

Application No: 22/3217C

Location: Recipharm, LONDON ROAD, HOLMES CHAPEL, CHESHIRE, CW4 8BE

Proposal: Outline application with all matters reserved except for access, for the erection of a new manufacturing building and associated plant and landscaping

Applicant: Nick Atkinson, Recipharm HC Limited

Expiry Date: 10-Feb-2023

**CONCLUSION:**

The site is previously developed land within a Strategic Employment Area, the principle of the proposed development is supported within the CELPS (Policy EG1), the SADPD (EMP1) and the HCNP (Policy ES2).

The proposed development is considered acceptable and uses the established existing site access to London Road. The proposal would not have a material traffic impact on the local road network. The proposed development is considered to comply with policies CO1 and CO2 of the CELPS, INF3 of the SADPD, and TT2 and TT3 of the HCNP.

The matters of appearance, landscape, layout and scale are all reserved. There is no reason why an acceptable scheme could not be secured at the Reserved Matters stage to deal with design, amenity, noise and parking provision

The development will be acceptable in terms of its drainage/flood risk implications and in terms of the impact upon ecology.

The development would result in the loss of 10 Lombardy Poplar trees. Due to the industrial nature of the site usage and limited public access, in addition to the species present and the relatively short safe and useful life expectancy of Lombardy Poplar, there are no objections to the principal of their removal. Replacement planting will be secured at the Reserved Matters stage.

The development complies with the Development Plan as a whole.

**SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:**

**APPROVE subject to the following conditions**

## **PROPOSAL**

This is an outline planning application for the erection of a new manufacturing building and associated plant and landscaping. Access is to be determined at this stage with all other matters reserved.

Vehicular access would be taken via the existing employment site onto London Road (A50).

## **SITE DESCRIPTION**

The application site consists of a parcel of previously developed land to the northern part of the Recipharm site. The site is located within the Holmes Chapel Settlement Boundary.

There are industrial buildings to the north and east associated with the existing business. The main part of the site has a concrete slab associated where a former building which stood on the site and the northern part of the site is landscaped.

To the south of the site is the tree lined River Croco.

Part of the application site is located within Flood Zone 1.

## **RELEVANT HISTORY**

15/3847C - Part A: Outline permission with all matters reserved except for means of access for: • Extensions to Area 12 Manufacturing building, Area 11 Warehousing building, Area 77 Laboratory building and Area 37 Stability building; • Relocation of service buildings and the erection of storage tanks, substation and associated plant; and • Provision of additional staff car parking Part B: Full planning permission for: • Extension to Area 13 Building to create new reception area, canteen and office floor space (2,775m<sup>2</sup>) • Demolition of Building 15; and • Alterations to internal roads and servicing area, provision of new internal HGV lay by, installation of new access gates and associated boundary treatments – Approved 26<sup>th</sup> November 2015

15/2154C - Variation of Condition 13 with respect to permission 12/2217C; Reserved Matters Application pursuant to Outline planning permission 11/1682C proposing full details for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for a residential development comprising 224 dwellings, internal access road, open space and landscaping on the Former Fisons site, Marsh Lane, Holmes Chapel – Approved 4<sup>th</sup> September 2015

12/0311C - Removal of Condition 40 of Approved Application 11/1682C - Relating to Details of Mini Roundabout – Withdrawn 19<sup>th</sup> June 2012

11/1682C - Outline Application Including Means of Access for Up to 231 Residential Units, Local Needs Retail Foodstore (A1), Commercial Development Comprising B1(a) Offices, B1(c) Light Industrial, Medical Facility (D1), Care Home (C2) and Children's Day Care Facility (D1), Part Retention of the Former Fisons Building (frontage), demolition of rear wings and Change of Use to Public House (A4), Restaurant (A3), Care Home (C2) and Hotel (C1) in addition to Provision of Public Open Space, Landscaping and other ancillary works – Approved 9<sup>th</sup> December 2011

08/0405/FUL - New energy centre and assoc. ancillary equipment, new sprinkler water storage tank and pump house – Approved 15<sup>th</sup> May 2008

06/1272/FUL - Proposed new single storey fibre-glass enclosure for new sub station – Approved 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2007

