

Application No: 19/4503M

Location: ASTRAZENECA, CHARTER WAY, MACCLESFIELD, SK10 2NA

Proposal: Redevelopment for a new pharmaceutical manufacturing facility (Building 52)

Applicant: Mr N Bennion, AstraZeneca

Expiry Date: 31-Dec-2019

## **SUMMARY**

The proposal is for the construction of a new three storey manufacturing plant within the existing AstraZeneca campus on the Hurdsfield Industrial Estate.

The proposed development would support the functioning of the existing Employment Area. It would not result in any harm to the setting of the Conservation Area, highway safety or wider landscape views. Issues relating to the integrity of the canal and surface water drainage can be adequately addressed by way of appropriately worded conditions. However, matters in relation to contaminated land remain outstanding, as do comments from certain consultees, as such, it is recommended that the application be delegated back to officers to APPROVE, subject to the satisfaction of these matters.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That authority be DELEGATED to the Head of Planning (Regulation), in consultation with the Chairman of Northern Planning Committee, to APPROVE the application, subject to the recommended conditions, for the reasons set out in the report to the Committee subject to;**

- **The resolution of contaminated land matters in relation to planning application 19/2943M**
- **The positive outcome of outstanding consultee comments**

## **REASON FOR REFERRAL**

The development would create a floor area of 8890sqm. The scale of the proposal therefore triggers an automatic referral call-in to Northern Planning Committee.

## **DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT**

The application site is within the AstraZeneca Macclesfield Campus, which is in the Hurdsfield Industrial Area. This is a designated Employment Area. On the wider AstraZeneca site, there are other manufacturing buildings of a similar height and scale to the application proposal.

The site lies to the west of the Macclesfield Canal Conservation Area. It is separated from the Canal by a mature evergreen hedgerow. The AstraZeneca site is also at a lower level than the Canal tow path.

Within the wider site, there are eight surface car parks and one multi-storey car park. There are also 30 bays with electric vehicle infrastructure.

## **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

Full planning permission is sought for the construction of a new three storey pharmaceutical manufacturing building. The proposed building would sit adjacent to a similar building approved in 2014.

No parking is proposed as part of the scheme, apart from a single disabled bay. The occupiers of the building would have access to the parking and facilities on the wider site.

## **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

18/5573M – approval not required – 30 January 2019  
Determination for proposed demolition of a building

19/3241S – EIA not required – July 2019  
EIA screening option for remediation works

19/2943M – pending consideration  
Land remediation works

19/4518S – pending consideration  
EIA screening opinion for a new pharmaceutical manufacturing facility, building 52

### Building 51

13/2384M – approved – September 2013  
New facility for the manufacture of pharmaceuticals, totalling 6668 sq. m gross internal floor area

## **POLICIES**

### Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy

MP 1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  
PG 2 – Settlement Hierarchy  
SD 1 – Sustainable Development in Cheshire East  
SD 2 – Sustainable Development Principles  
EG 1 – Economic Prosperity  
EG 3 – Existing and Allocated Employment Sites  
SE 1 – Design  
SE 3 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity  
SE 4 – The Landscape  
SE 5 – Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland  
SE 7 – The Historic Environment  
SE 9 – Energy Efficient Development  
SE 12 – Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability  
SE 13 – Flood Risk and Water Management  
CO 1 – Sustainable Travel and Transport  
CO 2 – Enabling Business Growth through Transport Infrastructure  
CO 4 – Travel Plans and Transport Assessments  
Appendix C – Adopted Parking Standards

### Macclesfield Borough Local Plan

DC3 – Amenity  
DC6 – Circulation and Access  
BE6 – Macclesfield Canal Conservation Area

## **OTHER MATERIAL POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2019)  
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

## **CONSULTATIONS EXTERNAL TO PLANNING**

Canal and River Trust – No objections, subject to conditions requiring details of the final retaining wall design to and details of the means of construction of the roadway and retaining wall. Any approved construction management plan should include measures to protect the canal and its users from contamination.

An informative is also recommended advising the applicant of the need to comply with the Trust's 'Code of Practice for Works affecting the Canal & River Trust'.

