

Application No: 12/0447N

Location: THE OLD CREAMERY, STATION ROAD, WRENBURY, CW5 8EX

Proposal: Provision of 21 X 70m Portal Framed Shed for casting Concrete Products
Provision of 2m Diameter X 10m High Mobile Cement Silo and Three Bay Bin - 8.50 X 2.50

Applicant: Mr G Heath, Concrete Panel Systems Ltd

Expiry Date: 01-May-2012

MAIN ISSUES:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on neighbouring residential amenity.
- Impact on Highway safety and surrounding road network.
- Pollution.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Approved with Conditions

1. REASON FOR REFERRAL

This application has been referred to planning committee because it involves the construction of an industrial building with a floor area greater than 1000m²

2. DESCRIPTION AND SITE CONTEXT

The site measures 0.54ha is currently a vacant brown field site within an area identified as open countryside by the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011.

The site forms part of what is commonly known as Wrenbury Industrial Estate which has a common access point onto Wrenbury Road. The estate is made up of small commercial units (Mill Farm estate) which have their own access onto Station Road and the remnants of the former Wrenbury Creamery and various outbuildings.

The site also includes a residential property, Holly House. The Crewe to Shrewsbury railway line runs to the north west of the site with the River Weaver lying within 50m of the site at its closest point towards the north west.

A public footpath runs across open fields 200m to the south of the site.

3. DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The proposal involves the construction of an industrial building (21 x 70 x 6.6m high) on a vacant plot of land within the confines of an existing industrial estate. The proposal also includes the provision of a 10m high cement silo and batching plant.

The site which measures 0.54ha will be used for the manufacture and storage of concrete panels which are generally used in the construction of steel framed buildings. The manufacturing process involves the importation of the raw materials to create the concrete mix which is then poured into moulds using a conventional mobile cement mixer vehicle within the building. The moulds are then left to cure and placed outside awaiting transportation off site

The proposal follows pre-application advice following an approach by Mr Heath who represents the company, Concrete Panel Systems Ltd and a sister company, Graham Heath Construction Ltd, which occupies an adjacent site for the fabrication of steel frame buildings. Mr Heath has been looking for an appropriate site to manufacture the concrete panels following planning enforcement action against the site which is currently used at Top End Farm, Crewe Green. The site in Crewe Green does not benefit from planning permission and was considered inappropriate and contrary to Local Development Plan policy due to the impact on the Green Belt and Highway safety.

The Authority has received an amended plan and supporting statement on 9th March 2012. This plan indicates the introduction of a second building (12 x 6 x 6m high) which will enclose the concrete batching plant. The applicant states that the enclosure of the batching plant is in response to concerns raised by members of the public over noise and dust emissions.

4. RELEVANT HISTORY (relating to this site and those within the industrial estate)

P91/0001	Change of use to recycling of plastics - Approved 1991.
P91/0228	7 Industrial units - Approved 1992
P92/0340	Extension to industrial unit - Approved 1992
P03/0406	Engineering depot, workshop & store - Approved 1993.
P95/0838	Office building - Approved 1996.

P95/0839	Use of land for outdoor storage in connection with engineering depot Approved 1996.
P95/0223	Paint booth - Approved 1995.
P95/0279	Change of use to manufacture of vending machines Approved 1995
P95/0920	Retention of hard-standing - Approved 1996.
P96/0818	Outline demolition of industrial buildings & erection of dwellings (existing units located adj to Station Road). Refused on appeal 1997.
P97/0938	Vehicle repair shop - Approved 1998.
P02/0698	COU of warehouse to MOT & car care - Approved 2002.
P02/0571	Change of use of ground floor, to manufacture, storage and public house - Approved 2002
P02/0979	Change of use of first floor to guest accommodation in association with brewery - Approved 2002.
P04/0812	Construction of 8 light industrial units - Approved 2004.
P07/0403	11 industrial units – restricted by condition to B1 - Approved 2007.
P08/0070 additional	COU from agricultural contractors to B2 use including an storage shed - Approved 2008
10/2076N	Extension of time to P07/0403 - Approved 2010.
11/1165N	16 Affordable houses Resolution to approve subject to the completion of a Section 106

