

Application No: 12/1157N

Location: Land off Crewe Road, Basford West, Crewe

Proposal: Variation of Condition 14 of application P03/1071 Relating to the Proposed Rail Link

Applicant: Goodman

Expiry Date: 16-May-2012

#### **SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:**

- **Approve subject to conditions and Deed of Variation to legal agreement relating to planning permission P03/1071**
- **Amend resolution relating to application 12/1959N**

#### **MAIN ISSUES:**

- **Rail Link**
- **Highways Implications**

#### **REFERRAL**

This application is to be determined by the Strategic Board because the proposal relates to a major development exceeding 2 hectares on a strategic employment site.

#### **1. SITE DESCRIPTION**

The Basford West Development site is that area of land bounded by houses on Crewe Road, Shavington to the west, Gresty Road to the north, the West Coast Main Line to the east and the A500 to the south. The land at the rear of the houses on Crewe Road forms part of the ecological mitigation areas rather than the development site itself. The area as a whole comprises 53 ha of former agricultural land and is allocated within the Local Plan for employment development. The part of the site to which this application relates is a triangle of land, approximately 6.14ha in area in the south east corner of the site.

Outline planning permission was granted for employment development in May 2008 and site works have now commenced. (Application P03/1071 refers)

However, a triangle of land in the south east corner of the site was excluded from that permission, despite forming part of the Local Plan allocation, due to being within a different ownership at the time. The land has subsequently been bought by the owner of the previously approved part of the site.

Members may recall that earlier this year, Strategic Planning Board resolved to grant, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement, outline planning permission for the erection of a building for use within use Class B8 (storage and distribution); B2 (Manufacturing) and B1 (light industrial / office) and with ancillary offices, construction of access roads, ecological mitigation works and associated structural landscaping and car parking on this triangle of land. All matters of siting, external appearance, landscaping and access are reserved for subsequent approval. (Application 12/1959N refers)

Whilst the proposals involved an increase in total developable area of the Basford West employment site as a whole, there was no proposed increase to the overall gross floor area of B1, B2 and B8 uses above the thresholds agreed as a part of the outline planning permission for the wider Basford West site. It is proposed to deliver 4,578sq.m of B1 uses, 18,326sq.m of B2 uses and 120,770sq.m of B8 uses across the Basford site as a whole.

## 2. DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

Condition 14 of permission P03/1071 states:

*The first reserved matters application for phase 3 shall include full details of all changes of level throughout the whole of phase 3 (including contour plans and sections) and details of the proposed rail links to the main link infrastructure to all plots in phase 3 (as shown on drawing number 2000-068/024C) of the development).*

The Section 106 Agreement attached to that permission also includes a requirement for the provision of rail links from the main line to the application site to be provided prior to the development of rail linked units (Phase 3). The trigger being at 4,645 sq m B1 development, 18,580 sq m B2/B8 development and 47,844 sq m B8 development.

This Section 73 application seeks to vary the terms of condition 14 as follows:

*The first reserved matters application for phase 3 shall include full details of all changes of level throughout the whole of phase 3 (including contour plans and sections) and details of the opportunity for a proposed rail links to the main link infrastructure to all plots in phase 3 (as shown on drawing number 2000-068/024C) of the development).*

It also seeks to amend the requirements of the Section 106 Agreement to remove the **requirement** to provide the rail link, although it would be retained as an option if requested by an end user of one of the rail linked units.

Similarly conditions included within the resolution to approve application 12/1959N by Strategic Planning Board also required a scheme for development of rail linked units including levels and provision of rail links to all plots.

In the interests of consistency, therefore, if Members are minded to approve this application the conditions attached to the resolution pertaining to application 12/1959N should also be amended accordingly. (N.B. This permission is awaiting the signing of a Section 106 Agreement and therefore has not been issued yet. Consequently, there is no change of application number.)

### **3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

P03/1071	Outline permission for Warehousing and Distribution (B8), Manufacturing (B2), and Light Industrial/ office (B1) Development, Construction of access roads, footpaths, and rail infrastructure, importation of soil materials, heavy good vehicle and car parking and landscaping and habitat mitigation including Environmental Statement. Approved (subject to S106) 13 <sup>th</sup> May 2008.
P06/1234	Ten Great Crested Newt Mitigation Ponds and associated ecological works. Approved 17 <sup>th</sup> January 2007.
P08/0801	Creation of Bat Barn and associated ecological works. Approved 7 <sup>th</sup> August 2008.
P08/1054	Substation and associated works. Approved 3 <sup>rd</sup> November 2008.
P08/1091	Screening opinion for enabling works Environmental Impact Assessment not required. 23 <sup>rd</sup> October 2008
P08/1258	Reserved matters for ground works for spine road, drainage, balancing ponds, plot formation, structural landscaping, public art, (with ecological assessment, lighting strategy, construction management plan, flood risk assessment).
09/1480N	Reserved Matters for B8/B2 unit with ancillary offices, security gatehouse and associated car parking and landscaping. Approved 2010

