Application No: 23/3276M

Location: Land West Of London Road And South Of, GAW END

LANE, LYME GREEN

Proposal: Full application for the erection of 40 1,2,3 and 4 bedroom

dwellings and their associated access, public open space and landscaping following refusal of application no.

21/1249M

Applicant: Mr Garry Goodwin, Morris Homes Limited & the Trustees of

Lyme Green Settlement CIO

Expiry Date: 28-Nov-2023

### SUMMARY

Full planning permission has recently been allowed on appeal to construct 42 dwellings on the site. This application proposes a scheme of 40 dwellings and the provision of onsite public open space, which the appeal scheme did not. The principle of development on the site has been accepted and the site is allocated for such in the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS) under Policy LPS 17. Vehicular and pedestrian access would be taken from directly from London Road with further pedestrian connections made with the adjoining development to the west and Gaw End Lane and a pedestrian refuge on London Road.

The design of the scheme complies with the CEC Design Guide. There would be less than substantial harm to the nearby Toll Bar Cottage, but this has been minimised through landscaping and would be outweighed by the benefits of delivering sustainable housing a strategic housing allocation. The proposal provides the required amount of affordable housing with an appropriate mix and density of housing. In allowing the previous appeal, a Planning Inspector determined that a similar development would not result in a cramped from of development or overdevelopment of the site. The proposal achieves an appropriately designed residential development and would not materially harm neighbouring residential amenity and would provide sufficient amenity for the new occupants.

Mitigation for the impact of the proposal on local infrastructure including education, open space and provision for recreation outdoor sports would be secured as part of a s106 legal agreement.

With respect to highways, a development of this size will not have a detrimental impact on the local highway network even accounting for other committed developments. Similarly, the impact on local air quality (including cumulative impacts) will be acceptable also.

A scheme of surface water attenuation is proposed ensuring there will be no increase in surface water runoff. Subject to conditions, the Council's Flood Risk Manager has confirmed that the scheme could adequately mitigate the residual risk of flooding from surface water and not increase the risk of flooding to neighbouring properties. The scheme would offset its impact on biodiversity and although some surveys are dated, the extant planning approval is based on similar surveys.

On this basis, the proposal is for sustainable development which would bring environmental, economic and social benefits and is therefore considered to be acceptable in the context of the relevant policies of the Development Plan and advice contained within the NPPF.

#### SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE subject to conditions and a s106 agreement.

### **DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT**

This application relates to a greenfield site lying to the south of Macclesfield, near to Lyme Green Business Park. The site measures approximately 1.6 hectares in size. The site sits to the south of the junction where London Road (A523), Gaw End Lane and Robins Lane meet. To the east beyond London Road there is residential development forming Lyme Green Settlement. To the south of the site is 'Rayswood Nature Reserve'. To the west is a larger housing development which is currently being built out by Vistry Homes. Surrounding uses include mainly commercial, residential and agricultural land.

There is a small, old redundant sub-station located in the far north-western corner of the site which will be removed to facilitate the proposed development. Just outside of the boundary is a working sub-station which is not associated with the development and will remain in situ.

The site forms part of an allocated site for housing development under Policy LPS 17 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS) and is within the settlement boundary as designated by the Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Plan Document (SADPD).

#### **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 40 no. dwellings and follows an appeal which allowed 42 dwellings on the site. The site has been excluded from a larger development for which outline planning permission and reserved matters approvals has already been given for the erection of 306 dwellings (planning ref; 18/3245M refers). The neighbouring development is currently being constructed by Vistry Homes. Vehicular access would be provided by its own dedicated access taken from London Road.

#### RELEVANT HISTORY

21/1249M – Land West Of London Road And South Of, GAW END LANE, LYME GREEN – Allowed on Appeal 31-Jan-2024

The reason for refusing the previous scheme was as follows:

1. "The proposed residential development would result in a cramped form of development which would undermine the visual amenity of the area and the landscaping of the site contrary to Policies LPS 17, SE 1, SD 2 and SC 4 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy, saved Policy DC41 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan as well as the Councils Design Guide and advice within National Planning Policy Framework."

In allowing the appeal, the inspector concluded that the previous scheme would not result in a cramped form of development and that the visual amenity and the landscaping of the site would not be visually harmful in its context:

"I note the criticisms of the Council of the density of the site, and their desire for a transition from the built-up area to the countryside. However, I do not consider that the proposal is too dense for the site, nor do I find that the layout is cramped or akin to a more urban area rather than this semi-rural one".

The changes to the scheme compared with the recently allowed appeal can be summarised as:

- Reduction in number of units from 42 to 40
- Changes to the internal layout to accommodate a revision to the unit types and provision of onsite open space.
- Associated amendments to site landscaping and car parking
- Increase in separation with the Rayswood Nature Reserve to the south
- Introduction of an on-site Local Area for Play instead of offsite commuted sums

#### **POLICIES**

#### **Development Plan**

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS)

MP1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development

PG1 Overall Development Strategy

PG2 Settlement hierarchy

PG7 Spatial Distribution of Development

SD1 Sustainable Development in Cheshire East

SD2 Sustainable Development Principles

IN1 Infrastructure

**IN2 Developer Contributions** 

SC1 Leisure and Recreation

SC2 Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities

SC3 Health and wellbeing

SC4 Residential Mix

SC5 Affordable Homes

SE1 Design

SE2 Efficient use of land

SE3 Biodiversity and geodiversity

SE4 The Landscape

SE5 Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland

SE6 Green Infrastructure

SE7 The Historic Environment

SE9 Energy Efficient development

SE12 Pollution, land contamination and land stability

SE13 Flood risk and water management

CO1 Sustainable travel and transport

CO3 Digital connections

CO4 Travel plans and transport assessments

LPS 17 Gaw End Lane, Macclesfield

## Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD)

PG9 - Settlement Boundaries

GEN1 – Design Principles

ENV2 – Ecological Implementation

ENV3 - Landscape Character

ENV5 – Landscaping

ENV6 – Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland Implementation

ENV7 - Climate Change

ENV12 – Air Quality

ENV14 – Light Pollution

ENV16 – Surface water Management and Flood Risk

HER1 - Heritage Assets

HER2 - Listed Buildings

HOU1 – Housing Mix

HOU8 – Space, Accessibility and Wheelchair Housing Standards

HOU12 – Amenity

HOU13 - Residential Standards

HOU14 - Housing Density

HOU15 – Housing Density

HOU16 - Small and Medium Sized Sites

INF1 - Cycleways, Bridleways and Footpaths

INF3 – Highways Safety and Access

INF9 - Utilities

REC2 – Indoor Sport and Recreation Implementation

REC3 – Open Space Implementation

### **Other Material Considerations**

National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework)

National Planning Practice Guidance

Cheshire East Design Guide

## **CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)**

**ANSA / Greenspaces -** No objections subject to conditions securing detailed designs, specifications and a management plan for the onsite Local Area for Play (LAP) and a financial contribution towards offsite Recreation and Outdoor Sport provision calculated at a rate of £1,000 per family dwelling or £500 per bed space in apartments.