05/1026/FUL - Erection of security fences, gates, barriers, security cabin, flag poles, landscaping, vehicle layby and footpaths within the existing site boundary – Approved 14<sup>th</sup> November 2005

28429/3 - Demolition of existing single storey sheet clad warehouse and erection of single storey temporary building complex for scientific laboratories and offices – Approved 24<sup>th</sup> September 1996

22637/3 - Workshop, temporary offices and temporary store – Approved 2<sup>nd</sup> October 1990

20589/3 - Dismantling and reconstruction of existing stores with an addition of new extension and first floor area – Approved 24<sup>th</sup> January 1989

14688/3 - Re-locating three existing temporary buildings to allow future construction works – Approved 9<sup>th</sup> February 1983

## **POLICIES**

### **Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy**

PG1 - Overall Development Strategy

PG2 – Settlement Hierarchy

PG7 – Spatial Distribution of Development

SD1 - Sustainable Development in Cheshire East

SD2 - Sustainable Development Principles

EG1 – Economic Prosperity

EG3 – Existing and Allocated Employment Sites

SE 1 - Design

SE 2 - Efficient Use of Land

SE 3 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity

SE 4 - The Landscape

SE 5 - Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland

SE 3 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity

SE 8 – Low Carbon Energy

SE12 – Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability

SE 13 - Flood Risk and Water Management

IN1 – Infrastructure

IN2 – Developer Contributions

CO1 – Sustainable Travel and Transport

CO2 – Enabling Business Growth through Transport Infrastructure

CO4 – Travel Plans and Transport Assessments

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

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  
RUR5 – Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land  
EMP1 – Strategic Employment Allocations  
HOU12 – Amenity  
INF1 – Cycleways, Bridleways and Footpaths  
INF3 – Highways Safety and Access  
INF9 – Utilities

### **Neighbourhood Plan**

The Holmes Chapel Neighbourhood Plan was made on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2017

ES2 – Encourage Greater Employment Opportunities  
CE5 – Character and Design  
CE7 - Water Management on New Developments  
TT1 - Promoting Sustainable Transport  
TT2 – Congestion and Highway Safety  
TT3 - Parking

### **National Policy**

The National Planning Policy Framework

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Head of Strategic Infrastructure:** No objection.

**Jodrell Bank:** No comments received.

**Cadent Gas:** No comments received.

**United Utilities:** General advice provided and a drainage condition suggested.

**Flood Risk Manager:** Conditions are suggested relating to a drainage strategy and finished floor levels.

**Environment Agency:** The development site appears to have been the subject of past industrial activity which poses a high risk of pollution to controlled waters. Recommend that the Council considers EA Guidance.

Recommend consultation with your Environmental Health/Environmental Protection Department for advice on generic aspects of land contamination management. Where planning controls are considered necessary, the EA recommend that the environmental protection of controlled waters is

considered alongside any human health protection requirements. This approach is supported by paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Environmental Health:** Conditions suggested relating to noise mitigation, external lighting, travel plan, low emission boilers and contaminated land.

## **VIEWS OF THE PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL**

**Holmes Chapel Parish Council:** The Parish Council has no objection and is supportive in principle of the development; however, the Parish Council wish to be fully aware of any reserved matters so that they can make further representation regarding the development.

**Brereton Parish Council:** Brereton Parish Council are concerned about the land being contaminated and wish to see further evidence that allays these concerns.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

A letter of objection has been received from a local household which raises the following points;

- This application places several potentially explosive cylinders beside residential properties containing families with young children. This is a dangerous proposal and should not be allowed to go any further.

A letter of objection has been submitted on behalf of Bridgemount Property Ltd which raises the following points;

