of concrete crusher if required or alternative procedure;
- j. Details of odour control systems including maintenance and manufacture specifications;
- k. Maximum mitigated noise levels produced by construction equipment, plant and vehicles;
- l. Site lighting for the relevant part of the site;
- m. Screening and hoarding details;
- n. Liaison, consultation and publicity arrangements, including dedicated points of contact;
- o. Complaints procedures, including complaints response procedures;
- p. Membership of the considerate contractors' scheme; and
- q. Archaeological protection and mitigation measures to be implemented during the construction process.

The CEMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details during the construction phase.

**Reason:** *To ensure the environmental impact of the construction of the development is adequately mitigated and in the interests of the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers, particularly in terms of local air quality. In accordance with policies CC/6, SC/9, SC/10, SC/11, SC/12 and SC/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018); Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020 (section 3.6. Pollution); and policies 33, 34, 35 and 36 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018). The condition is pre-commencement as it is necessary to agree the detailed information in relation to the CEMP from the outset, prior to the construction phase, to ensure that the appropriate mitigation measures and controls are agreed and in place before any development commences.*

## 5. Soft and hard landscape works

No development shall commence until a detailed soft and hard landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The details shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:

- planting plans;
- written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes, proposed numbers and densities, tree pit details (where appropriate) including, but not limited to, locations soil volume in cubic metres, cross sections and dimensions;
- restoration of soils to allow species-rich grassland to establish;
- details of any alterations relating to existing bunds;
- hard landscaping proposals; and
- a timetable for implementation.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with such approved details, including the timetable for implementation.

**Reason:** *To help to assimilate the development into its surroundings taking account of its Green Belt and heritage setting, whilst also ensuring a benefit to biodiversity net gain, in accordance with policies S/4, CC/2, CC/6, HQ/1, NH/2, NH/4, NH/8 and NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policies 8, 29, 55, 56, 59 and 61 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018). The condition is pre-commencement as it is necessary to agree the landscaping details to ensure it is capable of assimilating into its surroundings and ensuring the biodiversity net gain is assessed in line with national and local planning policy before any development commences.*

## **6. 5-Year Landscape Establishment**

Any trees or plants provided as part of the landscape scheme as detailed in condition 5 above which, within a period of 5 years from the planting date, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species as those originally planted.

**Reason:** *In the interests of visual amenity and safeguarding trees and plants that are worthy of retention in accordance with policies HQ/1, NH/2, NH/4, and NH/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policies 8, 56, 59, 70 and 71 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018).*

## **7. Soil Strategy Plan**

No development shall commence until a Soil Strategy Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The Soil Strategy Plan shall be based on available Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) data supplemented, as appropriate, with the findings of a detailed soil resource survey. The Strategy shall include proposed mitigation measures to manage soils in a sustainable way during construction, including measures for stripping, storing and re-use of topsoil where appropriate and protection of soils from contamination.

The Soil Strategy Plan shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with such approved details and shall be completed prior to the Travel Hub first being brought into public use or occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner.

**Reason:** *To ensure the sustainable use of soils and protection of this natural resource in line with Paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and in accordance with policies CC/6, NH/3 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policies 8 and 70 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018). The condition is pre-commencement as it is necessary to agree the details for the protection and handling of soils to ensure that this valuable natural resource is protected and used appropriately in line with national and local planning policy before any development commences.*

## **8. Land Levels**

No development shall commence until details of the land levels, based on the principles set out within the agreed Earthworks Calculations and Review of Assessments Technical Note, Mott MacDonald, dated 1 December 2020 (received 4 December 2020), have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority.

The land levels shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with such approved details and shall be completed prior to the Travel Hub first being brought into public use or occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner.

