

Planning Reference No:	09/3066C
Application Address:	Henry Alty, Knutsford Road, Cranage, Holmes Chapel
Proposal:	Proposed B1 Office Building
Applicant:	Cheshire Prop (Cranage) 1LTD & 2LTD
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission
Grid Reference:	374585 370066
Ward:	Congleton Rural
Earliest Determination Date:	12 November 2009
Expiry Dated:	12 November 2009
Date of Officer's Site Visit:	10 May 2009
Date Report Prepared:	28 October 2009 – Updated 20 November 2009
Constraints:	Control of Adverts Infill Boundary Line Jodrell Bank TPO 107

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE subject to conditions.

MAIN ISSUES:

- Principle of development,
- Trees and wildlife,
- Access and parking,
- Layout, design and impact of the character of the area,
- Sustainability,
- Impact on neighbour amenity.

1. UPDATE

Introduction

Following the preparation of the initial officer's report, additional information and comments have been submitted in respect of this application, these are detailed below. Following the update section at the front of this report, the original officers report is repeated which provides the main element of the report.

The Transport Statement that originally accompanied the application has been reviewed and updated to take on board the comments received during the public consultation period. This was prepared in following discussion with the Strategic Highways Officer and submitted just prior to the preparation of this report. The Strategic Highways Manager has received a copy of the updated report and their final comments will be provided on an update sheet prior to committee.

In summary, it is felt that based on the proposed conditions and the supplementary paper from the applicants in respect of the matters raised it is recommended that this application be approved subject to conditions as set out at the end of the report.

Additional Comments

Parish Councils

Cranage Parish Council has objected to the scheme on the grounds of poor design inappropriate to the character of the area and impact on neighbouring properties. Concerns also raised over the issue of highway safety and the volume of traffic that may emerge onto the Knutsford Road.

Additional points commented upon relate to impact on trees and the harm that excessive lighting could cause to the surrounding countryside.

An objection has also been received from Goostrey Parish Council. Goostrey Parish Council considers the proposed scale and design of the building to be totally inappropriate for the location and that the construction of an office building on this site is likely to substantially increase traffic through Goostrey village at peak times.

Goostrey Parish Council have gone on to comment that this section of the A50 is already a 'red route' and extra traffic turning off and onto the road at the site and at nearby junctions can only add to the dangers.

Officers Response

In respect of the design, this is felt to be an improvement over that already approved and based on the earlier comments of the Highways Officer, impact on the A50 is felt to be within acceptable limits. The other matters are ones that are considered through the main report below and it is felt that these can either be addressed through conditions or could not be sustained if the application were to be taken to appeal.

Strategic Highways Officer

The Officer has previously appraised the application and has not raised objection to the application although a number of conditions have been recommended. Further comments will be provided in respect of further additional information which has included 85th percentile trip rates and other minor amendments as requested by the Strategic Highways Officer.

An analysis of the applicants earlier submission was undertaken and whilst there were some concerns over the format of the methodology used and the comparison sites used in the TRICs database, it was felt that the overall impact of the development would be acceptable.

As the applicants have undertaken a review of comparison sites in the TRICs database, the Strategic Highways Officer has provided an initial comment to indicate that they will review this in light of the capacity of the A50 to accept additional traffic generation. The Highways officer has advised that this relationship between the generation of traffic from the site and the existing capacity of the surrounding highway network to accommodate any traffic generated will be fundamental their review of the scheme.

Based on their earlier comments, the Highways Officer has acknowledged that the provided Travel Plan Framework would be acceptable as a basis for an umbrella travel plan for the site, but would need to be negotiated in detail with the Strategic Highways Manager's Travel Plan Officer. It is requested that this be achieved through a s106 agreement. The Travel Plan Framework does not however identify the point at which a full Travel Plan for the site will be developed and put in place and the Strategic Highways Manager recommends that the production of a formal Travel Plan be conditioned to an appropriate timescale beyond first occupation of the development

As the site is outside the settlement of Cranage, the Highways Officer has also requested a condition requiring the provision of cycle parking facilities.

Officers Response

On the basis of the earlier comments and the additional information submitted, it is felt that the development in principle is acceptable in highways terms. The conditions suggested are deemed to be appropriate and can be accepted. It is noted though that a s106 agreement has been requested in respect of the provision of the Travel Plan but as this is not dependant on a financial contribution being made, this can be addressed through a condition.

