

# Strategic Planning Board

## Updates

---

**Date:** Wednesday, 14th August, 2013  
**Time:** 10.30 am  
**Venue:** Council Chamber, Municipal Buildings, Earle Street, Crewe  
CW1 2BJ

---

The information on the following pages was received following publication of the Board agenda.

**Planning Updates** (Pages 1 - 16)

---

Please contact Sarah Baxter on 01270 68642  
E-Mail: [sarah.baxter@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.baxter@cheshireeast.gov.uk) with any apologies, requests for further  
information or to arrange to speak at the meeting

---

This page is intentionally left blank

Application No: 13/0336N

Location: LAND OFF CREWE ROAD, BASFORD WEST, SHAVINGTON CUM GRESTDY, CREWE

Proposal: Outline application for residential development (up to 370 units), Offices (B1), local centre comprising food and non-food retail (A1) and restaurant/public house (A3/A4), hotel (C1), car showroom and associated works including construction of new spine road with accesses from Crewe Road and A500, creation of footpaths, drainage including formation of SUDS, foul pumping station, substation, earthworks to form landscaped bunds, provision of public open space and landscaping

Applicant: Goodman

Expiry Date: 26-Apr-2013

**Update Report 12<sup>TH</sup> August 2013**

**ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION**

**Gladman**

The following letter has been received from Gladman developments:

*You will recall that on 29th January 2013 we raised objection to the consideration of an outline planning application for 400 dwellings at Shavington Triangle (12/3114N) because amongst other things, it proposed only 10% affordable housing (rather the 30% or 35% required by policy) in preference for contributions for strategic highway works. The application was deferred consideration by the Strategic Planning Board (SPB) on 30<sup>th</sup> January. The application was eventually reconsidered by the SPB and it was resolved to be approved with the full provision of 30% affordable housing. I am enclosing our previous representation for information.*

*We have become aware that the Council's SPB will be considering a planning application at Basford West on 14th August and we fear that the Council will be repeating the same mistake.*

*The Officer's Report in respect of the Basford West proposals recommends that planning permission should be granted subject to a set of S106 contributions amount to almost £7m. Mr Fisher recently confirmed at the Alsager Public Inquiry that these contributions were being 'loaded' on to the 370 dwellings to cross-subsidise the employment and other uses.*

*The report recommends that the affordable housing provision should be reduced to 10% for viability reasons.*

*We have the following concerns:*

1. *There is no evidence as to how the f2.5m contribution towards the relief of the congested A500 corridor has been calculated as the cost of the overall highway scheme to which it is contributing is not quantified. If the proposal absent the contribution is unacceptable because of the impact on the A500 corridor, there is no explanation of that conclusion or how the contribution will effectively remove the concerns that the impact of the proposal generates. The analysis is without any rationale for how the f2.5m is justified. There appears no policy basis for the contribution. Absent of justification the provision of the money would not comply with the regulation 122 of CIL Regulations. The payment would be unlawful as it has not been proven to be necessary. Thus, if the development generates an impact the scheme should mitigate that impact, or part thereof, and this must be justified.*
2. *Similarly, there is no justification how the contribution of f3.2m towards the Crewe Green Link Road has been calculated. Our concerns set out in 1. above are therefore repeated.*
3. *There is no assessment to show why the affordable housing provision should be reduced rather than reducing the highway contributions. Given that the money to be provided is only a 'contribution' it would presumably be acceptable to provide a lower contribution, provided the principle of the contribution can be justified in the first instance. Essential social infrastructure to meet basic human needs such as housing need must be understood and a choice made as to why affordable housing should be reduced rather than highway projects. There is no analysis of this crucial choice anywhere in the Report.*
4. *While we appreciate that Draft Policy SC4 of the emerging Local Plan allows for the reduction in affordable housing as an exception, the purpose of the policy cannot be intended to apply to draft Strategic Sites where the knowledge of their infrastructure requirements was presumably taken into account at the point in time they were selected. Viability in accordance with the Framework should have been a key consideration in selection of the Strategic Sites. It would seem that the choice of such sites and/or the viability information that underpinned the choice was seriously flawed. If that is so, such sites should be reconsidered and deleted from the emerging Local Plan. The selection as a Strategic Site has proceeded on the false premise that it would deliver benefits including the fully compliant affordable housing contribution of 30%. Now that the applicants have demonstrated the site is incapable of delivering those benefits logic requires its reassessment for inclusion as a proposed allocation in the emerging Local Plan. It is not a committed site and the Council must reconsider it as a proposed allocation in light of the information now before it and whether as a consequence it can continue to support it.*
5. *Draft Policy SC4 is intended to apply in circumstances where 'unforeseen' development constraints occur on sites. The Council's*