### **4. PLANNING POLICIES**

#### **Regional Spatial Strategy**

DP1 Spatial Principles  
DP2 Promote Sustainable Communities  
DP5 Managing Travel Demand  
DP7 Promote Environmental Quality  
DP9 Reducing Emissions and Adapt to Climate Change  
RDF1 Spatial Priorities

W2 Locations for Regionally Significant Economic Development  
RT2 Managing Travel Demand  
RT3 Public Transport Framework  
RT4 Managing the Highway Network  
RT9 Walking and Cycling  
EM1 Integrated Enhancement and Protection of the Region's Environmental Assets  
EM3 Green Infrastructure  
EM5 Integrated Water Management  
EM11 Waste Management Principles  
EM18 Decentralised Energy Supply  
MCR4 South Cheshire

### **Cheshire Replacement Waste Local Plan**

Policy 11A Development and Waste Recycling.  
Policies in the Local Plan  
NE.5 Nature Conservation and Habitats  
NE.9 Protected Species  
NE.10 New Woodland and Landscaping.  
BE.1 Amenity  
BE.2 Design Standards  
BE.3 Access and Parking  
BE.4 Drainage, Utilities and Resources  
BE.5 Infrastructure  
BE.16 Development and Archaeology  
E.3 Regional and Strategic Employment Allocations at Basford  
TRAN.3 Pedestrians  
TRAN.5 Provision for Cyclists  
TRAN.6 Cycle Routes  
TRAN.9 Car Parking Standards  
TRAN.11 Non- Trunk Roads.

### **Other Material Considerations**

Basford West Development Brief approved by Crewe and Nantwich Borough  
Council April 2004

National Planning Policy Framework

## **5. OBSERVATIONS OF CONSULTEES**

### **Highways**

Highways raise no objection to the variation of the Rail Link condition subject to the following:

1. If the rail link is provided the maximum trip generation for the whole site is constrained to 861 vehicles as originally conditioned

2. If the rail link is not provided as part of phase 3 of the scheme then the maximum total Basford West traffic generation is constrained to 1003 vehicles
3. Should the rail link not be provided as part of phase 3 then an additional highways contribution of £524,040.60 (Index linked to the date of the original S106) will be payable. This will not form part of the contribution to Crewe Green Link Road as it is anticipated that this scheme will be in situ at the time of development / reserved matters for Phase 3. As such this contribution will be put towards highway improvements to the *Strategic A500 corridor and/or Gresty Road / South Street Corridor*.
4. It will be necessary to enter a deed of variation to amend the original S106 accordingly.
5. As a note only - the success of travel planning / actual vehicle generation for the early phases of the scheme will actually define the 'headroom' available for the later phases.

### **Cheshire Wildlife Trust**

Thank you for sending details of the above application to Cheshire Wildlife Trust (CWT) for comment. We have no particular observations to make on the proposed variation of Condition 14. However, if the rail link corridor is to be retained in order to 'safeguard the future opportunity for a rail link', CWT would strongly recommend that the corridor land is prepared/planted and managed for the benefit of wildlife, and that a proposal to achieve this objective is submitted for approval as part of the amended Condition. This would make a contribution to biodiversity enhancement within the overall scheme.

### **Network Rail**

In order to achieve the rail connection the applicant would have to come across Network Rail's land although I am not aware that any agreement was put in place to facilitate.

Network Rail has no comment to make on the proposed Deed of Variation to the S106 Agreement.

### **Environment Agency**

No objections in principle to the proposed Variation of Condition 14.

### **Natural England**

- This proposal does not appear to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes, or have significant impacts on the conservation of soils, nor is the proposal EIA development.
- Where there is a reasonable likelihood of a protected species being present and affected by the proposed development, the LPA should request survey information from the applicant before determining the application

- This application may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes.
- If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local wildlife site, e.g. Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local wildlife site before it determines the application.

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

### **Shavington Parish Council**

The Parish Council considered the above planning application at its meeting on 2nd May 2012 and makes the following objection:

- This application, to remove the railway siding condition to warehouse development at Basford West will result in a greater need and demand for road haulage, adding more heavy vehicle movements to a local road infrastructure already under strain, and causing further congestion and inconvenience to residents and other road users. The rail link was a pivotal element of the original approval and the Parish Council feels strongly that the principle of rail movement should be maintained

### **Weston and Basford Parish Council**

Parish Council notes the reason for seeking to vary this condition. Whilst accepting that in economic terms this is possibly a sustainable solution, we question its environmental and social sustainability. A more detailed explanation and justification for this change is requested before any decision is made.

If at the end of the day the Local Planning Authority agree to this variation, the Parish Council wish to receive an assurance in relation to the following points:

- That enforceable designated routes from the site onto the primary road network be agreed, to avoid rat running and incursion of heavy vehicles onto our indigenous road network and country lanes within the parish.
- We understand that the establishment of a "Basford User Group" to monitor detailed development proposals has already been agreed in principle. We request that this is now formally brought into operation and that my Council be invited to join that group.