Environment Agency - No comments received at time of report

Environmental Protection - No objections, subject to conditions relating to contaminated land. The applicant should also be informed of appropriate hours for construction and pilling works.

Lead Local Flood Risk Authority – No objections, subject to a condition should be imposed requiring a detailed strategy/design to limit surface water run off.

Health and Safety Executive (HSE) - Do not advise against

Head of Strategic Infrastructure (Highways) - No objections

Macclesfield Civic Society - Support the proposal. Advise positive economic and employment benefits for the town. Whilst visible in long distance views from elevated ground, it would not be out of scale. Any permission should be subject to the usual conditions to safeguard amenity and the local environment.

Manchester Airport Safeguarding – No comments received at time of report

United Utilities – No objections, subject to a condition requiring the prior submission/approval of a surface water drainage scheme and a condition that surface and foul water be drained on separate systems

Macclesfield Town Council - No objections but support comments raised by the Canal and River Trust. The committee sought measures to strengthen the canal bank as per the Canal and River Trust recommendation and the planting of trees to reduce the impact of the development on users of the canal

## **OTHER REPRESENTATIONS**

None received

## **OFFICER APPRAISAL**

### **Principle of development**

CELPs policy EG 3 relates to existing Employment Areas. It seeks to protect Employment Areas to ensure sufficient employment land is available to attract both new businesses and allow existing businesses to grow.

AstraZeneca is an established and major employer within Macclesfield. The proposal would provide new facilities to enable the growth of their facilities within the town. A pharmaceutical building would fall within use class B2, which is considered to be an employment use. The proposal would fully comply with the aims of CELPs policy EG 3. The principle of development is therefore deemed to be acceptable.

### **Conservation Area, impact upon Canal and wider landscape impacts**

#### Conservation Area and Landscape

The application site lies adjacent to the Macclesfield Canal Conservation Area. The application site sits at a lower level to the Canal and is screened by existing vegetation.

CELPs policy SE 7 relates to the Historic Environment. It states that the Council will support development proposals that do not cause harm to the significance of heritage assets. Saved MBLP policy BE6 relates to development within the built up stretch of the Macclesfield Canal Corridor. It confirms that development may be permitted, where it preserves or enhances the historic environment.

The proposal has been reviewed by the Council's Built Conservation Officer. They have raised no objection to the proposal, subject to confirmation that the works would not have any detrimental effect on the embankment of the canal. They have advised that the building would not be visible from the canal.

The proposed building would be of a functional appearance, reflecting its use as a manufacturing facility. However, it would include some detailing and would reflect the appearance of the adjacent buildings. Whilst it would be visible in longer range views from the hills, it would be seen in the context of the surrounding manufacturing buildings, which are of similar heights.

The Council's Landscaping Officer has advised that the proposed development would not result in any significant landscape or visual impacts.

It is considered that the proposal would not adversely affect the setting of the Macclesfield Canal Conservation Area. It would comply with CELPS policy SE 7 and saved MBLP Policy BE6.

#### Impact on Canal

CELPs Policy SE 12 relates to land instability amongst other matters. It states that development will only be deemed acceptable where it can be demonstrated that any land instability issues can be appropriately mitigated against and remediated if necessary.

The proposed development would require works to excavate into the embankment and the construction of a new retaining wall structure. The Canal and River Trust have advised that these works have the potential to threaten the stability of the embankment and increase the risk of a canal breach into the site, unless adequate precautions are undertaken.

To prevent this, the Trust recommend that prior to commencement of development, details of the final retaining wall design and the means of construction will need to be submitted for approval by the local planning authority. The Town Council support the Trust's comments.

Subject to these conditions, it is deemed that the proposal would adequately comply with the requirements of CELPS Policy SE 12 in relation to land instability.

The Trust have also requested that the submitted management plan should be expanded upon to include details of dust protection measures, to prevent the canal corridor and users from contamination during works. A condition will be included to this effect in the event of approval to recommend the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

## Highways

CELPs Policy CO 1 relates to Sustainable Travel and Transport. It sets out the ways in which development will be expected to deliver the Council's objectives of delivering a sustainable transport system. Amongst other matters, it states that development should be guided to sustainable and accessible locations.

CELPs policy CO 4 requires the submission of a Transport Assessment for applications likely to generate significant additional journeys.