**Canal and Rivers Trust** – No objection as the site lies outside of the consultation zone.

**Education –** No objection subject to financial contributions of £81,713.45 towards secondary education provision.

**Environmental Protection** – No objection subject to conditions and infromatives relating to electric vehicle charging infrastructure, use of ultra-low emission boilers, construction hours, piling, dust management, noise mitigation and contaminated land.

**Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)** – no objection subject to conditions requiring submission of a detailed drainage strategy / design, associated management / maintenance plan and levels. The LLFA also comments that the necessary land drainage consents and building control approval must be secured before development commences.

**Head of Strategic Infrastructure** – No objection subject to conditions requiring the footway along the frontage to the site to be increased in width from 2 metres to 3 metres so that it can serve as a shared pedestrian / cycle facility and the provision of an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point that includes a pedestrian refuge on London Road.

Housing Strategy & Needs Manager – Object on the basis that the affordable housing statement needs to clarify the bedroom sizes of both the Rented and Intermediate dwellings / change the proposed split in tenures of the affordable dwellings to be policy compliant or provide justification as to why they cannot be / advise when the affordable dwellings are to be completed in the development / confirm that the dwellings are to be NDSS compliant / advise on the rate at which the rented units are to be charged at (including any applicable service charges).

**Natural England** – No objection subject to the proposed drainage strategy being secured.

NHS - No comments received

**United Utilities (UU)** – No objection subject to the submitted drainage strategy being conditioned

#### VIEWS OF THE PARISH COUNCIL

## **Sutton Parish Council** – Object on the basis that:

- 1. The proposed site layout does not address the reasons for refusal on application 21/1249M e.g.
  - The total number of houses on this development will over-extend those set out in Cheshire Easts Local Plan and thus is an over intensification of the area.
  - There have been no plans shown regarding funding for new schools, health and welfare services or towards adapting the road system to accommodate the increase in housing stock.
  - The council are very concerned that there has been no adaption to the road system to accommodate the increase in housing stock. There are safety issues regarding the main entrance being after the 40mph sign with exiting from the site being into the 50mph zone. The decrease in the speed limit to this junction is very dangerous.
- 2. The proposal does not comply with policy Site LPS17 (Local plan strategy): Gaw End Lane.
- 3. There is an inadequate green buffer to London Road/Leek Road.
- 4. There is no area of protected open space adjacent to Rayswood Nature Reserve.
- 5. The proposed site layout is still cramped despite the inclusion of the play area.
- 6. Inadequate parking on site will/may cause overflow parking elsewhere.
- 7. The proposals do not fulfil requirements of Peak Park fringe."

We expect one of the conditions should be that the control of speed be addressed."

#### OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of representation have been received from approximately 16 addresses raising the following objections / comments:

- Principle of Development
  - o Development is contrary to a number of Development Plan policies.
  - More houses are not 'needed' with several large developments going up in Macclesfield at this very time
  - The proposal is no different to the previous scheme that was refused
  - o Unnecessary urban intrusion to the green space contrary to LPS17
  - Would double the size of Lyme Green settlement.
  - A new application should not be lodged when an appeal has been submitted.
  - Council has a five-year supply of sites (11.6 years). No need to grant planning permission in this case.
  - Development would result in more homes than included in the Local Plan Strategy (LPS) allocation - LPS 17 Gaw End Lane (for around 300 Homes).
  - Boundary to adjoining Rayswood is incorrect and would reduce the proposed buffer

- Afforable housing inconsistent
- Design / character / landscape
  - o Density, design and layout represent overdevelopment of the site.
  - o Density would be more appropriate for a brownfield site in town.
  - o Loss of greenspace, trees, scrub and impact on semi-rural character
- Highways / access
  - o Concerns over traffic congestion impacting on the local area,
  - No safe cycle routes to town centre, train station.
  - o Traffic safety concerns, particularly students attending local schools.
  - o Concerns regarding traffic speed around the access to the site.
  - Proposed access would add to the 7 junctions which already exist, on a short, dangerous stretch of road.
  - Traffic counts need updating to take into account other new developments
  - Doesn't take into account how busy/fast London Road is for pedestrians

## Infrastructure

- No additional facilities, services or shops.
- Inadequate school provision in the local area (Impact seems to have been based on 36 units not 40)
- Impact of the development on infrastructure including sewerage, water etc
- No consideration given to additional infrastructure provision including doctors/dentist etc

## Flooding / drainage

Site floods: there is regular 'waterlogging' on the site

#### Nature conservation

- Impact on Danes Moss SSSI
- Various species not included in assessments, moths, otters, willow tits etc
- Surveys inaccurate and ignore the Save Danes Moss surveying that lists over 100 protected species that have been recorded in the last 5 years
- Loss of underlying peat which is vital as a carbon sink
- No details of bat / bird boxes
- Loss of habitat for so many species.
- Buffer zone to adjacent nature reserve is a tiny sliver of land to be left undeveloped.