*approach in the Committee Report is tantamount to accepting that it has chosen the wrong Strategic Sites in its emerging plan.*

*In the light of the above, we would request that the application is deferred from the agenda to allow these issues to be addressed by the Council and the applicant. However, if the SPB resolves to accept the recommendation in the terms set out in the officer's report, we will be left with no option other than to consider embarking on proceedings to Judicially Review any planning permission which is issued pursuant to that recommendation.*

*We are also extremely concerned about the frequency and 'matter of fact' way the Council has been reducing affordable housing provision in favour of contributions for highway schemes that appear to have no or very little connection to the impact of a scheme. We will therefore consider including a review of decisions where affordable housing provision has been relaxed in favour of highway contributions. You will recall that you recently put such a proposition to us in the context of the Queens Drive application. We rejected the offer because we firmly believe that developments should provide a proper balance of housing to create a sustainable community. We recognise the life changing experience that affordable housing has on people's well-being. Our scheme at Queens Drive will deliver 30% affordable housing and a contribution towards highway improvements directly related to the scheme*

## **OFFICER COMMENT**

In response to the Gladman letter, the following points can be made:

- Gladman draw similarities between the current application and the Shavington Triangle case (12/3114N). That case was different in that at 30% affordable housing it was viable to provide sufficient highways contributions to offset any adverse impact.
- However, as an alternative, Members were offered an enhanced highways contribution (which went above the minimum necessary to avoid any highways objection) and a reduced affordable housing provision. Members resolved not to adopt this approach, however, as it would not have been CIL compliant.
- Gladman argue that there is a risk of the Council adopting a similar non CIL compliant stance in this case because affordable housing is to be reduced and, in their view, there is no evidence as to why the highway contributions, which amount to almost £7m have been justified.
- The Strategic Highways Manager has explained that the impacts of the Basford West site have been addressed as a wholly masterplanned site including the residential part of the development subject to this application and the employment and distribution portion of the site subject to the previous application. It was previously identified as part of the Atkins Study that the employment and distribution proposals at the site would have a significant impact on the A500 corridor and at M6 J16. This was also revealed in previous studies of the corridor that examined the potential impact of developments on the corridor, in particular Basford West and Basford East.

- As a result a S278 scheme was proposed and agreed as part of this previous planning application. This application involves a significant reduction in the area of land allocated to employment uses. However the Council still considers the volume of HGVs generated by the site and the car trips from the residential use will have an impact at Junction 16. The previous S278 scheme was believed to have cost over £7m, and to reflect the overall impact from the site the Council is still seeking a proportionate contribution towards improvements along the A500 corridor towards the M6 based on the previous approved application, which will include additional widening to create a third lane along its entire length.
- The contribution requested towards Crewe Green Link Road is based on that agreed in the previous application. Crewe Green Link Road is required to mitigate the traffic impact on the Gresty Road/ South Street corridor, which suffers from congestion, particularly at its northern end where it meets Nantwich Road. Traffic modelling has shown the Crewe Green Link Road scheme will significantly reduce the level of traffic on Gresty Road. The residential site is likely to send more traffic towards Crewe town centre than the previous employment site as heavy vehicles would be much more likely to travel onto the strategic road network than through the town, which has a height restriction at a rail under bridge. Therefore the contribution towards the delivery of Crewe Green Link Road is still required to mitigate the harm, whereas the contribution towards Junction 16 / A500, can be reduced proportionately as a result of the change in the mix of uses.
- Gladman are also concerned that there has been no assessment to show why the affordable housing provisions should be reduced instead of highway contributions. Whilst it is an alternative option open to Members to reduce the affordable housing rather than the highways contribution, it is officers view that in this case, the provision of the highways infrastructure should be the priority. For the reasons set out above, the highways contributions are important in order to address the potential impacts of the development in terms of congestion and highway safety. Furthermore, main report makes it clear that the development of the Basford sites and the associated infrastructure improvements, and release of employment land that it will enable, is essential to the success of “All Change for Crewe” and the delivery of the associated economic benefits. Furthermore, there are other sites in the Shavington area which will have less significant highway impacts and will therefore not necessitate such large highways contributions which can provide for affordable housing needs.
- Gladman argue that Draft Policy SC4 of the emerging Local Plan allows for the reduction in affordable housing as an exception, and argue that it should not apply to strategic sites identified in the Draft Development Strategy and that viability should have been a consideration in selection of such sites and only sites where it viable to meet all local plan policy requirement should have been selected. Notwithstanding the fact that the site is a strategic site in the draft strategy, this is a live planning application which the Council is required to determine in accordance with local plan policies and other material considerations as they stand at the current time. The NPPF, which is an important material consideration, makes it very clear that viability is a material consideration and that developments should not be prevented through the imposition of Section 106 burdens which it is unviable for them to carry. It