In respect of the request for cycle parking facilities, this is felt to be appropriate in providing alternatives to the use of the car for users of the site and is supported.

It is noted that the initial detail of the access ramp is such that the turning points into and out of the car park would be tight for entering or emerging vehicles. This is a factor of the design of the garage and a widening of the access ramp would create sufficient space for vehicles to safely pass. This can be addressed through condition.

Neighbours

Objections have been received from four neighbours. These raise comment in relation to the following points:

Character of the building form

Lighting impacting on the open countryside

Impact on the highway network

Detrimental harm to the open countryside

The Owner of the site is not the applicant

The drawings are of the incorrect format

The development would result in a deep excavation for the car park which could destabilise neighbouring properties.

In addition a detailed report has been produced on behalf of five of the neighbours surrounding the site some of whom have written separate letters. The report covers five key points, these being:

Planning guidance for the Rudheath Woods Area

Planning history

Highways appraisal

Need for the development

Impact on the local community

At the end of the report, the neighbour had provided a comparison of the differences between this application and that previously approved for Cheshire Cookers in 2006.

Officers Response

In respect of these comments, many of these matters have been addressed through the main officers report to committee.

On the matter of ownership, the application had been submitted through a holding company which is not an uncommon practice but it understood that the owner and applicant despite the differences in name are one and the same.

The initial drawing submitted with the application was incorrect but these have subsequently been revised and considered by the consultees.

In respect of the depth of the excavation, such work is common place in respect of many developments and would not be sufficient reason to refuse the application as this is a private matter between occupiers and any structural damage would be the responsibility of the applicant and their builder to ensure safe working practices. However, it is felt that the condition in respect of the access arrangements should be widened to include construction arrangements for the basement.

On the points raised in the objectors report, the site lies within the open countryside in the infill boundary line for Rudheath Woods. As noted in the main report, Policy E5 of the Local Plan sets out criteria for employment development in the Open Countryside and whilst the main part of the policy is not fully in support of the scale of development proposed, the presence of the Cheshire Cookers application is a material matter that needs to be considered. It is your Officers opinion that the proposed scheme is comparable to that previously approved and on this basis the scheme is felt to be acceptable.

The objector has, on page 6 of their report, set out a series of reasons why this development should be refused. It is accepted that these policy matters have to be considered but as already noted this scheme follows on from an extant approval which has substantially more weight in your Officers Opinion than that attributed to it by the objector. It is accepted that are some noticeable differences between the two schemes but the overall height, scale, mass and location of the two buildings are broadly similar.

In terms of the planning history, there was a scheme for residential development of three dwellings on the site (ref 05/0895/FUL) which was refused. Whilst this included highway matters as one of the reasons for refusal (as highlighted by the objector) the key reason for refusal was one of policy on housing in the open countryside. It is accepted that the design of the access arrangements on the housing scheme were poor, hence the reason for refusal, but if this had been the only grounds for refusing the scheme then it is felt, following discussion with the Strategic Highways Officer, that the layout of the site could have been amended to a suitable single access point design.

Moving on to the issue of highways and access, the objector has already raised concerns with the Council on this point during the consultation period and these

matters have been appraised by the Strategic Highways Officer. Whilst it is recognised that there are some areas where the applicants Transport assessment is weak, the overall findings of the report are robust and the impact on the highways is deemed acceptable.

In respect of the question of need for the development, the applicants have already pre-let some of the office space. It is acknowledged that there is additional office space in neighbouring centres but this scheme is to provide modern serviced officer accommodation which is sought by occupiers.

In terms of the impact on the local area, the objector has undertaken a point by point critique of the differences between the two schemes for Cheshire Cookers and that currently being considered.

It has already been accepted that the new scheme is not a replica of the Cheshire Cookers proposal but of a comparable nature. Whilst the objector had highlighted that the new building is two storey with a basement compared to the single storey scheme from 2006, the external heights and mass of the buildings are similar and it is this issue, how will the building impact on neighbours, that is of key note, not the internal arrangements.

In terms of the appearance, the objector has claimed that the approved industrial building is more attractive than that currently under consideration. This is a point of view that is robustly resisted by your Officers. The approved scheme is poorly fenestrated with blank elevations to the west and south whilst the roadside frontage is interspersed with a roller shutter door in the centre of the main façade. Extensive use is also proposed to be made of composite sheeting for the walls whilst the roof comprises of a combination of flat roof sections, pitched elements and a small gable perched over the main entrance.