5. PLANNING POLICIES

Development Plan Policies

Local Plan policy

- NE.2 (Open Countryside)
- BE.1 (Amenity)
- BE.2 (Design Standards)
- BE.3 (Access and Parking)
- BE.4 (Drainage, Utilities and Resources)
- BE.5 (Infrastructure)

BE.6 (Development on Potentially Contaminated Land)
NE.11 (River and Canal Corridors)
NE. 17 (Pollution Control)
E.4 (Development on Existing Employment Areas)
E.6 (Employment Development within open countryside)
TRAN.5 (Provision for Cyclists)

National policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Planning for Growth: Written Ministerial Statement (23rd March 2011)

OBSERVATIONS OF CONSULTEES

United Utilities: No objection subject to planning conditions relating to prior approval of drainage details.

Highway Authority: No objection subject to planning conditions to secure improvements to the access road including a passing bay, control over the number of vehicles and requests financial contribution from the developer to pay for addition road signage and to investigate a possible environmental weight restriction area along Nantwich Road, Wrenbury.

Environmental Heath: No objection subject to conditions relating to approved hours of construction and operation and the submission of agreed details relating to noise mitigation and the control of dust. The department also recommends a watching brief in relation to contaminated land during the construction phase.

Environment Agency: No objection subject to conditions to prevent pollution by contaminated surface water run-off.

Network Rail: No objection.

VIEWS OF THE PARISH COUNCIL:

Wrenbury Parish Council resolved to object to the development on the following grounds:

The site is adjacent to Holly House, a residential property. The proposed development will cause demonstrable harm to the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of this dwelling. The operation will create noise levels of in excess of 100 decibels compared to the background levels of 37 decibels. It will also create lime dust and due to the proposed operating hours it will cause disturbance to the occupiers early in the morning and at weekends. The development will therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Adopted Local Plan which states that “

Clearly this development will not be compatible with adjacent uses and will prejudice the amenity of the occupiers of adjacent property by reason of noise and disturbance. It will also generate levels of traffic that will prejudice the safe movement of traffic on surrounding roads and have an adverse effect on neighbouring uses. It will also lead to an increase in air and pollution.

Please note that the local plan does not state that this policy will be overridden by the former use of the site. In fact the introduction to this section states

“It is important to ensure that new development does not have an adverse impact on the surrounding environment. It is therefore proposed to adopt certain basic criteria relating to amenity, design, access, infrastructure and resources which must be met before development takes place.”

The development will also have an impact on nearby property in Station Road and on the proposed affordable housing site at the Station yard.

It will no doubt be argued that the existing use of the site is industrial due to the previous occupation of the site by Trufood, manufacturers of baby food. The development should however be judged against all policies in the local plan and the proposed use should not override the potential harm to the amenity of adjacent occupiers.

The Parish Council is also of the view that the use of the land surrounding the site has changed over time from an area of general industrial use to one of mixed use. This change has been endorsed by the local planning authority. Holly House was originally a tied dwelling related to the manufacturing unit in a similar way to the relationship between farmhouse and a farm unit. When Trufood closed the use of Holly House as a dwelling was allowed to continue and thus the planning unit changed. If the local planning authority intended that the site should remain wholly industrial it should have taken enforcement action and not allowed the use of Holly House as a separate dwelling, unrelated to a business enterprise, to become established. More recently the planning authority has engaged in discussions about the future of the Station Yard site which has resulted in a planning permission for affordable housing. If the area was to remain industrial this development should not have been granted. Having granted the permission the local planning authority has accepted that the area is one of mixed use. The introduction of a general industrial, use, and one which is more akin to a B3 use, is not compatible with a mixed use area of development where light industrial uses are more appropriate.

The Parish Council notes that an existing Wrenbury firm, BCM, a producer of similar products, was not allowed to relocate to this site in the past and was forced to move to Whitchurch.