also emphasises the importance of housing deliverability and economic growth.

- Gladman are concerned that the Council frequently reduces affordable housing provision in favour of highways contributions. A number of sites have seen reductions in affordable housing. However, each site is judged on its own merits following a careful assessment of viability and taking into account any other impacts and mitigation in terms of highways, education, open space, affordable housing and other planning considerations relating to that individual site, in the light of the CIL Regulations.

With regard to the viability the main report stated that Gerald Eve, who are independently assessing the viability position on behalf of the Council are broadly satisfied with the submitted appraisal. However, they were unable at the time the report was published to conclude that the revised Section 106 and 10% Affordable Housing represented the maximum that the scheme can afford in accordance with the RICS guidance. Further clarity was needed on the following issues:

- Clarity is needed regarding the costs to be attributed to the scheme, to be explicitly apportioned as costs attributable to Section 106 Contributions, On-site Contributions and Off-site Contributions. Within the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors Professional Guidance entitled 'Financial Viability in Planning' which represents best practice it concludes that 'a full QS cost report' is recommended to be provided.
- Gerald Eve's analysis demonstrates that the scheme is likely to be able to afford a higher level of affordable housing if adjustments are made to the tenure split of the affordable to be provided in accordance with the mix agreed with the Council's Housing Officers.
- Further clarity is sought on the timing assumptions on the main land trading appraisal.
- The rent period has been calculated as an explicit cost to development not within the investment valuation of the GDV.
- 12% professional costs have been used and Gerald Eve considers that 7.5% professional costs would be appropriate.
- The appraisal produces a surplus of £236,954 which could be used for AH/Section 106.
- 5% Stamp Duty has been used within the residential appraisal this should be 4%.
- Within the residential appraisal costs of £ 88,807 and £88,807 have been used without explanation.
- In addition, Gerald Eve's analysis demonstrates that it may be appropriate for the scheme to provide higher Section 106 contributions and it would therefore be appropriate to consider a re-appraisal mechanism which would be triggered prior to an implementation. It is noted that this included within the draft Section 106.
- Profit on costs is 22.31% for the Open Market Appraisal.

Further information has been provided by the applicant in relation to the above. Gerald Eve have confirmed that most of the issues have now been resolved in relation to Affordable Housing, professional fees, and the residential appraisal.

However, a number of queries still remain:

- The rail link cost of £524,000. Further clarification is sought in relation to this item.
- Further details of the costs are awaited.
- The professional fees have been amended to 10% and an revised appraisal is awaited.
- The surplus of £236,9540 (and potentially the revised professional fees need to be assessed and included as Section 106/Affordable Housing.

A further verbal update will be provided in respect of these issues to Members at their meeting.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**As per main report**



# CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

## STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD

---

**Date of meeting:** 14<sup>th</sup> August 2013  
**Report of:** Steve Irvine – Development Management and Building Control Manager  
**Title:** Proposed Alterations to the Section 106 Agreement relating to application 11/1879 for Land at Parkers Road, Crewe.