#### Amenity

- o The proposal has implications for noise and air pollution.
- Substation too close to development

### **OFFICER APPRAISAL**

### Background

Members may recall that at the Strategic Planning Board meeting of 27<sup>th</sup> July 2022, following a deferral from an earlier meeting, a similar application for the erection of 42 no. dwelling was refused on the basis that the proposal 'would

result in a cramped form of development which would undermine the visual amenity of the area and the landscaping of the site. The applicant lodged an appeal against the decision, and it was recently allowed by a Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State appointed. The applicant has made some further changes to the scheme, some of which respond to members previous concerns and so this application is to consider those changes whilst also having regard to the fact that planning permission has been granted for a similar scheme. The changes can be summarised as:

- Reduction in number of units from 42 to 40
- Changes to the internal layout to accommodate a revision to the unit types and provision of onsite open space.
- Associated amendments to site landscaping and car parking
- Increase in separation with the Rayswood Nature Reserve to the south
- Introduction of an on-site Local Area for Play instead of offsite commuted sums

Thus, the principle of development has already been established by the grant of planning permission on appeal. Nevertheless, this is recapped as follows.

## **Principle of Development**

Macclesfield is identified as one of the principal towns in Cheshire East where CELPS Policy PG 2 seeks to direct 'significant development' to the towns in order to 'support their revitalisation', recognising their roles as the most important settlements in the borough. Development will maximise the use of existing infrastructure and resources to allow jobs, homes and other facilities to be located close to each other and accessible by public transport.

The application site is allocated as a Strategic Site for housing under Policy LPS 17 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS). When the Council adopted the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy on 27th July 2017, the site was removed from the Green Belt.

The adjoining land to the north and west is currently being developed by Vistry Homes for 306 dwellings (planning ref; 18/3245M and 21/0966M refer). This application site is separate from the larger scheme and is being brought forward by a different applicant and developer (Morris Homes).

Site LPS 17 states that the development of Gaw End Lane will be achieved over the Local Plan Strategy period through:

- 1. The delivery of around 300 homes;
- 2. Incorporation of green infrastructure which should include the following:
  - i. Green linkages to the wider footpath network, habitats and site LPS 13 including links to the north/south strategic link of the Macclesfield Canal. Land to the southwest of the site adjacent to the canal should remain undeveloped and is allocated for open space within site LPS 17 as shown on Figure 15.19;
  - ii. New public open space;

- iii. Green buffers to London Road/Leek Road and Macclesfield Canal; and
- iv. An area of protected open space adjacent Rayswood Nature Reserve as shown on the proposals map;
- 3. Pedestrian and cycle links to new and existing residential areas, shops, schools and health facilities; and
- 4. On site provision, or where appropriate, relevant contributions towards highways and transport, education, health, open space and community facilities.

Additionally, the following site specific principles of development apply:

- a. Buffer zone of semi-natural habitats to be provided adjacent to the Macclesfield Canal SBI.
- b. Development must be sensitive to the conservation area and listed structures / buildings. The retention of open space on the western edge of the site would help safeguard the immediate context from urbanising development up to the canal edge, where it would most dramatically affect views and the sense of openness within the bend in the canal. Regarding the setting of Toll Bar cottage, the impact could be lessened in the approach taken to the site's planning, by retaining the mature boundary landscaping opposite the property and also by using this south easterly part of the site as a pedestrian gateway into the scheme, with associated open space.
- c. This Local Plan Strategy site is expected to provide affordable housing in line with the policy requirements set out in Policy SC 5 'Affordable Homes'.
- d. The site will be developed only where it can be demonstrated that there is no significant harm on the Danes Moss SSSI, particularly in relation to changes in water levels and quality and recreational pressures. This should include a full assessment of the direct and indirect impacts of the development on the features of special interest. Where impacts cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation measures will be required to ensure protection of the SSSI
- e. Any application would need to be supported by a full ecological appraisal. Ecological mitigation would be required to address any adverse impacts.
- f. A minimum of a Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment for contaminated land should be carried out to demonstrate that the site is, or could be made, suitable for use should it be found to be contaminated. Further work, including a site investigation, may be required at a preplanning stage, depending on the nature of the site.

This application is for 40 units in addition to the 306 units approved in the adjoining development.

Objectors have levied concern that the two schemes combined would take the development numbers past the general number of 300 indicated in the site allocation. Each application needs to be considered on their merits but also within the context of each other. The total number of dwellings proposed by the

two applications would amount to 346. In light of the appeal decision, 348 have already been consented.

As noted above, LPS 17 allows for around 300 new homes, but this is a broad figure and is not an upper limit for development as factors such as size and mix of housing have a bearing on numbers. Further, 42 units have already been consented on the site. Subject to the development complying with other relevant planning policies, it is considered that such a number could be considered to meet the requirement of "around 300 dwellings" in LPS 17. The delivery of the site for residential development will provide a small contribution towards the Council's housing land supply and assist in meeting the development requirements of Macclesfield and the wider Borough. The further requirements of policy LPS 17, and other relevant policies, are considered below.

## **Affordable Housing**

Policy SC 5 of the CELPS and the Councils Interim Planning Statement on Affordable Housing (IPS) requires the provision of 30% affordable housing on all 'windfall' sites of 15 dwellings or more. This relates to both social rented and/or intermediate housing, as appropriate. Normally the Council would expect a ratio of 65/35 between social rented and intermediate housing.

As this is a scheme for 40 no. units, 12 of the units will be required to be affordable. To satisfy the required tenure split, 8 of the units would need to be provided as social / affordable rent accommodation and 4 of the units as intermediate tenure.

The current need for rented units show a total of 1849 on the Cheshire Homechoice register with Macclesfield as their first choice. From this data there is a need for 1-, 2-, 3-, and 4-bedroom dwellings. The Affordable Housing Statement provided by the applicant initially had all the affordable dwellings as 3-bedroom dwellings. However, this has since been amended to provide 1-, 2- and 3-bedroom affordable dwellings and would on this basis, would meet an identified rented need for Macclesfield and is therefore acceptable. With regard to internal space standards the size of the dwellings would meet those standards prescribed with the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS).

The mix as amended is:

4 x 1 bed (4 affordable / social rent)

1 x 2 bed (1 affordable / social rent)

7 x 3 bed (3 affordable / social rent & 4 intermediate)

This is an improvement over the original scheme and addresses a comment made by the Councils Strategic Housing Officer that there is a need for 1 and 2 bed affordable rented units.