The Parish Council is also of the view that Trufood was a less intensive use than the one now proposed. Servicing of the site was significantly different with farmers using their own vehicles to deliver milk to the site. Whilst the number of vehicles may have been similar to those now proposed the nature and tonnage of

the vehicles was significantly different. The impact of these vehicles on the highway network was therefore much less than that which will result from the HGV's that will serve this development. The volume and nature of the traffic will have a major impact on the local highway network particularly at the corners on the road to Aston. These are not "sweeping bends" but are tight corners where traffic has to give way to large vehicles and coaches.

The Parish Council therefore opposes this application as the proposed development will cause demonstrable harm to the residential amenity enjoyed by the adjacent and nearby occupiers, demonstrable harm to highway safety and will cause pollution in term of noise and dust, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Local Plan and urges refusal of the application

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS:

A large number of objections, over 200, have been received including a petition signed by 256 people. The relevant issues are as follows:-

- Traffic safety issues, including inadequate local highway infrastructure especially along Station Road which has narrow points and a very tight 90 degree bend; increased HGV vehicle movements along a country lane without a footpath which is a well used cycle route;
- Noise generation concerns relating to the concrete batching plant and the use of the site as a whole;
- Pollution concerns relating to contamination of the nearby river and the general impact of cement dust on the local population and surrounding agricultural land;
- Lack of details relating to how waste will be managed;
- Concerns of the hours of operation which are considered to be incompatible with surrounding residential amenity;
- Questions marks of the assessment of the former creamery's traffic demand claimed in the supporting traffic statement;
- A previous refusal for a similar use on this site;
- Questions of the sustainability of the site;
- The development will have a negative visual impact;
- The proposal will conflict with the recently approved affordable housing scheme;
- The development will have an adverse impact on tourism;
- The proposal fails to provide an environmental impact assessment.
- There are more appropriate sites elsewhere.
- Impact on the line of trees along the shared access.

A number of local resident's have commissioned an independent report by Rex Brockway who is a Chartered Town Planner.

The summery of the report states;

The proposed concrete plant, with attendant problems of noise and dust and an increase in HGV traffic, would represent a departure from the Local Planning Authority's established practice of restricting development on Wrenbury industrial estate to that which would not harm the amenity of the rural area in general and nearby residents in particular.

The proposed increase in HGV traffic would worsen problems of highway safety already experienced on local roads, discourage walking and cycling between Aston and the railway station and facilities located in Wrenbury, and damage the character of Aston Conservation Area.

A Noise Impact Assessment by Dynamic Response finds there to be lower background noise levels than submitted on behalf of the applicant and that if the batching plant is located externally and is allowed to operate at any time between 06:00 - 18:00 hours, that complaints would be likely. With regard to the proposed enclosure of the batching plant, there is insufficient information to demonstrate that noise will not have an adverse impact on residents at Holly House.

Wardell Armstrong has undertaken a review of the 'Dust Management Plan' submitted on behalf of the applicant. Although it contains some basic steps to mitigate dust emissions from the proposed operation, the plan is light on detail and leaves doubts as to how effective the dust mitigation will be, even with the addition of the batching shed.

Objections have also been received from Newhall Parish Council which is an adjacent parish. The areas of concern are similar to those mentioned above namely: Impact of additional traffic; noise generation; hours of operation; classification of the site; negative environmental issues and previous approval for 11 units specified that they were to be used for light industrial use only.

A small number of comments supporting the proposal have been received, one from a neighbouring business which welcomes the regeneration of a vacant industrial site the remaining comments are from employees of Concrete Panel Systems Ltd or Graham Heath Construction Ltd who have concerns over their continued employment should the application be refused.

APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING INFORMATION:

A design and access statement has been submitted on behalf of the applicant which adequately sets out the reasoned justification for the development: the proposal represents re-development of an existing sustainably located industrial site in compliance with adopted local plan policy.

Traffic Report and Supplementary Traffic Flow Assessment by Bob Hindhaugh Associates, including details of access improvements and routing plan.