---

### UPDATE REPORT 12<sup>th</sup> AUGUST 2013

#### Viability Information

- 1.1 Members will have noted from the main report that the Council commissioned Gerald Eve to assess the Financial Viability Appraisal (FVA) which has been submitted. They concluded that the Proposed Scheme, as detailed above, is viable. At the time of report preparation they were unable to conclude that the Section 106 contributions represented the maximum the scheme can afford and further viability testing needed be undertaken to establish the appropriate level of contributions.
- 1.2 Further clarity was also needed on the following issues:
- The applicant has applied an average sales value of £107 per sq.ft to the affordable housing element and an average sales value of £169 per sq.ft to the market housing element. Further information regarding calculation of both values is required;
  - Gerald Eve require further input from Cheshire East Council's Affordable Housing Team regarding the acceptability of the proposed tenure split provided by the applicant;
  - A profit target of 18% profit on Gross Development Value has been used by the applicant. Further clarification is sought from the applicant to justify this figure;
  - Clarity is needed regarding the costs to be attributed to the scheme, to be explicitly apportioned as abnormal costs and Section 106 Contributions. Within the RICS Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors Professional Guidance entitled 'Financial Viability in Planning' which represents best practice it concludes that 'a full QS cost report' is recommended to be provided;
  - 3% professional fees have been used and Gerald Eve considers that 7.5% would be appropriate;
  - Full phasing details are required to accurately assess the implications of finance costs on the viability of the scheme.

- Gerald Eve's analysis has demonstrated that it may be appropriate to consider a re-appraisal mechanism which would ensure the scheme provides an appropriate level of contribution

1.3 Since the initial report went to print, Gerald Eve have been provided with additional information by DTZ in respect of the above-mentioned planning application.

1.4 In summary

- Detailed comparable evidence has been provided to support the sales values per sq. ft.
- A full breakdown with an RP offer has been provided for the affordable housing values.
- Further cost information in relation to the abnormal costs has been provided.
- Full phasing details has been provided.
- The profit level is a reasonable return for development in the current market.

1.5 Gerald Eve have assessed the additional information and have concluded (based on the information provided) that the revised Section 106 and 10% Affordable Housing represent the maximum that the scheme can afford in accordance with the RICS guidance.

### **Section 106 Trigger Points**

1.6 For clarification, with regard to the trigger points within the Section 106 Agreement for highways contributions, the developers will make £200K available (of the total of 300K for highway improvements) at request of the Authority to provide the lay-by i.e. it does not have to wait for completion or 5 years. This reflects the existing draft s106 which already includes the provision for £200K to be requested after commencement. However, it is considered that this should be stated explicitly within the Strategic Board resolution.

## **3. Conclusion**

3.1 On the basis of the above, the proposed amendment to the wording of the resolution is considered to be acceptable.

## **4. Amended Recommendation**

**That the Board resolve to amend the previous resolution in respect of application 11/1879N to read:**

***That the application be approved subject to completion of Section 106 legal agreement securing***

1. **Provision of education contribution of £398,990**
2. **Provision of £300,000 towards highway improvements to the Remer Street corridor and the provision of a drop-off lay-by at Leighton Primary School. (To include the provision for £200K for the layby to be requested after commencement)**
3. **Provision of public open space including amenity greenspace and an equipped children's play area conforming to NEAP Standard, to include:**
  - a. **A minimum of 8 pieces of equipment,**
  - b. **1.4 metre high bowtop railing surround with two pedestrian access gates and a double leaf vehicular access gate.**
  - c. **Railings to be painted green and pedestrian gates to be yellow.**
  - d. **Equipment to be predominantly metal, inclusive, and conforming to BS EN 1176.**
  - e. **Equipment to have wetpour safer surfacing underneath it, conforming to BS EN 1177.**
  - f. **Surfacing between the wetpour to be tarmacadam with precast concrete edging surround.**
  - g. **Access paths to gates to be tarmacadam**
4. **Provision for future management of children's play areas and amenity greenspace to include transfer to and future maintenance by a private management company.**
5. **Provision of 10% of the 400 units proposed across the whole site as affordable housing in perpetuity. The tenure split to be on a 25% social/affordable rent, 75% intermediate tenure basis. Phase B to include key worker housing to be agreed as part of subsequent reserved matters applications.**
6. **Overage clause**
7. **Travel Plan Monitoring Fee £5000**
8. **Contribution of £25,000 for the provision of Green Infrastructure within Crewe and the environs of the site.**

**And subject to the following conditions:-**

1. **Standard 3 year time limit (Phase A)**
2. **Standard outline time limit (Phase B)**
3. **Submission of reserved matters (Phase B)**
4. **Plans**
5. **Materials**
6. **Boundary Treatment**
7. **Landscaping submission**
8. **Landscaping implementation**
9. **Breeding bird survey to be carried out prior to commencement of any works during nesting season**
10. **Features for use by birds and bats**
11. **Habitat creation and management plan**
12. **Design of proposed pond**