- Bridgemount were not notified of the planning application.
- Bridgemount own Plot C of the wider site (to the west of this application site).
- Plots A and B have been developed for residential use and Plot C has a lawfully implemented permission for a Sainsburys supermarket.
- Bridgemount is seeking to bring forward a viable development as a sole C3 use or a mixed-use development and is engaging with housebuilders and commercial operators. It is intended that an application will be made in the coming months
- Whilst the Bridgemount site does not benefit from planning permission or an allocation it would constitute an appropriate location for residential use.
- Application 12/2217C establishes the precedent of residential development on plot C as it is a brownfield site within the settlement boundary. It is well related to services and facilities, and appropriate mitigation could be secured between the site and the existing Recipharm site.
- The Gladman scheme opposite was allowed by the SoS and it was confirmed that that site was sustainable.
- In terms of loss of employment site, the position has changed since 12/2217C was approved. Policy E10 of the CLP is no longer saved and Policy EG3 of the CELPS does not relate to this site.
- The Bridgemount site was identified as being suitable, achievable and deliverable in the SHLAA, it is within the settlement boundary, and policies within the Development Plan support the redevelopment of previously developed land.
- The principle of residential development is acceptable on the Bridgemount site (Plot C), and this should be viewed as an 'agent for change' in relation to the ongoing and future operations of the Recipharm site. It is important that the Recipharm application does not undermine the future delivery of the Bridgemount site for a residential development (full or in part).

- The current Recipharm application makes no reference to the Bridgemount site and its possible future redevelopment.
- The application does not include plans or technical detail in terms of the formation of the access
- The parameters plan lacks any specific details. It is important to ensure that the proposed new building acknowledges the appropriate off-set distances to the Bridgemount site. Cross sections should be provided to understand the relationship with the future residential development.
- The illustrative plans identify that a new pipe bridge will be required along the western shared boundary with the Bridgemount site. This is not included within the description of development and no details have been provided. This could undermine the delivery of the Bidgemount site.
- No landscaping is indicated along the boundary with the Bridgemount site.
- The Council should assess the visual impact of the development from the Bridgemount site.
- The number of jobs created raises issues in terms of the impact upon the surrounding road network particularly the A54/A50 junction where the Council has been pooling S106 contributions.
- The dates for the Noise Impact Assessment should be confirmed.
- No information has been provided regarding the source of the noise levels and assumptions.
- Background noise levels have been taken from a single point and there may be higher background noise levels. Background noise levels should be taken from other locations.
- The prediction noise levels should be confirmed.
- The assessment assumes that doors to the manufacturing building will remain closed, but this will not be possible with HGV's servicing the site.
- Some indication should be given to the potential impact upon noise sensitive receptors – this is not fully assessed within the report
- No details of vehicular movements through the night have been provided
- Surprised at the view taken in terms of the A54/A50 junction
- The proposal will result in increased traffic at the junction of the A54/A50 - 14 vehicles in the morning peak and 11 vehicles in the evening peak
- CEC have previously stated that the proposed A54/A50 roundabout junction is absolutely necessary to mitigate the existing and future issues. CEC have acknowledged that there is a significant funding gap to prevent the implementation of the roundabout improvement.
- A contribution should be sought from this development for the H54/A50 junction.
- CEC Highways have stated that they will seek a contribution from the Bridgemount site despite acknowledging that the Sainsburys permission has been lawfully implemented. It is not appropriate for a development which proposes a significant uplift in employment numbers to be the subject of such a basic assessment

## **APPRAISAL**

### **Principle of Development**

Recipharm is a global pharmaceutical Contract Development and Manufacturing Organisation, and they provide pharmaceutical companies development and manufacturing services including inhalation products and devices. The proposal aims to create a manufacturing facility which provides a more sustainable way of producing new metered dose inhaler products.

The application is in outline form but seeks consent for a new manufacturing plant with a maximum height parameter of 15m. To the north of the site the application includes a plant exclusion zone, which is required as the new low greenhouse gas emitting propellants are potentially flammable and they require additional measures to safely manufacture them. The propellant storage area will have space for three tanks.

The site is previously developed land within a settlement boundary for Holmes Chapel. The site is identified as a Strategic Employment Area as part of Policy EMP1 of the SADPD. As part of Policy EMP1 it states that the strategic employment sites are of particular significance to the economy of Cheshire East and that they will be protected. Proposals for future investment for employment uses in these areas will be supported subject to other policies of the Development Plan.

The support for the redevelopment of the site is echoed within Policy EG1 of the CELPS, which states that employment development (B1, B2 and B8) will be supported within the Principal Towns, Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres.

Policy ES2 (Encourage Greater Employment Opportunities) of the HCNP sets out the desire to encourage the establishment and growth of high-quality employment opportunities. Policy ES2 then sets out that proposals to retain land currently used for industrial and employment purposes will be supported. This is subject to the provision of secure and environmentally sensitive off-street parking set out in Policy TT3 (Parking) and compliance with policy CE5 (Character and Design).