Noise Report and Assessment by Mr G Corker. This report was been updated to include the impact on Holly House.

Statement of Support by Civitas Planning Ltd. This statements was submitted in an attempt to address the concerns raised as part of the consultation process

Dust Management Plan submitted by Concrete Panel Systems Ltd

OFFICER APPRAISAL

General Principle

The NPPF supports the objectives set out in the Plan for Growth and states that authorities should approach development management decisions positively – looking for solutions rather than problems so that applications can be approved wherever it is practical to do so.

The NPPF and the “Plan for Growth” introduces a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that Authorities should ensure that they give appropriate weight to the need to support economic recovery, and that applications that secure sustainable growth are treated favourably and that the Secretary of State for Communities will attach weight to the need to secure economic growth and employment when determining applications that come before him for decision.

One of the core principles of the NPPF is to “proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places the country needs”.

Policy NE.2 seeks, for the most part, to limit development to that which is essential to agriculture, outdoor recreation or other uses appropriate to a rural area. Policy E.4 and E.6 support employment development specifically Policy E.4

The last lawful use of the site was in connection with the manufacture of food products which would put it within B2 (General Industry) of the Town and Country (Use Classes) Order 1987, as amended. Whilst a proposal to re-develop the site for light industrial use was approved and renewed ref 10/2076N there is no evidence that this permission was implemented other than the demolition of the original factory however, it would appear that this was done due to health and safety concerns and not pursuant to a planning permission.

Therefore, the application does not involve a material change of use in land for the purposes of planning nevertheless, it does involve the construction of two buildings which will have form and function and whilst the construction of the two buildings on an existing industrial estate is considered appropriate to the area the material impacts of the form and function of those building must be duly considered as part of the decision making process.

The proposal has generated considerable local objection mainly due to vehicles movements and the threat of noise and dust generation.

Comments have been received claiming that the proposal involved as use which falls with B3 (Special Industrial Group A) of the Use Classes Order 1987. The Special

Industrial Classes B3 – B7 were repealed via an amendment in 1995 with all general industrial uses now being classes as B2 (General Industry). However, had the amendment not happened the proposal would have still been classified as B2 and not a Special Industrial use.

The extensive planning history relating to this plot of land and the wider industrial site indicate that the Authority has approved numerous industrial uses both general industrial and light industrial. It is clear that the site as a whole is made up of various industrial and commercial uses which is often the case on industrial estates of this nature.

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that all applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations dictate otherwise.

Local Plan Policy E.4 supports the re-development or intensification of land within existing employment areas subject to compliance with Policies BE.1 – BE.5. This Policy is considered to conform with the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

The aforementioned policies and guidance require the Authority to give considerable favourable weight to proposals for sustainably located economic development. Previous proposals ref P07/0403 & renewal ref 10/2076N considered the site to be sustainable in principle. The criteria and circumstances remain the same today however, Government guidance in the intervening period has strengthened the weight attached to proposals for sustainable economic development.

It is considered that there is substantial national and local policy support for the redevelopment of existing commercial land which aids the economic recovery. Nevertheless, this support must be measured against any negative impacts the development would have on other environmental interests.

Design

The design of the two buildings is typical of modern industrial utility buildings with a steel frame clad with profiled steel cladding. The main manufacturing building would be Juniper Green in colour, with similar materials employed for the construction of the roof, which also includes the installation of 88 roof-lights. The main access is via 3 roller shutter doors on the north elevation, in addition 4 personnel/fire doors are indicated, 3 on the western and 1 on the southern elevation. The building would be located longitudinally north to south adjacent to the eastern boundary which is defined by a 1.8m high native hedge. Whilst the building has a large footprint the height is relatively modest at 6.6m therefore it will not be unduly prominent against the backdrop of the railway station and surrounding commercial buildings. Due to the confines of the site there is limited opportunity for the introduction of additional landscaping however, additional hedge planting is recommended along the southern boundary. There is currently no boundary treatment on the boundary of the site with the residential garden to Holly House. The introduction of boundary treatment will have to

be considered in light of any noise mitigation scheme required to limit the impact of the development.