The glazed front elevation of the building which is the main design feature of the building is felt by officers to be a positive feature of the buildings and provides some character to the structure that is missing from the more industrial design for the Cheshire Cookers scheme.

In comparison, the new scheme has a less complicated roof line which is aesthetically simpler and more appropriate solution. Use is also made of overhangs at the eaves which helps define the change between the roof and wall elements of the building as opposed to the basic box form of the approved scheme.

The use of the underground car park should have minimal impact on the character of the area and whilst it may cause some concern to neighbours about its construction, this has already been noted in this report and a condition has been proposed to address this point.

There are also a number of additional points which have been raised including drainage and electricity supply. A condition has been proposed in the main officers report recommending a sustainable drainage scheme and in terms of electricity supply, this is a matter for the developer to address with the utility company and would not necessitate a condition.

Manchester Metropolitan University

The University has objected to the proposal on the basis that the development would harm the operation of the Jodrell Bank Telescopes.

In respect of the earlier application in 2006, the University was consulted on the proposal for the Cheshire Cooker scheme. No response was raised at that time, nor was any conditions attached to the approval to reduce the impact of the scheme on the telescopes.

Officers Response

Discussions have been held with the University into the impact that this scheme will have on the operation of the telescopes. The key concern the University has is the location of the building to the dish with the potential for radio frequency interference.

The impact of the building can be mitigated against through the use of Pilkington K glass to reflect internal radio signals back away from the direct of the telescopes and back into the building which combined with foil lined plasterboard can have a valuable role in shielding the building from observers using the Jodrell Bank facility.

Given that the previous development is a material consideration, this needs to be taken into account, however, it is recognised that the operation of the telescope is an important matter. To address this conflict, it is recommended that the site management condition is amended to ensure that prior to the commencement of development the construction management plan includes details of operating methods that may affect the telescope and a schedule of materials is submitted to ensure a degree of radio-frequency shielding is provided.

Summary

Whilst there are a number of matters that need to be addressed through this proposal; these can be addressed through the use of appropriate conditions. As a result, it is felt that the refusal of the development could not be sustained at appeal.

ORIGINAL REPORT PRESENTED TO 11 NOVEMBER COMMITTEE

2. REASON FOR REFERRAL

This application would normally be referred to the Southern Planning Committee by virtue of its scale as a major planning application. However, due to the timing for the end of public consultation and the expiry date for the determination of the application, the scheme has been brought to the Strategic Planning Board to enable a decision to be issued to the applicants within the prescribed time period.

3. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

The site lies to the north of Holmes Chapel on the A50. It forms part of a chain of ribbon development leading out of the town and into the open countryside.

The main part of the site is given over to the existing Henry Alty commercial premises which have been used for the retail sale of gardening products and the associated car park to the front. The business has since closed.

In addition, the northern and western (rear) parts of the site are characterised by a large number of trees which define the nature of the area. A tree preservation order (Cranage TPO 1988) covers the site but some of the trees are self set and of poor amenity value.

The site lies in the open countryside to the north of Holmes Chapel.

The existing building on the site had been developed over a series of stages comprising of the former two storey dwelling house which was more recently used for office accommodation and a newer single storey element at the front which was used for the sale of horticultural goods.

The property is characterised by three gable elements that project forward and are interlinked with short interlinking sections.

The property is brick built with rendered walls and a tiled roof and dates from the 1930's

Surrounding the site to the south and west particularly are a number of other properties including a number of residential dwellings some of which directly back onto the site.

The site already benefits for planning permission to redevelop to an industrial/retail premises specifically for the sale and repair of AGA cookers. This was granted in 2007.

4. DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The proposal is for the development of a serviced B1 office block with associated parking and landscaping. The gross internal office floorspace to be provided amounts to 2,100m².

The proposed building closely follows the footprint of the earlier approved scheme detailed below for the sale and servicing of cookers however, as there is no proposed industrial activity on the site, the environmental impacts in terms of noise and fumes will be reduced.

To provide sufficient off street parking, the applicants are proposing 45 ground level parking spaces and the provision of an underground parking facility for a further 51 spaces to accompany the surface level parking.

The proposal seeks to retain many of the trees that characterise the site although some poorer specimens and a moderate value tree as identified

through the accompanying tree survey are to be removed. There will also be some pruning of the remaining trees.