Regarding pepper potting, there are 3 blocks of affordable units spread through the development. It is considered that the tenures are appropriately pepper potted through the site having regard to the size of the scheme and the application which was allowed at appeal, and accordingly the proposal complies with policies SC 5 or LPS17 of the CELPS.

#### **Residential Mix**

Policy SC4 of the CELPS states that new residential development should maintain, provide or contribute to a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes to help support the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities. Reference is made to the need for development proposals to accommodate units specifically designed for the elderly and people who require specialist accommodation.

The proposed development comprises of:

	number	% of total units
1 bed	4	10
2 bed	6	15
3 bed	17	42
4 bed	13	33
Total	40	100

Overall mix of open market units:

	Number	% of open market	
2 bed	5	18	
3 bed	10	36	
4 bed	13	46	
Total	28	100	

Overall mix of affordable units:

	Number	% of affordable units
1 bed	4	33
2 bed	1	9
3 bed	7	58
Total	12	100

A range of housing types are being proposed from small sized 1 bed units offering ground floor single storey entry as well as 2 bed, 3 bed, and 4 mews, semi-detached and detached dwellings. The previous scheme did include two 5 bed units but this application no longer proposes any 5 bed units. This general makeup of dwellings would provide a good mix of type, size and coupled with the affordable provision. The proposal would provide a diverse community and would fit in with the existing residential development which varies in terms of its size and type. As such, the scheme is found to be in general accordance with CELPS Policy SC 4 and SADPD Policy HOU 1.

## **Design - Layout, Scale and Appearance**

Amongst other criteria, policy SD2 of the CELPS expects all development to contribute positively to an area's character and identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness in terms of:

- a. Height, scale, form and grouping;
- b. Choice of materials;
- c. External design features;
- d. Massing of development the balance between built form and green/public spaces;
- e. Green infrastructure; and
- f. Relationship to neighbouring properties, street scene and the wider neighbourhood

Policy SE1 of the CELPS expects housing developments to achieve Building for Life 12 (BfL12) standard, and that development proposals consider the wider character of a place in addition to that of the site and its immediate context, to ensure that it reinforces the area in which it is located. These principles are also reflected in the CEC Design Guide. The relevant BfL12 headings are considered below:

**Connections (Green)** – The proposal is well connected within the existing infrastructure with pedestrian, cycle and vehicular routes. Links to the closest PROWs include Gawsworth FP5 & 31 and Sutton FP 46 that runs along the Macclesfield Canal, joining with Sutton FP1 that enables the crossing of the canal. All of the footpaths connect to wider routes leading to Macclesfield Town Centre, Gawsworth, Sutton and beyond.

Where the carving up of LPS sites is necessary to attract investors, each part should interconnect with the adjacent one to enable a whole site design to be developed. The site design should incorporate a collaborative approach with adjoining development plots. Following officer amendments to both this site and layout and the adjoining development during the planning process, the 2 layouts have been amended so that connections between both sites can be made.

**Facilities and Services (Green)** - The site lies close to South Macclesfield where a full range of facilities and services can be accessed. There are shops, pubs, schools and access to local transport hubs, within easy walking distance of the site. In addition to Lyme Green Recreation Ground, located East of the site on Robin Lane, there is an area of public open space provided on site including the provision of Local Area for Play (LAP), which did not feature in the scheme allowed on appeal.

**Public Transport (Green)** - The closest bus stops to the scheme are located on London Road (A523) a short distance from the proposed site access. From services found there, access can be gained into Macclesfield town center and to the National Rail station, with its excellent services to Manchester and the wider UK. As a result, a green light is awarded.

**Accommodation and Tenure Mix (Amber)** - The affordable units are spread through the site albeit they are clustered together in 3 blocks. This assists with management purposes by the Registered Providers (RPs). That said, this application is only for a small number of homes and it is acceptable that some affordable units are clustered in groups as opposed to properly dispersed as set out in Policy SC 5.

**Character (Green)** - The inclusion of some local precedent work and reference to the Cheshire East Borough Design Guide is welcomed and it can be seen where the cues have been taken from. The homes are essentially standard house types and whilst the Design Guide accepts the reality of these, it suggests that these can be given a fresh and modern feel. The scheme as would introduce some well-designed units with a well-conceived layout and follows a similar design approach to that allowed on appeal.

Working with the site and its context (Green) - Areas of existing trees and natural assets are retained and incorporated within the layout design. The listed building, Toll Bar Cottage, adjacent to the Eastern edge of the development has been identified as an asset and as a unique feature close to the site. The LPS requirements ask that to retain the setting of this building, a green buffer is maintained by the retention of the existing greening and pedestrian accessway along Gaw End Lane. The scheme includes a good landscaping buffer with the nearest units stepped back into the site. Parallel to London Road, the homes along this edge face outwards but although a pathway has been introduced onto this edge to create a more informal walkway / cycleway. The use of shared surfaces in this location would enable a more efficient use of the land.

**Creating well defined streets, easy to find your way around and streets for all (Green)** - There is a clear hierarchy leading from the main entrance into the site, through and to the outskirts of the development. The proposed character areas, use of materials and units as well pockets of green infrastructure would be acceptable. Corner turning types provide strong architectural features and designs to enable an increase in legibility across the site and nodal points provide good focal points.

**Car Parking (Amber)** - A mix of parking solutions is encouraged by the Design Guide so that the street scene isn't dominated by vehicles. The development has achieved a varied mix of parking solutions across the site.

**Public and private spaces (Amber)** - Houses have reasonably sized rear gardens and some space to the front too which is well defined.

**External storage and amenity space (Amber)** - Houses have reasonably sized rear gardens, large enough to house the bin/recycling stores. These rear gardens have a clear external route to the front of the property for bin collection without the need to go through homes. Garages are provided at some plots, maybe with the intention of use for bike storage.

In terms of appearance, the proposed dwellings would be acceptable within the context of the site and would offer a degree of variation within the street. It is

considered that the overall design, scale, form and appearance of the proposals would be acceptable subject to the use of high quality materials. The proposal achieves a well-designed residential development which would accord with LPS 17 and the Cheshire East Design Guide.