**Reason:** *To ensure the development is able to assimilate into its surroundings taking account of its Green Belt and heritage setting in accordance with policies S/4, CC/6, HQ/1, NH/2, NH/8 and NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policies 8, 56 and 59 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018). The condition is pre-commencement as it is necessary to agree the land levels before any development commences.*

**9. Detailed Biodiversity and Ecological Design, including a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan**

No development shall commence until a detailed Biodiversity and Ecological Design, to include a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), is submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. This shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- (a) Construction Environment Management Plan for Biodiversity (based on BS202:2013 standard, or its successor in title) detailing proposed protection and mitigation measures during construction for designated sites (River Cam County Wildlife Site), Trumpington Meadows Country Park, protected species (bats, badger, reptiles, breeding birds, wintering birds, otter) and national / local priority species and habitats.
- (b) Detailed ecological design, including detailed drainage scheme (discharge into coprolite ponds, swales and discharge into River Cam via new outfall, including the proposed reinstatement of land used for the drainage scheme) and design of badger/otter tunnel(s) or underpass(es).
- (c) detailed planting scheme for ecological mitigation / enhancement areas.
- (d) Biodiversity Impact Assessment (based on the Defra 2.0 biodiversity impact calculator metric or its successor in title) demonstrating a minimum positive biodiversity net gain unit score of 10% above the pre-development baseline.
- (e) Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), which shall include (but not be limited to):
  - i. A detailed planting scheme, including species list;
  - ii. Details of plant establishment for a period of 5 years;
  - iii. Long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, including copies of agreements with landowners that provide details of the location extent and maintenance of replacement habitat mitigation (outside of the red line boundary) so as to ensure there is no net loss in biodiversity;
  - iv. A scheme detailing how the new habitat will be established, managed and maintained for a period of 25 years;

- v. A habitat monitoring scheme to report to relevant bodies 2, 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 years after works are started. If desired conditions are not reached within predicted timeframes remedial actions shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority as part of this monitoring requirement; and
- vi. A scheme for the provision of annual reports, to be submitted to the County Planning Authority, to report on the ongoing habitat management, as agreed in part v. above, for a period of 25 years.

The approved detailed Biodiversity and Ecological Design scheme, including the LEMP, shall be implemented in full for a minimum of 25 years from the first available planting reason after the date that the Travel Hub is first brought into public use, or occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner.

**Reason:** *In the interests, of visual amenity and to ensure that landscaping becomes appropriately established on site; that any affected footpaths are restored appropriately including that the drainage route will go back to the path; for the protection of existing species and the ecological and biodiversity value of the area including biodiversity net gain is achieved; and to ensure that the construction works do not adversely impact on protected species such as bats in accordance with Policies HQ/1, NH/2 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policies 8, 56, 59, 69, 70 and 71 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018). The condition is pre-commencement as it is necessary to agree the detailed information in relation to the mitigation and protection of biodiversity prior to the construction phase, so they must be agreed before any development commences.*

## 10. Access Management and Maintenance Plan

No development shall commence until an Access Management and Maintenance Plan (AMMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The AMMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Details setting out mitigation measures to include the new fencing and field gates agreed as part of the Letter of Comfort dated 19 July 2021 to ensure the protection of Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Nature Reserve from increased visitor pressure;
- Detailed design of the access routes, landscaped areas (including set areas for dogs off leads), facilities (such as picnic benches, seating areas and bins) and signage and visitor / interpretation boards within the application boundary in line with condition 5, to ensure the site complements and avoids unnecessary pressures on the adjacent country park;
- An implementation timetable and review triggers to align with the LEMP monitoring set out in condition 9 above.

The Access Management and Maintenance Plan shall be implemented in full, in accordance with the approved timetable and review triggers, for the lifetime of the development hereby permitted.

**Reason:** *In the interests of biodiversity net gain and to ensure that the development does not impact adversely on existing species and the ecological and biodiversity value of the adjacent area in accordance with Policies HQ/1, NH/2 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policies 8, 56, 59, 70 and 71 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018). The condition is pre-commencement as it is necessary to agree the detailed*

*information in relation to the Access Management and Maintenance Plan; and the detailed information in relation to the biodiversity net gain achieved from the scheme from the outset prior to the construction phase to ensure the area is designed to avoid unnecessary pressure being placed on the adjacent country park, which is why it must be agreed and in place before any development commences.*

#### **11. Permitted Construction Hours**

All construction works shall be limited to 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

**Reason:** *To ensure the environmental impact of the construction of the development is adequately mitigated and in the interests of the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers. In accordance with policy SC/10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policy 35 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018).*

#### **12. No Bonfires or Burning of Waste**

During the construction and operational phases there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on site.