- 13. Design and layout of the proposed newt mitigation area including proposals to ensure no public access.**
- 14. Submission of details of bin storage.**
- 15. Archaeology investigation / report**
- 16. Compliance with flood Risk Assessment**
- 17. Restrict surface water run-off**
- 18. Surface water attenuation**
- 19. Minimum Floor Levels**
- 20. Surface Water Regulation Scheme**
- 21. Site to be drained on a separate system**
- 22. Phase II contaminated land investigation and remediation**
- 23. Travel Plan**
- 24. Updated Air Quality Impact Assessment**
- 25. Limit hours of construction to 08:00 – 1800 Monday to Friday and**
  - a. 0900 – 1400 on Saturday with no working on Sunday or Bank Holiday**
- 26. Details of external lighting to be submitted and approved**
- 27. Submission of details of phasing / triggers for construction of access and highway improvements. Works to be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**
- 28. Provision of Parking**
- 29. Highway Construction details to be submitted**
- 30. Replacement hedge and tree planting**
- 31. Tree / hedge protection measures**
- 32. Implementation of Tree / hedge Protection**
- 33. Arboricultural Method Statement**
- 34. Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3**
- 35. Noise Impact Assessment**
- 36. Details of proposed apprenticeship scheme**
- 37. Provision of Bin Stores**
- 38. Provision of Bungalows in Phase B**
- 39. A Highway assessment of Moss Lane and if necessary submission of a scheme of measures for improvement and a timetable for their implementation**

**STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD – 14 August 2013**

**UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO.**

12/4652M

**LOCATION**

Land off Earl Road, Handforth

**UPDATE PREPARED**

12 August 2013

**KEY ISSUES**

**Retail Impact**

Comments from the retail consultant (WYG) are still awaited and will be reported to members as a verbal update.

**S106 package**

As noted in the original report the development does trigger the requirement for open space contributions in lieu of on site provision, and the development will create some demand for open space / recreation facilities. Given the location of the site and its distance to existing facilities that would be improved with any financial contributions, this impact is unlikely to be significant. Therefore a figure of £15,000 for open space and £15,000 for outdoor sport and recreation is considered to fairly and reasonably be related in scale and kind to the development.

The provision of this development on existing employment land could contribute towards enabling future employment uses through contributions towards the provision of infrastructure for the remaining employment site.

Accessibility to the site is raised in the original report as a significant issue due to the considerable reliance on the private car. Therefore mitigation is required to make the development acceptable in planning terms. A financial contribution of £205,000 would extend the existing 312 service between Stockport and Handforth Dean. This would provide an additional evening service and a new hourly Sunday service between 07.30 and 18.00 for a period of five years. New bus stops could also be provided close to the site on Earl Road.

In terms of footpaths and cycle routes, there is some potential to improve cycle routes in the local area. Notably footpath 80 between Delamere Road / Earl Road and Spath Lane / Bramhall could be upgraded to a cycle path. A feasibility study would however be required to establish the extent of the

upgrade requirements. But this would facilitate access for cyclists from the south / west and north / east. This is still being discussed with the applicant as the time of writing.

Finally, electric car charging points are something that would take advantage of opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes by incorporating facilities for low emission vehicles. This is something that could be dealt with by condition as opposed to through the s106.

Therefore, the following heads of terms are recommended:

- Payment of a Commuted sum of £15,000 for off-site provision of Public Open Space for improvements, additions and enhancement of existing Public Open Space facilities at open space facilities at Meriton Road Park, Henbury Road and Spath Lane.
- Payment of a commuted sum of £15,000 for off-site provision of recreation/outdoor sport (outdoor sports facilities and pitches, courts, greens and supporting facilities/infrastructure) at Meriton Road Park and Spath Lane
- Submission, operation and monitoring of a staff travel plan
- Upgrade of existing footpath / tracks (footpath 80 between Delamere Road / Earl Road and Spath Lane / Bramhall) to cycle routes (discussions ongoing at the time of writing)
- Payment of a commuted sum of £205,000 for improvements to local bus services to and from the site.
- Payment of a commuted sum of £30,000 for new bus stops on Earl Road
- Payment of a commuted sum of £100,000 for infrastructure works within the employment site
- Submission and implementation of an employment and skills plan (local employment agreement)

An additional condition is also recommended requiring 2% of the total number of car parking spaces to be provided with electric car charging points.

### **CONCLUSION**

As in the original report, a recommendation of approval is made, subject to the outstanding comments from the retail consultants.