5. RELEVANT HISTORY

Although there are a number of applications appertaining the historic use of the site, there are two key applications for consideration as detailed below.

In January 2007, approval (ref. 06/1173/FUL) was granted for the change of use of the site to an industrial/ retail premises which was specifically designed for the sale and repair of AGA cookers. More recently a second application was submitted and subsequently withdrawn (ref. 09/0951C). This was broadly similar to the current scheme and also sought approval for the development of a similar amount of serviced office accommodation on the site. This was different from the current proposal in terms of the parking on site which is discussed further in the report.

6. POLICIES

North West of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2011

DP 4 Making the Best Use of Existing Resources and Infrastructure
DP 5 Manage Travel Demand; Reduce the Need to Travel, and Increase Accessibility
DP 7 Promote Environmental Quality
DP 9 Reduce Emissions and Adapt to Climate Change
RDF 1 Spatial Priorities
RDF 2 Rural Areas
W 1 Strengthening the Regional Economy
W 3 Supply of Employment Land
RT 2 Managing Travel Demand
RT 3 Public Transport Framework
RT 9 Walking and Cycling
EM 1(D)Trees, Woodlands and Forests
EM 5 Integrated Water Management
EM 16 Energy Conservation & Efficiency
EM 17 Renewable Energy
MCR 3 Southern Part of the Manchester City Region

Cheshire Replacement Waste Local Plan

Policy 11 (Development and Waste Recycling)

Other Plans and Policies

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development
PPG4 Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms
PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

Congleton Borough Council Local Plan First Review

GR1 General Criteria for Development
GR2 Design
GR6 Amenity and Health

GR8 Amenity and Health
GR9 Accessibility, Servicing and Parking Provision; New Development
GR17 Car Parking
GR18 Traffic Generation
PS6 Settlements in the Open Countryside and the Green Belt
E5 Employment Development in the Open Countryside
NR1 Trees and Woodlands
PS10 Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope Consultation Zone

7. CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)

Highways

At the time of the preparation of the report formal comments are awaited. However, following withdrawal of the earlier scheme, this proposal has been designed in consultation with the Highways Officer at the pre-application stage.

Spatial Planning

Comments are awaited.

Environmental Health

At the time of the preparation of the report, comments are awaited.

Senior Landscape and Tree Officer

The Officer has acknowledged that the principle of redevelopment on this site has been accepted by virtue of the earlier 2007 approved scheme. Despite this, they would wish to see the submitted arboricultural method statement more closely reflect the layout. It is felt that this can be addressed through appropriate conditions in respect of a tree management plan arboricultural statement and identification of root protection zones.

8. VIEWS OF THE PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL:

At the time of preparation of the report, no comments have been received.

9. OTHER REPRESENTATIONS:

No comments had been received from neighbours at the time of the preparation of the report although it should be noted that objections were submitted to the earlier, withdrawn, scheme in respect of the following:
impact on neighbouring properties in terms of scale and mass,
harm on the character of the countryside and
highway safety on the A50.

10. APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING INFORMATION:

Trees: Cheshire Woodland Arboricultural Consultancy

This document has considered the existing tree coverage on site in the context of a survey undertaken in accordance with the guidance of BS 5837 (2005).

The report finds that subject to a suitable landscaping scheme, the impact of the development would be broadly neutral on the trees on the site when considered against the extant scheme approved in 2007.

Framework Travel Plan: WYG

This report sets out a draft travel plan framework to consider the accessibility of the development to sustainable modes of travel and reduce demand on the car.

The document sets out targets to be monitored against which the development can be appraised a year after the development is being brought into use.

Transport Statement: WYG

The transport statement has looked at the impact the development will have on the surrounding highways network, in particular the A50 Knutsford Road.

In summary, the report found that the northern access would provide a suitable access point with a visibility splay of 2.4m by 214m.

Design & Access Plan: Garry Usherwood Associates

The Design and Access Statement addresses the suitability of the development in respect of its surroundings. The document also goes on to consider the proposal against current policies in the Local Plan.

Ecological Report: Julie Drage, Ecologist

The protected species report has appraised the impact of the development of certain wildlife.

The report has found that the scheme will not have a detrimental impact on wildlife.