The colour of the building enclosing the batching plant has not been specified however, this can be dealt with by condition. The building contains only one opening on the northern elevation. This opening extends across the full elevation of the gable presumably to allow machinery access.

The design and layout of the buildings is considered to be acceptable within the context of the industrial estate without detrimental impact to the character of the surrounding countryside

Impact on Amenity

From a visual sense the proposal will have limited impact on neighbouring residential amenity with the exception of Holly House which adjoins the site. The rear elevation of the property is approximately 35m from the main building and whilst the building will be visible, due to this distance in relation to the ridge height of 6.6m, it is considered that it would not have an overshadowing or intrusive impact. It is also noted that the rear garden area between the existing house and the proposed building contains two 10m high (approx.) trees which will help to screen the development.

The impact of the development on potential future occupiers must also be considered. The Authority has recently granted consent for 16 affordable units on land to the west of the site ref 11/1165N. This application was approved in outline with all other matters reserved for subsequent approval therefore, it is considered that the design of the dwellings can be assessed when an application for reserved matters is submitted for consideration and if necessary, additional sound proofing measures within the dwellings would be required.

Noise generation has been a major concern both of the officers and neighbours as is borne out in the submitted comments. The noise assessment plan submitted in support of the proposal indicates that the impact of noise from the site can be made acceptable by mitigating measures. The independent report submitted on behalf of local residents included an additional noise assessment which questions the methodology and findings of the assessment submitted in support of the proposal. However, all such reports of question marks over the findings and conclusions they come to because it is not possible to accurately measure the sound levels generated and how this level will be affected by local conditions. Nevertheless, they do provide indication of the level and type of noise that will be generated and whether it can be controlled to acceptable levels by mitigating measures. The findings have been considered by the Authority's Environmental Health Department and subject to the introduction of controlling conditions requiring the submission of a noise mitigation scheme for approval, there is no objection in principle.

Nevertheless, following these concerns the Applicant has submitted a revised plan which proposes to enclose the batching plant, which is considered to be the main noise and dust generator, within a building. Whilst the building will have an open elevation it

will considerably improve noise containment from the plant, it will also include a sprinkler system to help prevent dust contamination.

The independent report by Rex Brockway suggests that the previous approvals on the industrial estate have sought to control noise generation in order to protect neighbouring residential amenity including maximum db level at the boundary. This particular proposal has also been considered with regard to noise generation however, a boundary noise level condition is not considered appropriate because experience as shown that such conditions are extremely difficult to monitor and enforce. It must also be noted that neighbouring residential amenity will be continually protected by the Environmental Protection Act should the operation of the site generate noise which is adjudged to be a statutory nuisance.

Highway Implications

The applicant has stated that 22 car parking spaces will be provided within the site. The amount of car parking proposed is consistent with the standards set out in Appendix 8.1 of the Replacement Local Plan industrial uses. The proposal for 22 spaces is below the maximum standard of 28 as set out in Appendix 8.1.

The application also indicates that 3 spaces will be provided for other light goods vehicles and 12 cycle spaces.

Therefore, off-street cycle provision is acceptable in principle subject to a controlling condition requiring details to be agreed and thereafter retained.

The HGV movements associated with manufacturing operation has raised considerable comments from members of the public who are concerned that the 24 vehicle movements per day will lead to road safety issues along Station Road which leads to the Village of Wrenbury and Wrenbury Road which leads from the site towards Aston and the A530 Whitchurch Road.

The supporting traffic statement was updated following the level of concern and officer comments. The amended statement which included existing traffic flow data indicated that during the two peak hours of the survey of the 253 vehicles using Station Road only 5 were HGV, this represented 2% of the vehicles. If the number of proposed vehicles were averaged out over a 10 hour working 2.4/hr and factored in it would represent an increase of 2% however, a figure of 4% in relation to the overall number of vehicles using the road is considered to be relatively small. It also has to be stated that the data was only collected over a period of one day therefore any conclusions made on it can only be afforded limited weight.