**Reason:** *To ensure the environmental impact of the construction of the development is adequately mitigated and in the interests of the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers. In accordance with policy SC/10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policy 35 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018).*

#### **13. Contamination Remediation Strategy – unexpected contamination**

If during the development contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, such as putrescible waste, visual or physical evidence of contamination of fuels/oils, backfill or asbestos containing materials, then no further development shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the County Planning Authority for, a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.

The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved to the satisfaction of the County Planning Authority.

**Reason:** *To ensure that risks from unexpected land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with policy SC/11 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policy 33 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018).*

#### **14. Detailed Highway Drawings**

No development shall commence until a detailed technical design scheme (including for the provision of badger/otter tunnel(s) or underpass(es)) for the following has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority:

- The proposed non-motorised user path between the A10 and A1309 and the new bridge to be constructed over the M11;
- The proposed signalled vehicular access junction off the A10 to the new Travel Hub site;
- The proposed Public Transport Route between the new Travel Hub site and the A1309 Hauxton Road/Addenbrooke's Road signal junction, including the proposed improvement works to the existing accommodation bridge over the M11;
- The proposed highway improvement works on the A10, at the M11, Junction 11 and on the A1309 Hauxton Road; and
- The proposed improvement works at the A1309 Hauxton Road/Addenbrooke's Road signal junction.

The approved works shall be carried out in full accordance with the agreed scheme prior to the Travel Hub first being brought into public use or occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner.

**Reason:** *To ensure that the M11 trunk road continues to serve its purpose as a part of a national system for through traffic in accordance with Section 10 of the Highways Act 1980, and to satisfy the reasonable requirements of road safety on the A10 trunk road; and in the interests of highway safety in line with policy TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policy 81 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018); and to ensure that the development does not impact adversely on the protection of existing species and the ecological and biodiversity value of the adjacent area in accordance with Policies HQ/1, NH/2 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (adopted September 2018) and policies 56, 59, 70 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018). The condition is pre-commencement as it is necessary to agree the detailed information in relation to the highway improvements to ensure that the necessary highway safety benefits can be achieved, which is why they must be agreed before any development commences.*

## 15. Non-Motorised User Route

No development shall commence until the ownership and Right of Way details of the new Non-Motorised User (NMU) route between the A10 and the A1309 Hauxton Road, in particular the proposed section east of the new NMU bridge to the A1309 Hauxton Road, have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority.

The details shall include the design relating to the entrance and exit points for the active NMU travel route through the site, any access controls for it and a timetable for implementation. The approved details shall be implemented in full, in accordance with the agreed timetable.

**Reason:** *To ensure that the Non-Motorised User Route is delivered and connected to the wider Rights of Way networks in the area to ensure that there is safe access and egress for all users in line with the guidance set out in Local Transport Note 1/20, or its successor in title, and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policy 81 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018). The condition is pre-commencement as it is necessary to agree the detailed information in relation to the rights of way network to ensure that the necessary access benefits can be achieved, which is why they must be agreed before any development commences.*



## 16. Internal Layout

No development shall commence until a detailed scheme for the internal layout of the new Travel Hub site has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority.

The approved works shall be carried out in full accordance with the agreed scheme prior to the Travel Hub first being brought into public use or occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner.

**Reason:** *To ensure that the internal arrangements are sufficient to take traffic off the highway safely and deliver the necessary transport infrastructure in accordance with policies TI/2 and TI/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policies 81 and 82 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018). The condition is pre-commencement as it is necessary to agree the detailed information in relation to the highway improvements to ensure that the necessary highway infrastructure can be achieved, which is why it must be agreed before any development commences.*

## 17. Implementation of the Low Emission Strategy (LES)

No development shall commence until the final details of the Low Emission Strategy, based on the principles set out in Section 9 of the Transport Assessment by Mott MacDonald dated 28 May 2020, have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. As a minimum the final measures shall include the following:

- a. Provision of proposed 108 Electric Vehicle Charging Points;
- b. Provision of proposed 326 Cycle Parking; and
- c. An implementation plan and timetable for each of the proposed measures.