11. OFFICER APPRAISALPrinciple of Development

From an initial appraisal of the policies surrounding this site, notably Policy E5, the scale of development being proposed on this site would not normally be acceptable. In this instance however, weight has to be given to the extant approval for the redevelopment of the site for the cooker refurbishment/ sale and the differences between the two schemes.

The earlier 2007 approval was for a specific scheme comprising of some intensive engineering operations and also class A1 retail use. As a result the building generated some unneighbourly impacts and acted as an attractor to visitors as well as staff. The built form of the approved building is also broadly similar to that currently under consideration in terms of location, scale and mass although the design has been substantially altered.

In looking at Policy E5, part 1 of the policy seeks to only allow employment development in the countryside which is for the expansion or redevelopment of an existing business. In reviewing this, material weight is given to the approved scheme and its character and form in comparison to the proposal. It is felt that the two schemes are comparable and accordingly, the development under consideration is compliant with the policy.

Highways

The earlier office scheme (ref. 09/0951C) was withdrawn after consideration of the comments of the Highways Officer. The concern raised related the capacity of the site to accommodate the anticipated level of parking demand that may be generated to ensure that there would be no on street parking on the A50 Knutsford Road.

It has not been possible for the applicants to expand the parking area at surface level as this would not only have a far greater impact on the protected trees surrounding the site but also result in the front of the site becoming dominated by cars.

Rather than reduce the available rental floorspace inside the premises which would impact on the commercial viability of the scheme, the applicants have instead sought to provide some of the parking underneath the building. Whilst this may be an expensive solution compared to traditional surface level parking, it is a consideration for the applicants and could not be seen as a reason for refusal as it would have no long term impact on neighbours or ecology.

The development of the underground car park will however increase the amount of materials being moved around on the site and for this reason, it is recommended that a site management plan including details for the displacement of soil excavated from the site be sought as a condition.

A framework travel plan has been submitted with the application and this document sets out targets against which the sustainability of the development can be judged. The document also sets out a framework against which further measures can be taken to promote sustainable travel if the development does not meet prescribed targets after the first annual monitor and review period.

Due to the relatively isolated location of the site, it is recommended that a detailed staff travel plan be submitted to minimise usage of the car as much as possible and to promote car sharing and other sustainable means of travel. A draft strategy has already been submitted in respect of this point.

Design

In terms of the approach to bringing forward the redevelopment of this site which is currently in an unsightly condition, the developers have looked at the constraints imposed by the location of neighbouring buildings, trees and the access arrangements off the main road. They have also given consideration to the approved extant scheme, in terms of the general scale and mass of development previously accepted.

The building itself is of a modern form with predominantly glazed elevations forming the main frontages to the property whilst the rear elevations facing back to the neighbouring dwellings having more cladding and limited window details. Some use has also been made of brick sections to break up the elevation details.

To minimise the impact on the neighbouring properties, the roof section has been chamfered back to reduce the overall height of the building by nearly 1.5m from 7.0m to 5.5m. This results in the rear of the building being of a scale comparable to a normal domestic dwelling thereby minimising any impact on residential amenity.

Some concern has been expressed on the earlier withdrawn scheme about the suitability of the design in this rural fringe location and the impact of lighting on the open countryside on the opposite side of the Knutsford Road to the east.

In terms of design, there are no clear design cues from the neighbouring properties and hence the site has to generate its own form and character rather than rely on integrating with neighbouring forms of architecture. In this respect, the design is felt to be successful and results in the site having its own identity which is suitable to the area especially as the building is set to the back of the site and not prominently exposed at the road frontage.

In terms of lighting, this could be a concern if levels are too high and for too protracted a period. During early evenings however, it is felt some lighting from the property will help define its character and appearance as an architectural feature but this should not continue through the night. To address this matter in detail, it is recommended that a condition be attached to the decision for the submission of a lighting scheme if the scheme is approved.

Amenity

The main concern is the impact that the development will have on the neighbours surrounding the site. It is acknowledged that the extant 2007 scheme would have had some impact on the neighbours already, the question is whether this scheme would have similar or greater levels of impact.

Having considered the matter, it is felt that this proposal will result in less harm to the neighbours not only in terms of the scale of the development being proposed but also in respect of the activity being generated at the site. The earlier proposal with its retail element would have resulted in activity on the site during the day and weekends. Some of this could have been noisy due to the commercial activity associated with the site although conditions were proposed to minimise this.

Having appraised the proposal, it is felt that this scheme is more acceptable than that already approved and cannot therefore be refused on this basis. To address any impact on neighbours during the construction period, conditions are recommended.