The statement also refers to the traffic demand which was generated when the site was last used for manufacturing. It is accepted that the previous use would have generated some HGV movements however, given the length of time since the factory closed any assumptions and claims are difficult to verify.

What is considered material is the extant permission for the 11 industrial units which included a full traffic impact assessment. The traffic statement supporting that application makes reference to the predicted traffic flow generation associated with the 11 industrial units. The supporting statement to this proposal concludes that the proposed traffic flows will be 25% lower than that predicted for the 11 industrial units.

It is accepted that this proposal will almost certainly generate fewer vehicle movements than those predicted for the 11 industrial units. Nevertheless, the proposal will increase the number of HGVs using the site over the previous lawful use and those which would be associated with the development of the 11 industrial units.

The consultation response received on behalf of the Strategic Highways and Transportation Manger does not raise an objection subject to the imposition of conditions to secure access alterations and improvements along the driveway; limits on the number of HGV movements; agreed routing plan and financial contributions for the installation of road traffic signs on Wrenbury Road to warn of road narrowing and to investigate the implementation of an environmental weight restriction area along Nantwich Road, Wrenbury.

The financial contribution will require a Section 106 agreement to secure delivery of the monies and to ensure repayment should the contribution not be spent. The applicant has agreed in principle to the contribution which amounts to £7,000.

It should be noted that the driveway to the site is not part of the application and it is understood falls outside the total control of the applicant. It cannot therefore be conditioned as part of this scheme. Further comments are awaited both from the applicants to verify ownership, and also from Highways as to understand the position further if the passing place is not provided. While it is appreciated that the proposal may generate more larger vehicles along the driveway, no such requirement was needed for the application for 11 industrial units. This use would have generated a mix of vehicles coming to and from those units, and it is also clear that the existing uses already generate a mix of traffic including HGV both into and out of the site. Officers are therefore concerned that to insist on a passing place would be unreasonable.

Pollution

The generation of dust by the manufacturing process has also been a major concern raised by neighbours who have concerns over the impact of cement dust on their health and the surrounding environment.

Under the Pollution Prevention and Control Act 1999, concrete block manufacturing is a prescribed process under Part B of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2012, and requires a permit to be issued by the Environmental Health Department. Therefore, the proposed manufacturing process as far as it relates to pollution will be regulated outside the Planning Act however, in principle, Environmental Health officers have indicated that the requirements for the issuing of any such permit can be met at this location. However, a condition is recommended to control dust generation on the site which falls outside the remit of the permit.

The Environmental Health Department have also advised a watching brief in relation to possible contaminated land matters during the construction process.

Drainage

The foul water drainage would be dealt with by means of a septic tank which is considered acceptable subject to agreement of details.

Whilst the application forms state that the surface water will be dealt with by means of a soakaway the subsequent supporting planning statement by Civitas Planning states that the surface water will be dealt with by a treatment plant which removes any contaminants for removal and recycles the water within the site. The manufacturing process including the external storage of the produce has the potential to contaminate the ground water therefore, a condition is recommended to agree details of the treatment plant and to remove any resultant contaminants from the site.

Ecology

The site is predominantly hard standing probably as a result of the demolition of the original creamery building. In the circumstances, it was not considered necessary or reasonable to require the applicant to undertake an ecological survey. The Authority's ecologist has confirmed this course of action as being appropriate.

Other Matters

The Parish Council have raised an issue in respect of a row of trees along the access road to the site, and whether they will be impacted upon by the development. The trees have been inspected and are considered to have a high amenity value in the area as they are widely visible. The loss of any trees would only become applicable if the passing place were required along the driveway, however as indicated above Officers do not believe that this can be conditioned. If such a passing place were needed, consideration in the form of a further plan and verification over land ownership would be required – at which point the impact on the trees could be fully assessed.