In addition to the above, the final details shall demonstrate how the proposal will facilitate sustainable transport modes to and from the Travel Hub as outlined in section 9.2 to 9.5 of the Transport Assessment (set out below for ease of reference):

- i. Provision of a 5m wide and non-motorised user route over the M11 between the A10 and the A1309/Hauxton Road.
- ii. Provision of cycle parking lockers and cycle storage to encourage Cycle and Ride trips at the Travel Hub.
- iii. Provision for additional 12 new public transport vehicles an hour serving the Travel Hub.

The delivery and implementation of the above measures shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with the approved details and implementation timetable, to ensure any impacts of the Travel Hub on local air quality is minimised.

**Reason:** *In the interests of reducing impacts of developments on local air quality and encouraging sustainable forms of transport in accordance with policies SC/12 and TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018); the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020 (section 3.6. Pollution); and policies 36 and 81 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018). The condition is pre-commencement as it is necessary to agree the Low Emission Strategy from the outset and maintain an emphasis on encouraging sustainable forms of transport before any development commences.*

## **18. Monitoring of cycle parking provision**

Prior to the Travel Hub first being brought into public use, or occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner, a scheme for the monitoring of cycle parking provision within the Travel Hub site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority.

Within one year of the Travel Hub first being brought into public use, or occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, as identified by condition 2, the monitoring survey as approved, will be undertaken to assess cycle parking capacity within the Travel Hub site. This survey shall be repeated once a year, for 15 years following opening.

If, at any time, the monitoring survey reports that cycle parking capacity within the Travel Hub site is lower than 20% of the total number of cycle parking spaces, then a programme for implementation of additional cycle parking facilities at the site shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The additional cycle parking spaces shall be implemented within six months of the date of the monitoring survey.

**Reason:** *To ensure that the cycling infrastructure and provision is achieved, and monitoring maintained, in accordance with policy TI/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policy 82 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018).*

## **19. Details of bus and coach service provision**

Prior to the Travel Hub first being brought into public use, or occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner, details of the bus and coach service provision, routes, to serve the site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority.

**Reason:** *To ensure that the sustainable transport information is understood in accordance with policy TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policy 81 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018).*

## **20. Programme of Archaeological Works**

No development shall commence until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has implemented a programme of archaeological work that has been secured in accordance with a written scheme of Investigation (WSI), which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. For land that is included within the WSI, no development shall take place other than under the provisions of the agreed WSI, which shall include:

- a) the statement of significance and research objectives;
- b) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;
- c) The timetable for the field investigation as part of the development programme; and
- d) The programme and timetable for the analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material.

**Reason:** *To protect any underlying archaeology in the area and secure appropriate mitigation such as interpretation boards to explain the wider historic significance in accordance with policy NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policy 61 of the Cambridge*

*City Council Local Plan (2018). The condition is pre-commencement as it is necessary to agree the Programme of Archaeological Works in order to ensure that the underlying archaeology is protected before any development commences.*

## **21. Protection of listed milestones**

No development shall commence until the details of the measures to be put in place to ensure that the two grade II Listed milestones will not be harmed as a result of the construction phase of the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority.

The approved mitigation measures shall be carried out in full and retained in place during the construction phases.

**Reason:** *In the interests of safeguarding the two grade II listed milestones in accordance with policy NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policy 61 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018). The condition is pre-commencement as it is necessary to agree the mitigation measures to ensure that the grade II listed milestones will not be harmed during the construction phase before any development commences.*

## **22. Lord's Bridge Radio Observatory safeguarding**

No development shall commence until details of the transmitters to be used in the communication with buses; and convertors to be incorporated within the solar array; have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority, to ensure that interference and suppression measures can be incorporated where necessary.