Trees

As noted earlier, the site is protected by a TPO. It is felt that whilst there may be some partial impact on the trees surrounding the site this will be limited and subject to appropriate protection measures it should be possible to retain the highest quality trees in the vicinity. Whilst the site does not offer extensive opportunities for landscaping, some new planting can be provided and this can be addressed through conditions.

The character of the site will alter but it is felt that this is acceptable and will be an improvement over the earlier approval.

Sustainable Development

Consideration is given to the requirements of the Regional Spatial Strategy in respect of sustainable development. The site itself is relatively small at 0.3Ha with limited opportunity significant sustainable energy sources e.g. wind turbines to be provided. However, it is felt that a condition be attached to the permission seeking the implementation of more viable measures to be introduced to reduce the environmental impact of the building in line with RSS policy EM17.

Drainage

Given the nature of the site and its rural location together with the area put over to car parking, it is felt that a sustainable drainage scheme should be incorporated into the development to address surface water drainage and minimise impact on the mains drainage system or the chance of run-off onto the main highway.

Protected Species

The applicants have undertaken an ecological survey of the site and it is noted that there are no protected species that may be affected by the development. Therefore no further action required in this instance.

REVISED CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

12. CONCLUSIONS

It is felt that whilst this proposal represents a change over the existing character of the site, the extant approval granted in 2007 is a significant material consideration and is given greater weight than the existing character and form of development on site.

When looking at the approved 2007 scheme and the development proposed, it is felt that the new application provides a number of improvements in terms of less impact on neighbours, less impact on the character of the area, a well designed building and suitable highway safety and is accordingly supported by officers.

13. RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Commence within 3 years
2. Development in accordance with submitted plans
3. Use of the development to be restrict to Use Class B1
4. Details of materials to be submitted
5. Landscaping scheme to be submitted
6. Landscaping scheme to be implemented
7. Site management plan to be submitted including details of construction of underground car park
8. Wheel washing facilities to be provided.
9. Lighting plan to be submitted and implemented
10. Review of implemented lighting after 3 months
11. Detailed Travel Plan to be submitted and implemented

12. Details of the parapet wall surrounding the entrance to the underground car park to be submitted prior to development.
13. Time limit on the hours of construction (M-F 9.00 to 18.00 & Saturday 9.00 to 13.00; 14. No working Sunday or Bank Holiday)
15. Limits on use of piling foundations (M-F 10.00 to 16.00; No working Saturday, Sunday or Bank Holiday)
16. Submission of a revised tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement.
17. Submission, approval and implementation of a revised schedule of all proposed tree works.
18. Submission of details, approval and implementation of special construction for areas of hard surfacing within tree root protection zones.
19. Drainage scheme including sustainable drainage and water attenuation (SUDS) to be provided and implemented

Additional conditions recommended following receipt of additional comments and supporting information

A formal Travel Plan for the development to be produced to the satisfaction of the LPA prior to the first occupation of the site. The conditions for its production will be agreed with the applicant and in writing prior to the commencement of development. Within six months of the first operation of the premises, a written report will be submitted to the LPA detailing progress against identified targets to promote sustainable means of travel. Thereafter, an annual monitoring report shall be submitted to the LPA

Prior to the commencement of development the applicant will provide detailed design drawings for: the reconstruction of the existing northern access, the full closure of the existing southern access and its reinstatement to footway/verge, resurfacing of the frontage footpath and renewal of the ghost island right turn lane which serves the site, for the approval of the LPA. This will form part of the off-site highway works. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details.

Prior to the commencement of development the applicant will provide detailed design drawings for the design and detail of the underground car park including construction details and width of the access ramp for the approval of the LPA.

The applicant will provide visibility splays in accordance with those offered on Dwg No. SK003 Rev P2 received 18th September 2009 - to include for verge cutting within the extent of the provisional splays. This will form part of the off-site highway works.

Prior to first occupation, the developer will provide 10 No. secure and covered cycle racks for the site together with shower and changing facilities. This will be shown on a revised plan and provided for the approval of the LPA.

Prior to the commencement of development details of the main construction elements shall be submitted to an approved in writing of the materials to be used in the construction of the building hereby approved to meet the requirements of Jodrell Bank Telescope.

LOCATION PLAN: Cheshire East Council Licence No. 100018515