The application site lies within the Hurdsfield Employment Area, which has good road, pedestrian and public transport links to Macclesfield Town Centre and the bus and rail stations. It is considered that the development would comply with the requirements of Policy CO 1.

No changes are proposed to the existing site access or parking arrangements for the wider site. No parking is proposed as part of the development, except for a single disabled space outside the buildings. However, there are nine car parks around the campus. The Council's Highway's Officer has advised that the existing parking facilities would be sufficient to accommodate any additional parking resulting from the proposed development.

The transport statement confirms that cycle storage and shower facilities are available around the campus. With this in mind, a condition requiring additional cycle storage is not deemed necessary.

The Highways Officer has considered the impact of the development on the highway network. They have advised that any impact is likely to be small and have not raised any objections.

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of its impact on highways safety.

## Amenity

### Privacy, light and overbearing impact considerations

Saved MBLP policy DC3 seeks to protect the amenities of residential properties and other sensitive uses. The proposed building would be located within the existing employment site amongst other similar buildings. Given this location and the distance from residential dwellings, it would not compromise the amenities of nearby properties.

### Contamination and air quality considerations

In relation to contamination, CELPS policy SE 12 advises that where a proposal may be affected by contamination or land instability, an investigation report will be required at planning stage. Development will only be deemed acceptable where it can be demonstrated that any contamination can be appropriately mitigated against and remediated, if necessary.

The Planning Practice Guidance advises that *'Applicants should provide proportionate but sufficient site investigation information (a risk assessment) to determine the existence or otherwise of contamination, its nature and extent, the risks it may pose and to whom/what (the 'receptors') so that these risks can be assessed and satisfactorily reduced to an*

*acceptable level. The risk assessment should also identify the potential sources, pathways and receptors ('pollutant/ contaminant linkages') and evaluate the risks. This information will enable the local planning authority to determine whether more detailed investigation is required, or whether any proposed remediation is satisfactory. At this stage, an applicant may be required to provide at least the report of a desk study and site walk-over. This may be sufficient to develop a conceptual model of the source of contamination, the pathways by which it might reach vulnerable receptors and options to show how the identified pollutant/ contaminant linkages can be broken.*

*Unless this initial assessment clearly demonstrates that the risk from contamination can be satisfactorily reduced to an acceptable level, further site investigations and risk assessment will be needed before the application can be determined'*

The application site was previously used for waste disposal and presents a high risk of contamination that could be mobilised during construction. The application site is subject to a related application for remediation works (19/2943M refers). This application has not yet been determined, pending revisions to the proposed remediation strategy.

Given the above risks, the local planning authority is not able to grant planning permission for this application until the extent of contamination is known and the remediation strategy agreed. It is recommended that the application be delegated back to officers to be approved in the event that planning permission for the remediation works is granted.

Policy SE 12 of the CELPS also states that developments should not result in a harmful or cumulative impact upon air quality. The application includes an Air Quality Impact Assessment. This concludes that the development will not have a significant impact on local air quality and that the potential dust impacts during construction will also not be significant, subject to appropriate dust mitigation measures.

The Council's Environmental Health officers have reviewed the proposal. They have not raised any concerns regarding the report and have confirmed that no air quality conditions are required.

## **Renewable Energy**

CELPS policy SE 9 relates to energy efficient development. It states that non-residential development over 1000sqm will be expected to secure at least 10% of its predicted energy requirements from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources, unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that having regard to the type of development and its design, this is not feasible or viable.

To ensure compliance with the requirements of this policy, a condition will be imposed requiring the submission and implementation of a low carbon/renewable energy scheme.

## **Ecology**

CELPS Policy SE 3 relates to biodiversity and geodiversity. Amongst other matters, it requires all development to positively contribute to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity.

A Phase 1 Ecology Report has been submitted as part of the application. This found the area to be of negligible importance from a nature conservation perspective.

This report has been reviewed by the Council's Nature Conservation Officer. The Officer has not raised any concerns regarding the impact of the proposal subject to a condition relating to nesting birds and a condition requiring the inclusion of ecological enhancements.