## **Impact on Designated Heritage Assets**

The land lies adjacent to the grade II listed properties Toll Bar Cottage and Lyme Green Hall with its gardens bordering the road. In considering whether to grant planning permission, the Council shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses (Section 66 of the Planning (listed buildings and Conservation areas) Act 1990, section 66).

The change of use of this land from greenfield to residential will inevitably alter the rural feeling at this point when entering or exiting the outskirts of Macclesfield. Currently both Toll Bar Cottage and Lyme Green Hall enjoy rural views. This proposed development will alter that view. Although the harm to the views from both properties will be less than substantial, there will be a change to the setting of both properties. This is particularly true of Toll Bar Cottage as it will be looking directly onto proposed plots 1-4. Toll Bar Cottage as its name suggests historically would have been the first building to be seen when traveling towards Macclesfield, its very purpose was to look down London Road, it has enjoyed that view since it was built.

The objective of the policies is to maintain and manage change to heritage assets in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance. That significance is the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic, or historic. This significance may derive not only from its physical presence but also from its setting. The setting of a heritage asset is defined as: The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.

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.

Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

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.

The nearest units directly opposite Toll bar Cottage are pulled back into the site and a green landscaping buffer provided to the northern corner of the site, similar to the appeal scheme. Further, the design of the scheme including its layout and architectural form have been elevated in terms of their design quality. The harm to the setting of both designated heritage assets has been reduced to the lesser end of less than substantial. It is considered that this harm is balanced and outweighed against the wider benefits of the scheme, which are providing housing in sustainable location and helping to deliver housing in line with one the of the council's strategic housing allocations. Accordingly, the proposal would not conflict with CELPS Policies SE1 and SE7 of the Cheshire East or NPPF advice.

## Landscaping

The application site is bound to the east by the A523 London Road, to the north by Gaw Lane End and to the south by Rayswood Nature Reserve, which also lies within the boundary of the Peak Fringe Local Landscape Designation Area (LLD), formerly known as a Area of Special County Value (ASCV).

Policy LPS17 Gaw Lane, Macclesfield indicates that the whole of the allocation site will allow the delivery of 300 homes, it also identifies that there will be green buffers to London Road and the Macclesfield Canal as well as an area of protected open space adjacent to Rayswood Nature Reserve.

While Policy LPS17 requires a green buffer along London Road and with Raywsood Nature Reserve, the proposal subject of this site represents a modest part of the overall site allocation. It is in part visually distinct from the remainder of the site allocation further to the north which achieves a much larger frontage to London Road and the Nature Reserve. The proposal has been amended so that the built form has been set back at the northern end where Gaw End Lane meets with London Road. This has allowed for a better standoff and the incorporation of soft landscaping to soften the transition. Elsewhere along the London Road frontage, a pedestrian / cycleway would be secured with complimentary planting along the frontage.

With respect to Rayswood Nature Reserve, as amended a defensible c5 metre buffer is provided. A condition requiring submission of a landscaping scheme to ensure appropriate species and density or planting are recommended. The proposals comply with Policy LPS17, and policies SE1 Design and SE4 The Landscape.

#### Education

One of the site specific principles of the site allocation under LPS 17 is that the development of the site will require "contributions to education and health facilities". In the case of the current proposal for 40 dwellings, a development of this size would generate:

- 8 primary children (40 x 0.19)
- 6 secondary children (40 x 0.15)

• 0 SEN children (42 x 0.51 x 0.023%)

The development is expected to impact on both primary school and secondary places in the immediate locality. Any contributions which have been negotiated on other developments are factored into the forecasts undertaken by the Council's Children's Services both in terms of the increased pupil numbers and the increased capacity at schools in the area as a result of agreed financial contributions. The Council's Children's Services has confirmed that there would be a shortfall in secondary school places but not at primary and SEN level for this proposed development. The shortfall in secondary provision would be secured by a commuted sum of £81,713.45 via a s106 legal agreement.

#### Healthcare

The views of the NHS Eastern Cheshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) have been sought but no response has been received. In the absence of any response form the NHS, it is advised that they would not be seeking any financial contributions from this development nor was one secured as part of the previous appeal scheme.

## **Public Open Space and Recreation**

The local plan allocation for this site and Policy SE 6 of the CELPS sets out that the open space requirements for housing development are (per dwelling):

- Children's play space 20sqm
- Amenity Green Space 20sqm
- Allotments 5sqm
- Green Infrastructure connectivity 20sqm

This policy states that it is likely that the total amount of 65sqm per home (plus developer contributions for outdoor and indoor sports) would be required on major Greenfield and brownfield development sites. At 65sqm per dwelling, the total amount of on-site open space required would be up to 2,600 square metres.

The applicant claims that the proposed layout incorporates 3,374 square metres of open space. This comprises of a newly proposed area of open space and Local Area for Play located within the site rather than relying on offsite provision. Some of the open space includes green infrastructure, which is not open space. However, excluding the areas of green infrastructure, the quantum of space would amount to around 2,700 square metres. In light of the support from the council's Green spaces Officer, the level of provision is deemed to be acceptable.

With respect to Recreation and Outdoor Sport (ROS), this will not be provided on site. To mitigate the impact of the development, the payment of a commuted sum for offsite provision would be needed. This will be calculated at a rate of £1,000 per family dwelling or £500 per bed space in apartments. The same request for indoor sport provision as the previous scheme would be secured.

Subject to this, the council's Green Spaces Officer has confirmed accordance with CELPS policies SE6, SC1 and SC2 and SADPD Policy REC3.

## **Residential Amenity**

CELPS Policy SE 12 states that development should ensure an appropriate level of privacy for new and existing residential properties. Policy HOU 12 of the SADPD states development proposals must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of adjoining or nearby occupiers of residential properties, sensitive users or future occupiers of the proposed development due to:

- 1. loss of privacy;
- 2. loss of sunlight and daylight;
- 3. the overbearing and dominating effect of new buildings;
- 4. environmental disturbance or pollution; or
- 5. traffic generation, access and parking.

Policy HOU13 of the SADPD sets out standards of space between dwellings, which new housing development is generally expected to meet. This is required to maintain an adequate standard of privacy and amenity between residential properties, unless the design and layout of the scheme and its relationship to the site and its characteristics provide a commensurate degree of light and privacy between buildings.