Application No: 13/2159N

Location: Land to East of University Way, Crewe

Proposal: Extension of time limit for the outline application for the erection of five office buildings with associated car parking and landscaping

Applicant: Hawkstone Properties (Crewe Green) LLP

Expiry Date: 14<sup>th</sup> August 2013

### **UPDATE 14<sup>th</sup> August 2013**

#### **Additional Information**

On the evening of 5<sup>th</sup> August an updated Phase 1 Habitat Survey and an updated Protected Species Survey were received.

#### **Officer Comments**

As was concluded during the previous ecological surveys at this site, the site itself is of limited intrinsic nature conservation value. However, the site has the potential to support a number of protected species including Great Crested Newts, Bats and there is a known protected species sett on site.

#### **Bats**

Eleven of the eighteen trees on site have been identified as having low/moderate to high potential to support roosting bats and a further survey is recommended by the ecologist who undertook the submitted survey to establish the presence of roosting bats. However, it is noted from the indicative layout plan that the trees would be retained as part of the proposed development. The Councils Ecologist therefore advises that the proposed development is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact upon bats even if they were to roost within the trees on the site.

#### **Great Crested Newts**

There is a historic record of a single Great Crested Newt being found on site over ten years ago. This animal is believed to have been associated with the ponds within Crewe Business Park. This population is known to have died out a number of years ago. The large balancing pond adjacent to the site has been assessed as having 'Below Average' potential to support great crested newts. The Councils Ecologist advises that Great Crested Newts are not reasonably likely to be present or affected by the proposed development and so no further action is required in respect of this species.

#### **Other Protected Species**

The latest survey report has confirmed the continued presence of a sett on the application site. The location and extent of the sett remains unchanged. Consequently, the potential impacts of the proposed development upon other protected species has not altered since the grant of the last renewal consent.

Outline mitigation measures to reduce the impacts upon other protected species have been included within the latest survey report. The Councils Ecologist recommends that a condition be attached requiring any future reserved matters application to be supported by up to an updated badger survey and Badger mitigation method statement.

#### Breeding birds

If planning consent is granted condition will be attached to safeguard breeding birds.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**On the basis of the updated Phase I Survey and the comments of the Councils Ecologist the recommendation is altered below:**

**Approve subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. Submission of details of layout, scale, appearance access to all individual plots and landscaping.**
- 2. Application for reserved matters to be made within 3 years of date of this permission.**
- 3. Development to be implemented within 3 years of the date of this outline permission or expiry of 2 years from final approval of the last of the reserved matters.**
- 4. All reserved matters applications to include site survey and details of proposed site and slab levels**
- 5. All reserved matters applications to include Framework Travel Plan, to be followed by a travel plan and its implementation.**
- 6. All reserved matters applications to provide development based on the all the sustainable development principles of the Design and Access Statement**
- 7. Car parking, motorised cycle parking and covered secure cycle parking for each plot, with showers in each building for use by all staff.**
- 8. Site to be used for B1 office use only.**
- 9. Remedial tree works to be completed in accordance with tree survey and recommendations of ecological survey.**
- 10. Replacement planting for trees which are removed to be provided with first reserved matters application. To include details of species, size on planting, location and timetable for the provision of the tree planting.**
- 11. Details of tree protection to be submitted approved and implemented.**
- 12. Landscaping scheme to be submitted with the first reserved matters planning application for the site to incorporate strategic planting to the University Way frontage and the planting on the north side of building B and south side of building D to reflect the strategic planting on Area C to the south of this site.**
- 13. Final check of trees for bats prior to tree works.**



14. Protection for nesting birds.
15. No development within 30m of any badger sett and further survey with mitigation if necessary to ensure protection to any setts.
16. Scheme for the provision of a wildlife buffer to the Valley Brook and Englesea Brook to be submitted approved and implemented.
17. Use of native species in landscaping of all plots.
18. Minimum slab level of 49.79m AOD for all buildings.
19. Pedestrian access to all buildings to be minimum of 49.49m AOD
20. Scheme for surface water regulation of the site to be submitted with first reserved matters for the development, approved and implemented.
21. Scheme for the disposal of surface and foul water drainage to be submitted approved and implemented with each plot.
22. Oil interceptors to car parks.
23. Areas used for vehicle washing to be contained and connected to foul sewer.
24. Scheme for protection of Englesea Brook and Valley Brook from contamination by building materials to be submitted approved and implemented.
25. Maximum floor area.
26. Details of external lighting.
27. Control invasive species on the site.

This page is intentionally left blank