The approved mitigation measures shall be carried out in full in accordance with the agreed details prior to the Travel Hub first being brought into public use or occupation of any part, whichever is the sooner.

**Reason:** *In the interests of safeguarding the Lord's Bridge Radio observatory and reducing the risk of any radio interference in accordance with policy TI/7 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policy 39 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018). The condition is pre-commencement as it is necessary to agree the details of the mitigation measures for the transmitters and converters in order to ensure that the Lord's Bridge Radio Observatory will not be affected by the operational phase of the Travel Hub before any development commences.*

## **23. Surface Water Drainage**

No above ground works shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Drainage Strategy Report prepared by SKANSKA (ref: SIS/5020323/CSWTH Rev A) dated 2 June 2020.

The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in full accordance with the approved details prior to the Travel Hub first being brought into public use, or occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner, for the lifetime of the development.

**Reason:** To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development in accordance with policies CC/7 and CC/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policy 31 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018).

## **24. Noise Impact Assessment**

Prior to the Travel Hub first being brought into public use, or occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner, an assessment of the noise impact of plant and or equipment including any renewable energy provision sources such as any air source heat pump or wind turbine on the proposed structures and a scheme for insulation as necessary, in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant and or equipment shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority.

Any noise insulation scheme as approved shall be fully implemented prior to the Travel Hub first being brought into public use, or occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner, and shall thereafter be maintained in strict accordance with the approved details and shall not be altered without prior approval.

**Reason:** To protect the amenities of nearby sensitive receptors in accordance with policy SC/10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policy 35 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018).

## **25. Lighting**

Prior to the installation of any lighting, a lighting scheme for the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The lighting scheme shall include details for the appearance of the height, type, position and angle of glare of any of the proposed final lighting within the Travel Hub site, including horizontal and vertical isolux contours; and, to ensure that it is designed sensitively for wildlife shall include zero lighting spill onto the adjacent country park / nature reserve; so all sensitive receptors can be considered and protected.

The detailed measures as approved shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed scheme and maintained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

**Reason:** In order to safeguard the Green Belt, and the amenity of all sensitive receptors, including biodiversity, in respect of possible adverse effects of lighting glare from any future lighting provision proposed for the travel hub in accordance with policies S/4, HQ/1, SC/9, NH/4 and NH/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policies 4, 8, 34 and 70 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018).

## **26. CCTV**

Prior to the installation of any CCTV, a CCTV scheme for the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The CCTV scheme shall include details for the appearance of the height, type, and position within the Travel Hub site.

The details as approved shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed scheme and maintained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

**Reason:** In order to ensure public safety within the Travel Hub site in accordance with policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policy 56 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018).

## **27. Solar Panel Layout to comply with Glint and Glare Assessments**

The proposed solar panels shall be constructed in strict accordance with the design shown on the Travel Hub Sections (Solar car ports), Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-GEN-ZZ-DR-CH-0702-S4 Rev P04, dated 19 March 2020, and Travel Hub General Arrangement Plan, Skanska Technology, ref: H19532-SKA-GEN-ZZ-DR-CB-0700-S4 Rev P13, dated 25 September 2020 (received 21 October 2020); and the panels shall be laid out in accordance with this plan subject to the following parameters:

- Maximum panel height from the ground level: 3.6 metres; and
- Minimum distance between car ports (measured panel to panel): 6 metres.

The mitigation landscaping referenced in section 9.4 Overall Conclusions and Recommendations of the Glint and Glare Assessment prepared by PagerPower Urban & Renewables, dated 26 February 2020 shall be retained and maintained for the full duration of the solar panels being used.

**Reason:** *To ensure that the development does not introduce any additional adverse effects in terms of its visual or ecological impact and is carried out in line with what was assessed in the Glint and Glare document in accordance with policies CC/2, SC/9 and TI/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and policies 8, 29 and 34 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018).*

## **28. Decommissioning**

In the event that the solar panels on site are no longer required for the production of energy, not less than 12 months prior to the planned cessation of the solar generation operations hereby permitted, written notice of the planned cessation shall be given to the County Planning Authority.