However, the CE Design Guide states separation distances should be seen as guide rather than a hard and fast rule. The Design Guide does however acknowledge that the distance between rear facing habitable room windows should not drop below 21m. 18m front to front will also provide a good level of privacy, but if this applied too rigidly it will lead to uniformity and limit the potential to create strong streetscenes and variety, and so this distance could go down as low as 12m in some cases.

The nearest existing residential properties are located to the north and north west on the opposite side of Gaw End Lane. The proposed layout shows that the part of the development fronting Gaw End Lane would achieve a separation distance of at least 22 metres with the nearest property referred to as 'The Bungalow'. This is sufficient to ensure no material harm to neighbouring amenity by reason of loss of light, direct overlooking or visual intrusion. As such, the amenity afforded to existing properties would be respected.

The layout within the site ensures the relationships between the new dwellings result in acceptable standards of space, light and privacy for future occupants, having regard to the distance guidelines set out above. There will be sufficient private amenity space for each new dwelling. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with SADPD policies HOU 12 and HOU 13.

#### **Noise**

The application is supported by a Road Traffic Noise Impact Assessment. The impact of the noise from road traffic on London Road on the proposed

development has been assessed in accordance with British Standard BS8233:2014 Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings. The report recommends noise mitigation measures in the form of specific glazing, ventilation and acoustic fencing which are designed to achieve BS8233: 2014 and WHO guidelines; to ensure that future occupants of the properties are not adversely affected by environmental noise. The proposal complies with policy SE 12 of the CELPS relating to noise and soundproofing.

## **Air Quality**

Policy SE 12 of the Local Plan states that the Council will seek to ensure all development is located and designed so as not to result in a harmful or cumulative impact upon air quality. This is in accordance with paragraph 109 of the NPPF and the Government's Air Quality Strategy. A scheme of this size does not meet the criteria to require an air quality impact assessment according to the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) and Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) guidance. The Council's Environmental Protection Unit has therefore confirmed that the addition of these extra dwellings would have a minimal impact and is considered insignificant in line with the previously mentioned guidance. Subject to electric vehicle charging infrastructure (now secured under Building Regulations) and a dust management plan, the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the air quality and the proposal will comply with Policy SE 12 of the CELPS.

# **Public Rights of Way and Accessibility**

Policy LPS 17 includes the following requirements for this site:

- Pedestrian and cycle links to new and existing residential areas, shops, schools and health facilities;
- Green infrastructure which should include ...green linkages to the wider footpath network, habitats and site LPS 13 including links to the north/south strategic link of the Macclesfield Canal.

The site does not directly affect a public right of way. However, there are a number in the vicinity of the site. In order to encourage people to walk and cycle for travel purposes and for healthy leisure activities, specific support and facilities should be offered to people at a 'transition point' in their lives, for instance, when they are changing job, house or school. The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) guidance *Walking and cycling: local measures to promote walking & cycling as forms of travel or recreation*, November 2012, states that "at these times people may be open to trying a new mode of transport or new types of recreation". It is therefore important that the facilities for walking and cycling, including routes, destination signage (secured by condition) and information materials, are completed and available for use prior to the first occupation of any property within any phase of the development, and remain available for use during the completion of other phases. This proposal would not undermine the justification to Policy LPS 17 of the CELPS.

## **Highways**

There is single priority junction access to London Road to serve this development. The Head of Strategic Infrastructure (HSI – Highways) has confirmed that a single access is acceptable to serve the 40 units proposed. The access road has a 5.5m carriageway with 6m radii, the initial section of road has a footway on both sides with the remaining section being shared surface. The applicant has submitted swept paths that indicates that a refuse vehicle can enter the site and turn within the turning area at the end of the access road.

## Access Visibility

The appropriate SSD's stopping sight distance) to be provided at the access point has been calculated from the applicant's speed survey undertaken on London Road. The 85%ile speeds are 47.1 mph northbound and 49.4 mph southbound and the necessary visibility splays of 2.4m x 160m in both directions for these speeds have been provided.

## Pedestrian/Cycle Access

The submitted layout plan includes a 2m footway along the eastern boundary of the site with London Road. Whilst this facility is welcomed, the HSI has recommended that this should be a 3m pedestrian/cycleway as this will link to a similar facility being provided by the larger residential development just north of this development. There is also a pedestrian connection at 2 points to the west of the site into the adjoining development and also to Gaw End Lane at the north end of the site. This is considered acceptable. The increase in width to the footway / cycleway was not deemed necessary when the inspector determined the previous appeal and so in light of this, it would be unreasonable to insist that this is increased in width in this particular case.

### Traffic Impact

The level of development is considerably below the threshold that requires a Transport Assessment to be undertaken as it normally expected that the traffic generation from this level of development would not result in capacity problems. The applicant has submitted some trip generation figures that indicate that circa 21 two-way trips would be generated in the peak hours. This level of generation would have a minimal impact on the local highway network and the impact is considerable acceptable.

## Car Parking

The car parking provision for each of the units is provided in accordance with CEC parking standards, 1 space for one bedroom, 2 spaces for 2 to 3 beds and 3 spaces for 4/5 beds.

## Summary

The proposed access and internal road layout is a satisfactory design to serve the 40 dwellings proposed and adequate parking is provided in accordance with CEC standards. The vehicle speeds on London Road have been surveyed and are in excess of the posted 40mph speed limit in both directions at the proposed access point. Visibility splays in accordance with the measured 85%ile speeds have been provided to ensure that the required SSD is met.

The submitted layout is acceptable in highway terms.

#### **Trees**

The site allocation refers to the requirement for green buffers to London Road/Leek Road as part of the provision of Green Infrastructure. In this regard the retention of existing tree cover through the delivery of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment has identified those trees appropriate for retention within the proposed development. Any tree identified as High (A) or Moderate (B) category in accordance with the definitions in BS5837:2012 *Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction* – Recommendations should be given priority for retention within the new development.

The site specific principles of LPS17 also make particular reference to Toll Bar Cottage and the retention of mature boundary landscaping opposite the property. There are a number of individual and groups of mature hedgerow trees to the south of Gaw End Lane which make a significant contribution to the existing landscape setting.