## **Forestry**

CELPS Policy SE 5 deals with trees, hedgerows and woodland. Proposals likely to result in the loss of or threat to trees, hedgerows or woodlands, which make a significant contribution to the amenity, biodiversity of the surrounding area will not normally be permitted.

There are 17 trees and 1 group of trees within the application site. All of these are categorised as low value 'C' class trees. They are not protected and do not lie within a conservation Area.

The proposal has been discussed with the Council's Forestry officer. The Officer has advised that the trees are of low significance. There is no objection in principle to their removal. However, as they do make some modest contribution to the green character of the surrounding area, a landscaping condition is recommended in the event of approval, which will also include details of replacement planting.

## **Drainage and Flood Risk**

Policy SE 13 deals with Flood Risk and Water Management. It states that all developments should include appropriate sustainable drainage systems. It confirms that it is not sustainable to dispose of surface water via the public sewer systems and applicants wishing to do so must demonstrate that there are no other more sustainable viable options.

A drainage strategy has been provided as part of the application. This states that surface water would be drained into the public sewers. United Utilities have raised an objection in principle the proposed drainage strategy, due to concerns regarding the impact on the sewer network. However, they have also suggested a condition relating to the submission of a surface water drainage plan. This has also been requested by the Council's Flood Risk Team. Subject to this condition, the proposal is deemed to adhere with CELPS Policy SE 13.

## **Manchester Airport**

Manchester Airport Safeguarding team has been consulted on the proposal. Their response has not yet been received but will be reported to the Planning Committee in the form of a written or verbal update.

## **Other matters**

Under Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, if the local planning authority grants planning permission, it is subject to a condition that sets the time limit within which the development must begin. While a three year time frame for implementation is standard, this is at the discretion of the local planning authority. The Planning Practice Guidance advises



that *“the local planning authority may wish to consider whether a variation in the time period could assist in the delivery of development.”*

It continues by stating that *“a longer time period may be justified for very complex projects where there is evidence that 3 years is not long enough to allow all the necessary preparations to be completed before development can start.”*

In this case, the applicant has requested that any planning permission is subject to a five year implementation period. In support of this, they have advised that this extended period is requested to remove any potential barriers, making the Campus, the number one option for AstraZeneca's investment.

AstraZeneca are a major employer within the town and the proposed development would make a significant positive contribution to the local economy. In light of the above and the requirement for remedial works to be carried, it is considered that the five year implementation period would be acceptable in the event of approval.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The proposal is for the construction of a new three storey manufacturing plant within the existing AstraZeneca campus on the Hurdsfield Industrial Estate.

The proposed development would support the functioning of the existing Employment Area. It would not result in any harm to the setting of the Conservation Area, highway safety or wider landscape views. Issues relating to the integrity of the canal and surface water drainage can be adequately addressed by way of appropriately worded conditions.

However, matters in relation to contaminated land remain outstanding, as do comments from certain consultees as such, it is recommended that the application be delegated back to officers to APPROVE, subject to the satisfaction of these matters.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**That authority be DELEGATED to the Head of Planning (Regulation), in consultation with the Chairman of Northern Planning Committee, to APPROVE the application, subject to the recommended conditions, for the reasons set out in the report to the Committee subject to;**

- **The approval of 19/2943M**
- **The positive outcome of outstanding consultee comments**

**And the following conditions;**

- 1. Five year time limit**
- 2. Works to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents**
- 3. Materials as per application**
- 4. Detailed surface water drainage strategy/scheme (prior to commencement)**
- 5. Details of the proposed retaining wall (prior to commencement)**
- 6. Details of means of construction of retaining wall and roadway (prior to commencement)**
- 7. Contamination – Remediation Strategy (prior to commencement)**
- 8. Contamination – Verification Report (prior to commencement)**
- 9. Nesting Birds**

**10. Ecological enhancements**

**11. Renewables 10%**

**12. Updated levels (prior to commencement)**

**13. Landscaping/replacement planting – Details**

**14. Landscape – Implementation**

**15. Construction Environmental Management Plan (prior to commencement)**

*In order to give proper effect to the Committee`s intent and without changing the substance of its decision, authority is delegated to the Acting Head of Planning in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice Chair) to correct any technical slip or omission in the resolution, before issue of the decision notice.*