Not less than 6 months prior to the planned cessation of the solar generation operations, a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The DEMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following details:

- a. The demolition / dismantling and removal of the plant;
- b. Site waste management including measures to recycle materials on the site;
- c. Hours of working;
- d. Car parking arrangements;
- e. Traffic management;
- f. Measures to control lighting, noise, dust, odours and fumes in order to minimise any adverse effects on the amenity of neighbours or surrounding uses;
- g. Temporary storage compounds and stockpile areas;
- h. Measures to protect trees and hedgerows;
- i. Temporary fencing and means of enclosure;
- j. Measures to minimise the pollution of surface and ground water and to deal with any areas of contamination;
- k. A restoration scheme; and

## I. A programme for implementation.

Decommissioning shall not commence until the DEMP has been approved in writing by the County Planning Authority and the Site shall be decommissioned and restored in full accordance with the approved DEMP and timetable thereafter.

**Reason:** *The application has been assessed and determined with the inclusion of solar panels on the site, but on the basis of decommissioning of these panels, in order to secure the removal of all materials, plant and equipment associated with the solar generation operations, this condition has been added to ensure that there is no long term visual, residential amenity or ecological impact in accordance with policy CC/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018).*

## Informatives

### Letter of Comfort

This permission is based on the terms of the Letter of Comfort dated 19 July 2021, for the provision of off-site stock fencing and gates (as shown on the plan Appendix A of the Letter of Comfort); on-site wayfinding, benches, bins and signage; and highway maintenance requirements.

### Environmental Permitting Regulations (2016)

The proposed new outfall to the River Cam is likely to fall under the terms of the Environmental Permitting Regulations (EPR) (2016) and so a permit may be required from the Environment Agency for these works.

The EPR are a risk-based framework that enables the Environment Agency to focus regulatory effort towards activities with highest flood or environmental risk. Lower risk activities will be exempt while higher risk activities will require a permit. The proposed works may fall under one or more of the below:

- Exemption
- Standard Rules Permit
- Bespoke permit

For information on the permitting requirements of the works please contact the Environment Agency: [PSO-Brampton@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:PSO-Brampton@environment-agency.gov.uk)

Additional information on how to apply for a permit and application forms can be found on the Environment Agency's website at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits>

### Ordinary Watercourse Consent

Constructions or alterations within an ordinary watercourse (temporary or permanent) require consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority under the Land Drainage Act 1991. Ordinary watercourses include every river, drain, stream, ditch, dyke, sewer (other than public sewer) and passage through which water flows that do not form part of Main Rivers (Main Rivers are

regulated by the Environment Agency). The applicant should refer to Cambridgeshire County Council's Culvert Policy for further guidance:

<https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/business/planning-and-development/water-minerals-and-waste/watercourse-management/>

Please note the council does not regulate ordinary watercourses in Internal Drainage Board areas.

## **Pollution Control**

Surface water and groundwater bodies are highly vulnerable to pollution and the impact of construction activities. It is essential that the risk of pollution (particularly during the construction phase) is considered and mitigated appropriately. It is important to remember that flow within the watercourse is likely to vary by season and it could be dry at certain times throughout the year. Dry watercourses should not be overlooked as these watercourses may flow or even flood following heavy rainfall.

## **Guidance on information required to satisfy condition 23**

Surface Water Drainage strategy will also need to include:

- a) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change), inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with an assessment of system performance;
- b) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers;
- c) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;
- d) Site Investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates;
- e) Temporary storage facilities if the development is to be phased;
- f) A timetable for implementation;
- g) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants;
- h) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system; and
- i) Relevant permissions from third party asset owners to allow connections into their systems.

## **Water efficient sanitary ware**

It is noted that toilet provision will be made as part of the Travel Hub building being provided on site. As water use will be relatively low, it is not considered necessary for water use to be conditioned for this proposal, but it is recommended that water efficient sanitary ware be specified for the toilets, making reference to the appropriate specification in Table 2.2 of Part G of the Building Regulations

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/504207/BR\\_PDF\\_AD\\_G\\_2015\\_with\\_2016\\_amendments.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/504207/BR_PDF_AD_G_2015_with_2016_amendments.pdf).