The scheme has been designed where all structures are located outside of the Root Protection Area of the retained trees and any indirect impacts can be controlled by appropriate tree protection measures. The proposal would result in the part removal of a hawthorn hedge along the London Road frontage and the southern boundary. Five no. trees are proposed to be removed to accommodate the proposal, whereas one no. tree is proposed for removal due to poor condition and limited long-term retention value. The trees and hedgerows proposed for removal range from low to moderate quality and therefore their loss can be offset through the proposed replacement planting.

The amended plans present no significant arboricutural implications. Accordingly, compliance with policy SE 5 of the CELPS and LPS 17 is confirmed.

## **Ecology**

The site is within close proximity to 'Rayswood Nature Reserve' and falls within Natural England's SSSI risk zones associated with Danes Moss. The application site falls within a core area of the CEC Ecological Network which forms part of the SADPD. Policy ENV1 requires developments within core areas to lead to benefits for priority habitats. Policy ENV 2 and SE3 also require all developments to make a positive contribution to the conservation of biodiversity.

The proposed development has the potential to lead to an overall increase in native hedgerows (a priority habitat) which would be sufficient to comply with policy ENV1. The overall losses and gains of biodiversity resulting from the development can be assessed using the biodiversity metric as discussed below.

Hedgerows - Native hedgerows are a priority habitat. The submitted Arboriculture Impact Assessment advises that there would be losses from three hedgerows on site (hedgerows 1, 2 and 3) as a result of proposed access points. The biodiversity metric (discussed below) can be utilised to establish whether sufficient compensatory planting is being provided.

Coastal and Flood Plain Grazing Marsh - The application site is listed on the national Inventory of Floodplain and Grazing Marsh Priority Habitat. Habitats of this type are a material consideration for planning. The habitats present on the application site, however, only partly meet the description of this priority habitat type. Much of the nature conservation value of grazing marsh habitats is associated with the related ditches. Only one ditch is present on site. This is a dry ditch on the site's southern boundary. It is therefore advised that it must be ensured that the existing ditch is retained and enhanced as part of the proposed development. This could be added to the submitted landscape master plan and secured by means of a condition if planning consent is granted. The dry ditch would be lost under the appeal scheme.

Great Crested Newts - There are a number of ponds within 250m of the application site that may potentially support Great Crested Newts. The revised ecological assessment concludes that potential impacts on great crested newts are unlikely. This conclusion is largely based upon the results of GCN surveys undertaken in 2018, although other factors were also considered. The Council's Nature Conservation Officer (NCO) has advised that this survey data is now too old to form the basis of an assessment of the current proposals and an updated Great Crested Newt Survey be undertaken.

Alternatively, the applicant could consider entry into Natural England's District Level Licencing Scheme. If the applicant intends to pursue this option, a copy of the countersigned Impact Assessment and Conservation Payment Certificate will be required as evidence of eligibility to join the scheme. In the light of the appeal scheme and therefore extant approval, this approach is not considered unreasonable.

Common Toad - No evidence of this priority species was recorded during the surveys to date. However, there is a possibility this species may occur on site on at least a transitory basis. The proposed development would have a localised adverse impact on this species, if present, as a result of the loss of relatively low value terrestrial habitat. The submitted Great Crested Newt report includes measures to reduce the risk of this species being killed or injured during the site clearance and construction process. If planning consent is granted, these measures would be secured by means of condition.

Badger - The initial surveys submitted in support of this application recorded a potential single entrance badger sett being present on site. The sett has been subject to recent surveys which have confirmed the presence of a single animal.

The sett is an outlying sett. In the absence of mitigation, the proposed development would result in the loss of the sett and the risk of badger being killed or disturbed during construction works. In order to avoid the risk of badgers being harmed the applicant's ecological consultant has proposed the closure of the sett under the terms of a Natural England license. If planning consent is granted, this approach would be acceptable to minimise the risk to badgers.

The proposed development would result in the loss of suitable foraging habitat which would have a low adverse impact upon the species. As the status of badgers on site can change in a short time scale, a condition should be attached which requires the submission of an updated badger survey and mitigation strategy prior to the commencement of development.

Bats (Trees) - A number of trees on site were identified as having potential to support roosting bats. No evidence of roosting bats has been recorded in the trees proposed to be removed. Based upon the current status of bats on site the proposed development is not likely to result in an adverse impact upon roosting bats. The status roosting bats associated with the trees on site may however change in the future. A condition should be attached which requires the undertaking and submission of a further bat survey prior to the commencement of development.

Lighting - To avoid any adverse impacts on bats resulting from any lighting associated with the development, a condition should be attached requiring any additional lighting to be agreed with the LPA.

This condition can be avoided if proposals are submitted prior to determination.

Nesting Birds - If planning consent is granted standard conditions would be required to safeguard nesting birds.

Biodiversity Net Gain - Local Plan Policy SE 3(5) requires all developments to aim to positively contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and ENV2 requires developments to achieve a Biodiversity Net Gain. In order to assess the potential losses and gains of biodiversity resulting from the development the applicant has submitted a report of an assessment undertaken using the Defra biodiversity version 4.0 'metric' methodology. The submitted biodiversity Net Gain report advises that the development as proposed would result in a net gain 20.62% for area-based habitats and 172.99% for hedgerow units.

The spreadsheet undertaken to complete the calculation however identifies down-trading errors. These errors occur where habitats being lost are being replaced by habitats of lower value or of a different type. Where this occurs developments cannot be said to achieve a biodiversity net gain. The application therefore does not comply with Policy ENV2. There is also an error reported in the metric relating to the area entered for habitat lost and the area entered for created.

Finally, 'other-neutral grassland' in good condition has been entered into the metric as a proposed habitat on site. The NCO advises that the small areas of

seeded grassland on site are unlikely to achieve required number of species per metre square or support a diverse sward as required to achieve good condition. Moderate condition is a more realistic target for this habitat.

Whilst the BNG metric and Biodiversity Net Gain proposals could be revised to address the above points, in light of the extant permission, which is a material consideration in favour of the scheme, in this case, the proposal is found to be acceptable in this regard.