The site is previously developed land within a Strategic Employment Area, the principle of the proposed development is supported within the CELPS (Policy EG1), the SADPD (EMP1) and the HCNP (Policy ES2).

### **Highways Implications**

The supporting Transport Statement identifies that the proposal would have a Gross Internal Area of 3,610sq.m. is this correct – should it not be 9,432sqm para 3.5 of Planning Statement. Based upon this floorspace the applicant has assessed the likely trip generation arising from the development having a maximum of 21 peak hour trips. This level of generation is not considered to have a material impact on the local road network or significant enough to warrant mitigation measures to be provided.

The concerns relating to the impact upon the A50/A54 junction are noted. The peak traffic generation from this development is 14 vehicles in the AM Peak (08:00-09:00) and 11 vehicles in the PM Peak (17:00-18:00), this amounts to just 3.3% AM and 0.01% PM impact based upon the level of traffic flow using the A50/A54 junction. Given that any contributions need to be directly related to the impact, it is not considered that a contribution to improve the junction could be required.

Although car parking and cycle parking is a matter to be considered in a reserved matters application there is sufficient existing parking on the site (511 spaces) which can accommodate additional parking demand.

The proposed development is considered acceptable and uses the established existing site access to London Road. The proposal would not have a material traffic impact on the local road network.

The proposed development is considered to comply with policies CO1 and CO2 of the CELPS, INF3 of the SADPD, and TT2 and TT3 of the HCNP.

## **Cycle Provision**

Cycle parking and changing facilities will be a requirement of any reserved matters application and this can be secured via the imposition of a planning condition.

## **Amenity**

The nearest residential properties are to the north of the site, and the indicative plan shows that there would be a separation distance of 97m from the proposed building to the boundary of the site and 47m from the nearest tank. Given the separation distances involved there is unlikely to be any implications in terms of privacy, overbearing impact or loss of light.

## **Noise**

The nearest residential properties are located to the north of the site fronting Severn Way. In support of the application, the applicant has submitted a Noise Impact Assessment and this comments as follows;

- As an outline application the exact noise sources for the proposed B2/B8 usage are not known and the only viable modelling which can be done is for the HGV movements and unloading/loading activities along with fork lift truck movements.
- It is assumed that internal noise levels would be restricted below 80dB as per the other areas of the site. A typical industrial façade gives a sound reduction of 31dB. External noise levels are expected to be at most 49dB radiating from the façade itself.
- In terms of the daytime assessment, the predicted rating falls below the existing typical background sound level at the closest residential properties and no mitigation measures will be required.
- In terms of the night-time assessment again the predicted rating levels fall below the background sound levels. It is also prudent to consider potential sleep disturbance and a 13dB reduction for an open window, shows that internal noise levels would be low enough to achieve levels below the 30dB criterion.
- Any fixed plant would have a low noise level and any impact would be negligible

The impact of the noise from fixed plant and operation on the proposed development has been assessed in accordance with the relevant British Standard. The reports methodology, conclusion and recommendations are accepted by the Environmental Health Officer and there is no reason that an acceptable scheme could not be secured at the Reserved Matters stage

As the application is in outline form and the layout and building design will be determined at a later date, it is considered reasonable to attach a condition to require the Reserved Matters applications to be accompanied by an updated Noise Impact Assessment.

## **Air Quality**

In support of the application the developer has submitted a qualitative screening assessment. The report states that a detailed assessment into the impacts of NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> during the operational phase is not required in accordance with EPUK and IAQM criteria based on the predicted development flows, and concludes, that the development impacts on local air quality would be not significant. The report also concludes that the potential dust impacts during construction would also be not significant subject to appropriate dust mitigation measures.



That being said, there is still a need for the Local Planning Authority to consider the cumulative impact of a large number of developments in a particular area. In particular, the impact of transport related emissions on Local Air Quality. Poor air quality is detrimental to the health and wellbeing of the public and also has a negative impact on the quality of life for sensitive individuals. It is therefore considered appropriate that mitigation should be sought in the form of direct measures to reduce the adverse air quality impact. Conditions could be imposed in terms of low emission boilers and the submission of a Travel Plan.