CONCLUSIONS

Considerable concern has been raised locally that the proposal will result in an inappropriate use in an inappropriate location due to an adverse impact on highway safety and neighbouring amenity. If the application involved the formation or expansion of an industrial site then greater material weight would be placed on these particular issues. However, the former and existing uses of the site, and current extant permissions establish the principle of the site with a various forms of industrial use.

It is accepted that the proposal will lead to an increase of heavy goods vehicles movements from the industrial estate along a road which has narrow points and a tight 90 degree bend. There are also issues relating to safety at the junction of Wrenbury Road, Aston with the A530 Whitchurch Road which has been the subject of accidents in the past. However, the increase in vehicle movements must be assessed against those which would be lost through the non-implementation for the consent for the 11

light industrial units on the same site. It is a well established convention that it is the number of vehicle movements which increase the likelihood of an accident not the type of vehicle. The Authority's Highway Engineers have not raised an objection in principle to the proposal subject to controlling conditions which have been discussed and accepted by the applicant.

The proposed manufacturing process will continue a general industrial use which has existed for many years albeit that it has lay dormant in the recent past. Other neighbouring general industrial uses currently operate with the benefit of planning permission including car repair businesses and a building fabrication operation. General industrial uses by their nature can conflict with other uses especially residential however, the imposition of controlling conditions to mitigate any disturbance to a level which is considered acceptable given the historical situation is considered acceptable.

Concerns have been raised that the operation will create unacceptable noise and contaminate the surrounding environment which includes the River Weaver however, the Authority's Environmental Health Department have no objection subject to conditions relating to hours of operation. Issues relating to general noise and dust associated with the manufacturing process will be dealt with as an ongoing requirement of the permit which is required under the Pollution Prevention and Control Act 1999. This impact has been further improved by the submission of revised plans which indicate the construction of a building around the batching plant.

Given the nature of the existing site including the previous consents granted for similar general industrial uses on the estate, it is considered that the application accords with NPPF and adopted Local Plan Policy.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE (subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure delivery of additional road signage and to investigate the provision of an environmental weight restriction area along Nantwich Road, Wrenbury.)

Conditions

1. **Standard time limits**
2. **Materials to be used on the external built form to be submitted for approval, prior to commencement.**
3. **Landscaping (hedgerow planting) to be submitted for approval prior to commencement**
4. **Landscaping implemented within the first planting season and thereafter protected for 5 years.**
5. **Surfacing materials to be used on the open areas to be submitted for approval prior to commencement.**
6. **Drainage scheme to be agreed and thereafter implemented and maintained in accordance with the agreed scheme.**
7. **Details of external lighting to be submitted and agreed prior to installation.**

8. Details of boundary treatment to be submitted for approval prior to commencement and thereafter implemented and retained.
9. Details of covered cycle parking to be submitted and agreed and available for uses prior to commencement for the use.
10. Details of parking to be submitted for agreement and available for use prior to commencement of the use and thereafter retained.
11. Retention of parking
12. No open storage within the site above 2m in height.
13. Hours of operation Monday – Friday 06.00 – 18.00 Saturday 06.00 – 18.00 and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays
14. Notwithstanding the limitations set out in Condition 13 the batching plant and any associated equipment shall only be operated between the hours of 08.00 – 18.00 Monday to Friday and 09.00 – 14.00 on a Saturday and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
15. Hours of construction Monday – Friday 08.00 – 18.00 Saturday 09.00 – 14.00 and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
16. Details of access and track improvement, including access track surface improvements to be submitted and agreed prior to implementation and available prior to commencement of the use.
17. Maximum of 24 heavy goods vehicle movements within approved hours in any one day. Operator must keep a log of HGV movements which shall be available for inspection at any time.
18. Adherence to travel route
19. Details of noise mitigation scheme including vehicle reversing alarm measures.
20. Personnel and fire doors to remain closed when not being used.
21. Site to be used for concrete panel manufacturing only and no other use within Class B2 without prior consent of the LPA.
22. No off-site sale of the un-cured concrete product or raw materials.
23. Implementation of dust monitoring measures.
24. Contaminated land, watching brief during construction phase.
25. Schedule of approved plans