This planning application provides an opportunity to incorporate features to increase the biodiversity value of the final development. The applicant has submitted an ecological enhancement strategy which includes proposals for the incorporation of features such as bat and bird boxes, brash piles and native species planting. If planning consent is granted, the NCO has recommended that these be secured by condition.

## Flood Risk and Drainage

With reference to the Environment Agency flood risk mapping data and the Flood Risk Assessment, the site is located within Flood Zone 1. In terms of pluvial flood risk there is an area of risk within the northern section of the site which will need to be safely managed through the proposed surface water drainage design and overland flow routing.

The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has confirmed that subject to conditions and compliance with other legislation outside of the planning forum (i.e. building regulations and land drainage consents), the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its impacts on flooding and drainage. Due to the final outfall destination for the ordinary watercourse (located southwest of the development site) being Macclesfield Canal the applicant must ensure that any required approvals/consents from the Canal and River Trust are obtained prior to detailed design stage.

LLFA approval is subject to the proposed development having a sustainable surface water drainage strategy and subject to there being no increase in flood risk on/off site because of the development. This detailed design would be secured by condition.

#### Peat

The Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment confirms that peat is present adjacent to the site but not within it.

## **Other Matters Raised by Representation**

Whilst a representative of Rayswood Nature Reserve has expressed concern about the form of boundary treatments (requiring a defensible barrier to prevent access), unauthorised access is a civil matter.

## **S106 HEADS OF TERMS**

A s106 agreement is currently being negotiated to secure:

- Affordable Housing comprising 30% (65% of which will be for social / affordable rent and 35% for shared ownership / intermediate tenure)
- Education contributions of £81,713.45
- Public Open Space contributions towards Recreation Outdoor Sports of £1,000 per family dwelling or £500 per bed space in apartments
- Indoor Sport contribution of £11800 towards Macclesfield Leisure Centre
- Management Plan for onsite Public Open Space and LAP

## **CIL Regulations**

In order to comply with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 it is necessary for planning applications with legal agreements to consider the issue of whether the requirements within the S106 satisfy the following:

- (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.

The provision of affordable housing, public open space, recreation outdoor sport (financial) mitigation would be necessary, fair and reasonable to provide a sustainable form of development, to contribute towards sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities and to comply with local and national planning policy.

The development would result in increased demand for secondary school places within the catchment area which currently have a shortfall of school places. In order to increase the capacity of the schools which would support the proposed development, a contribution towards secondary school education is required based upon the number of units applied for. This is considered to be necessary and fair and reasonable in relation to the development.

All elements are necessary, directly relate to the development and are fair and reasonable in relation to the scale and kind of the development

#### **CONCLUSIONS**

The proposal seeks to provide 40 dwellings on part of a site allocated within the CELPS. Consent has recently been granted on appeal for a larger scheme of 42 units and this proposal would not significantly deviate from this extant position. The comments received in representations have been given due consideration, however, subject to condition and \$106 agreement, the proposal complies with all relevant policies of the development plan and is therefore a sustainable form of development. On this basis, the proposal would bring environmental, economic and social benefits and is therefore considered to be acceptable in the context of the relevant policies of the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy and the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document and advice contained within the NPPF.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

# APPROVE subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement making provision for:

S106	Amount	Trigger
Affordable Housing – on-site provision	<ul> <li>30% of total number of dwellings shall be affordable (12)</li> <li>Affordable Housing split 65% and</li> </ul>	To be completed before 50% of the market housing is sold
	Affordable Rented Housing and 35% Intermediate Dwellings	or let
	- Retained as Affordable	
Education –	Contribution of £81,713.45 towards secondary	Prior to
Commuted sum	education provision.	commencement
Open Space –	- Submission/approval of an Open Space	Prior to
On site delivery	Scheme with detailed specifications for LAP	commencement
Open Space – management	- Submission/approval of Management and Maintenance Plan	Prior to commencement
	- Establishment of a private management company to manage & maintain the	
	relevant POS in perpetuity.	Prior to first occupation
Recreational Open Space - commuted sum	£1000 per family dwelling and £500 per 2+ bed apartment towards additions, improvements and enhancements in line with the Council's Playing Field Strategy or subsequent adopted policies.	Prior to first occupation
Indoor Sport – Commuted sum	Indoor Sport commuted sum of £11800 towards Macclesfield Leisure Centre - Calculated using Sport England Facility Calculator model and used in line with the Indoor Built Facilities Strategy and REC2.	Prior to first occupation

# And the following conditions:

- Standard Time limit 3 years
   Accordance with Approved / Amended Plans

- 3. Access to be constructed in accordance with approved plan prior to first occupation
- 4. Details of footway along eastern boundary to be submitted and pedestrian refuge to Lond Road
- 5. Submission of Construction Method Statement
- 6. Submission of contaminated land survey
- 7. Remediation of contaminated land
- 8. Details of drainage strategy to be submitted
- 9. Submission of existing and finished ground and floor levels
- 10. Landscaping scheme to be submitted including details of hard surfacing materials and details of hedgerow retention / mitigation and retention of ditch to southern boundary
- 11. Submission of Ecological Enhancement Strategy for the incorporation of on site features to enhance the biodiversity value of the proposed development
- 12. Entry of scheme onto Natural England's district licencing scheme
- 13. Submission of Habitat Creation Method Statement and a 30-year Habitat Management Plan for the retained and newly created habitats
- 14. Accordance with submitted noise mitigation scheme
- 15. Development to be carried out in accordance with submitted Flood Risk Assessment
- 16. Strategy for the incorporation of features to enhance the biodiversity value of the proposed development for use by roosting bats and nesting birds
- 17. Details of external lighting scheme to be submitted approved and implemented
- 18. Accordance with submitted facing materials or details to be submitted and approved
- 19. Updated Badger Survey to be submitted, approved and implemented
- 20. The proposed development to proceed in strict accordance with the Amphibian Reasonable Avoidance Measures detailed in the submitted Great Crested Newt Impact Assessment
- 21. Details of LAP Play area to be provided

In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions / informatives / planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Head of Planning (Regulation) has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Strategic Planning Board, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.