Subject to the imposition of these conditions the proposed development would comply with policies SE12 of the CELPS and ENV12 of the SADPD.

## **Contaminated Land**

The application site is previously developed land and there are records of landfill within the former Fisons site. The Environmental Health Officer has considered this application and raised no objection. The impact in terms of contaminated land can be controlled via the imposition of a planning conditions. There is no conflict with Policy SE12 of the CELPS.

## **Design**

The site is within the existing Recipharm site and there are utilitarian employment buildings which surround the site. Public views of the site would be limited although the proposal would be visible from the recently constructed residential development to the north fronting Severn Way.

The application includes indicative plans and elevations. However, the matters of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved for later approval. There is no reason why an acceptable design could not be achieved at the Reserved Matters stage that would comply with policies SE1, SD1 and SD2 of the CELPS, GEN1 of the SADPD and CE5 of the HCNP.

## **Ecology**

### Bats

Buildings and trees on site were assessed within Ecological Impact Assessment as offering a negligible potential for roosting bats. This has been accepted by the Councils Ecologist and no further survey effort for bats is required in support of this application.

### Breeding Birds

If planning consent is granted, a condition could be imposed to safeguard breeding birds.

### Great Crested Newts

Due to the surrounding good newt habitat and nearby ponds, the Councils Ecologist has stated that the proposed development presents a potential low risk to newts. This could be mitigated against by the implementation of reasonable avoidance measures. As a result, an appropriate method statement prepared by an ecologist in support of any future reserved matters application can be secured via the imposition of a planning condition.

## Ecological Enhancement

Local Plan Policy SE 3(5) requires all developments to aim to positively contribute to the conservation of biodiversity. This planning application provides an opportunity to incorporate features to increase the biodiversity value of the final development in accordance with this policy. If planning permission is granted a condition should be attached which requires the submission of an ecological enhancement strategy.

## **Trees**

The application site presently benefits from a linear group of Lombardy Poplars (10 in total) which run north to south within the site edged red, no statutory protection applies to these trees.

The application has been supported by a Preliminary Arboricultural Assessment. The report has surveyed the trees in accordance with BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction and categorised them as 9 high quality A Category trees and 1 moderate quality B Category tree. The submitted preliminary Tree Retention and Removal Plan indicates that all trees would be removed to accommodate the proposal. Given the industrial nature of the site usage and limited public access, in addition to the species present and the relatively short safe and useful life expectancy of Lombardy Poplar, there are no objections to the principal of their removal.

However, Local Plan Policy SE 5 requires that all developments should ensure the sustainable management of trees, woodlands and hedgerows including the provision of new planting within new development to retain and improve canopy cover, enable climate adaptation resilience and support biodiversity. This planning application provides an opportunity to incorporate new planting in accordance with this policy. It is recommended that if planning permission is granted any reserved matters application should be supported by a landscape scheme to meet the requirements of this policy and to ensure the delivery of adequate mitigation for any tree losses arising.

## **Energy Efficient Development**

Policy SE 9 (Energy Efficient Development) of the CELPS sets out that;

*'non-residential development over 1,000 square metres will be expected to secure at least 10 per cent 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.'*

It is considered reasonable to impose a condition on any planning approval for the submission of energy saving requirements in line with the above

## **Flood Risk and Drainage**

To the south of the site is the River Croco. The site covered by this application is located within Flood Zone 1 (Low Probability of Flooding) according to the Environment Agency Flood Maps.

The site is largely hardstanding and no flood risk/drainage objections have been raised by the Environment Agency, United Utilities or the Councils Flood Risk Manager. The proposed drainage details can be secured via the imposition of a planning condition.

### **Jodrell Bank**

Although the application falls within the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope consultation Zone Line, Jodrell Bank have not commented on the proposals, suggesting they raise no objections.

### **Other issues**

The letter of objection submitted on behalf of Bridgemount largely relates to a potential future development on land adjoining the application site. This adjacent land does not have any form of planning consent for residential development, it is not allocated for development within the Development Plan and the applicant for this current application states that there is a restrictive covenant which prevents residential development on that site. In comparison the Recipharm site is allocated as a Strategic Employment Site within the Development Plan. It is considered that any future application on the Bridgemount Site would need to take into account the potential issues caused by the Recipharm Site.