## **Archaeology**

Partial discharge of condition 20 can be applied for once the fieldwork at Part c) has been completed to enable the commencement of development.

Part d) of the condition shall not be discharged until all elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation.

### **General Contaminative Land Informative:**

Contaminated land should be considered and assessed in accordance with government / industry best practice and technical guidance and the 'Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2020' – available online at:

<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/planning/local-plan-and-neighbourhood-planning/sustainable-design-and-construction-consultation-spd/>

Further specialist advice and comments on contaminated land pertinent to this site can be obtained from Helen Bord or Claire Sproats - Scientific Officers, SCDC Waste and Environment – Contaminated Land Telephone No: 01954 713444 or email [contamland@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:contamland@scambs.gov.uk)

### **24 hour working**

If 24 hour working on the new Non-Motorised User bridge or road / bridge improvements are required, the following information will need to be submitted for approval to allow working outside of those controlled by condition 11:

- a) Results of a survey of noise sensitive properties (as agreed between the applicant and the County Planning Authority) identified as being in close proximity to the works with distance data to be provided;
- b) Details of the noise mitigation measures to be implemented prior to the works;
- c) Details of any lighting required as part of the works and the proposed locations for these, including any light spill anticipated;
- d) A timetable for the proposed works, including dates and times of the specific activities proposed, including the removal of any materials off site; and
- e) Biodiversity Method Statement setting out mitigation for impact on ecology and how it will accord with the Construction Environment Management Plan for Biodiversity (condition 9 criterion (a)).

If approval is granted, a letter will be required to be sent by the applicant to any affected sensitive properties or wildlife groups (as agreed between the applicant and the County Planning Authority) at least 5 working days before commencement of construction of the 24 hour working proposals which shall include emergency contact details and the details of the mitigation measures to be put in place as identified and approved in a) to e) above.

### **Lighting Guidance**

Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for External Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light – GN01:2011 (or as superseded).

### **Sustainable Design and Construction**

It is recommended for the Applicant to have consideration of the 'Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2020' - available online at:



<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/planning/local-plan-and-neighbourhood-planning/sustainable-design-and-construction-consultation-spd/>

Overall, any detailed design matters should be in accordance with the appropriate Design Codes/SPDs published.

### **Highways England Third Party Works (Section 278 Agreements)**

If as part of development proposals, there is a need to alter the trunk road network either to provide access on to it or to provide improvements to the road and its junctions, in order to mitigate the impact of the development, then the developer will need to enter in an arrangement with Highways England to procure and deliver these works. The applicant's attention is drawn to the information included in the letter from Highways England dated 11 March 2021.

### **Airport safeguarding**

The applicant's attention is drawn to the information included in the letter from the Imperial War Museum (IWM) Duxford dated 22 April 2021. This highlights the need to maintain contact with the IWM Duxford Airfield during the construction period in the case of any crane or drone usage, or road closures in case this effects their operations.

### **Lord's Bridge Radio Observatory safeguarding**

The applicant's attention is drawn to the information included in the response from the University of Cambridge dated 18 March 2021. This highlights the need to maintain contact with the Lord's Bridge Radio Observatory to ensure that if radio interference and / or suppression measures prove to be necessary, these can be incorporated within the design with their approval in line with condition 22.

Compliance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

The applicant sought pre-application advice. The County Planning Authority has worked proactively with the applicant to ensure that the proposed development is acceptable in planning terms. The applicant has responded positively to the advice and recommendations provided and amendments have been made (where required) to satisfy concerns raised. All land use planning matters have been given full consideration, which resulted in overall support for the development proposal from statutory consultees.

Source Documents

[South Cambridgeshire Local Plan adopted September 2018](#)

[Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy adopted July 2011](#)

[Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan adopted February 2012](#)

[Local Transport Plan | Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority \(cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk\)](#)