A letter of objection expresses concern over the risk from the proposed tanks within the proposed development. The appellant has clarified that the tanks will contain a medical grade propellant called HFA-152a. HFA-152a is an existing propellant, already used in some consumer aerosols (like clean sprays, hair sprays, deodorants, etc), and offers reduced global warming potential versus existing propellants used for inhalers (HFA-134a and HFA-227ea). The applicant has stated that;

*'The design of the new manufacturing facility, and associated propellant storage tanks have been designed in consideration of the flammable properties of the propellant. The British Aerosols Manufacturing Association (BAMA) provides guidance for the safe manufacturing of aerosols products with flammable propellants. Such guidance has been adopted by the consumer aerosols manufacturing industry and has been followed as the basis of safe design with the proposed new facility at Recipharm Holmes Chapel. For bulk storage of propellant, the BAMA guide references the LPG (Liquified Petroleum Gas) Regulations, which define the requirements for the segregation of storage tanks. The LPG regulations have been followed for the design of the facility; the separation distance between the storage tanks and the Recipharm boundary fence line exceeds the minimum requirements defined within the LPG regulations. Both the BAMA guides and the LPG regulations are referenced by the HSE as the source of information relating to safe manufacturing of aerosols with flammable propellants. The design of the facility, storage and process equipment would be subject to process safety risk assessment, including DSEAR, Hazard Study and Layers of Protection Analysis. By undertaking these assessments Recipharm will be able to ensure, and be able to demonstrate, that the design adequately addresses hazards associated with the use of a flammable propellant'*

Should the tanks store more than 50 tonnes of HFA-152a, then Hazardous Substances Consent will be required. The Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) regulations will also need to be considered.

The impact in terms of Health and Safety will be addressed under other legislation and regulated by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and any risk of explosion will be dealt with under their regulatory regimes.

## **PLANNING BALANCE**

The site is previously developed land within a Strategic Employment Area, the principle of the proposed development is supported within the CELPS (Policy EG1), the SADPD (EMP1) and the HCNP (Policy ES2).

The proposed development is considered acceptable and uses the established existing site access to London Road. The proposal would not have a material traffic impact on the local road network. The proposed development is considered to comply with policies CO1 and CO2 of the CELPS, INF3 of the SADPD, and TT2 and TT3 of the HCNP.

The matters of appearance, landscape, layout and scale are all reserved. There is no reason why an acceptable scheme could not be secured at the Reserved Matters stage to deal with design, amenity, noise and parking provision

The development will be acceptable in terms of its drainage/flood risk implications and in terms of the impact upon ecology.

The development would result in the loss of 10 Lombardy Poplar trees. Due to the industrial nature of the site usage and limited public access, in addition to the species present and the relatively short safe and useful life expectancy of Lombardy Poplar, there are no objections to the principal of their removal. Replacement planting will be secured at the Reserved Matters stage.

The development complies with the Development Plan as a whole.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

### **APPROVE subject to the following conditions**

- 1. Standard Outline 1**
- 2. Standard Outline 2**
- 3. Standard Outline 3**
- 4. Approved Plans**
- 5. Reserved Matters for Landscaping to include a scheme of replacement tree planting**
- 6. Detailed Drainage Design to be submitted and approved**
- 7. Finished Floor Levels to be submitted and approved**
- 8. Submission of a scheme for decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources**
- 9. Ecological Enhancement Strategy to be submitted and approved**
- 10. Breeding bird details to be submitted and approved**
- 11. Reserved Matters applications to include Reasonable Avoidance Measures for Great Crested Newts**
- 12. Low emission boilers to be provided**
- 13. Travel Plan to be submitted and approved**
- 14. Reserved Matters to include an updated Noise Impact Assessment**
- 15. Reserved Matters to include cycle parking and changing facilities**

- 16. Contaminated Land – submission of a Phase I Report and if required a Phase II Report**
- 17. Contaminated Land - submission of a Verification Report prior to first occupation**
- 18. Contaminated Land – Importation of soil**
- 19. Contaminated Land – Unexpected contamination**

**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 has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chair of the Southern Planning Committee, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee’s decision.**