## **6. OTHER REPRESENTATIONS**

### **Basford East Basford West Action Group (BEBWAG)**

BEBWAG objects to this application for the following reasons:

- Both the Basford sites were chosen as potential “employment” sites by Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council (CNBC) in 1989 because of their proximity to Basford sidings and the major rail junction of Crewe. In addition, Cheshire County Council pushed these sites as part of regional planning proposals. Both authorities were active in the 1992 Public Enquiry into the route of the A500: by routing it south of Crewe and north of Shavington, Basford and Hough, the two Basford sites would then have the advantage of a major highway, as well as substantial access to rail facilities.
- While there may be no environmental or conservation arguments against this proposal, there are historic reasons why it is untenable. The planning (P08/1258) application granted to Goodman in January 2010 was contrary to the *Development Brief for Basford West*, a document that was agreed between CNBC and BEBWAG. The final version contained 26 amendments to the original draft, all agreed at a public meeting of the CNBC Development Control Committee. This document, along with that for Basford East, set out the constraints and conditions to be applied to each site. Goodman, successfully rendered the Basford West Development Brief meaningless, claiming that the Brief was merely “a guide” to development proposals. Clearly, this has been demonstrated by the fact that an application for reserved matters for an 18m-high warehouse was approved on a plot of land for which the maximum allowable height had been agreed at 12m. In the light of this, it is ironic that Spawforths (Goodman’s agents) refer to the Development Brief in support of their argument to remove the requirement for a rail link.
- Cheshire East Council seems content to ignore all the relevant documentation detailing why certain things should not be done. The 2007 *Atkins Report* into traffic flows in the Crewe area indicated, from its detailed research, that a development the size of that proposed for Basford West was not sustainable, yet a planning application relating to a massive warehouse was passed with barely a reference to this document.
- Removal of a rail link from the conditions for Basford West will, in the long term, put more traffic onto an overloaded road system. Without investment in route improvements, any developments, such as those proposed for Basford West, will bring Crewe and surrounding areas to a stand-still. Taken with the recent proposals for housing in Shavington and Gresty, the possibility of increased road traffic from these potential sources is threatening new levels of congestion. The statement, that Goodman recognizes that removal of the rail-link requirement will increase road traffic and are prepared to re-negotiate their contribution to the Crewe Green Link Road, suggests that they see that road as the solution to all the local traffic-flow problems. Clearly, they are not seeing the wider picture: The A500 Barthomley Link is daily congested over its full two-mile length and this has an impact on local traffic into and out of Crewe. In fact, this road had reached its projected 2011 loading for traffic in 1992.
- Goodman may assert that they are happy to provide for intermodal transport facilities (i.e. container-based traffic), as indicated in the Deed of Variation, but the covering letter from Spawforths suggests that the dimensions of the site would prevent such a terminal from meeting the latest construction and train-length requirements. It is therefore essential that a rail link to the site is guaranteed for all potential users on the site and that Goodman is not allowed to “safeguard” the future opportunity for the rail link”.

- The principle of maintaining a rail link to the site is paramount. Companies like Goodmans are seeking customers for their B8 developments, and rather than take out the rail link, they could put on a “green” hat and promote it with a view to changing the transport philosophy for warehouse goods. Put freight on the rails and use the fact that Crewe has tentacles to reach everywhere around the country and, ultimately, overseas.
- BEBWAG is concerned that, in order to fulfil the requirements of the law, Cheshire East is accepting objections and comments on the proposal. However indications from Spawforth’s suggest that letters, dated June 2011, from Council Officers support the Goodman proposal and, by inference, will do nothing to counter it in Committee. Accordingly, it is hoped that BEBWAG’s arguments presented here will persuade the Council to view the rail link to Basford West as essential, thereby preventing any potential “blocking” moves, such as the construction of a massive warehouse adjacent to Basford sidings, from effectively closing off any routes into the site from the railway.

## **7. APPLICANT’S SUPPORTING INFORMATION:**

- Supporting Statement

## **8. OFFICER APPRAISAL**

### **Main Issues**

The Local Plan allocation and previous outline planning permission have established the acceptability in principle of employment development on this site. This application does not present an opportunity to re-examine those matters. The main issue in the consideration of this application is the removal of the requirement to provide the rail link and any possible implications in terms of increased vehicular traffic on the surrounding highway network which may result.

### **Rail Links**

The Adopted Local Plan and Structure Plan Policies and the Development Brief for the Basford West site required the provision of rail sidings for the shipment of freight between rail and road as well as or in addition to rail connected warehouses. This was secured in the outline application through the Section 106 agreement which prevents any development on Phase 3, above the final ground level of a building, without the provision of the rail link to a level of construction that would result in it being capable of connection to the main rail line. Furthermore, the Section 106 agreement prevents more than 71,069m<sup>2</sup> GIA of the development as a whole to be occupied until a connection has been made from the rail connection to the main line railway. This was the indicative floorspace as stated on the outline application for Phases 1 and 2, with Phase 3 intended to be occupied only when the physical link to the rail network has been provided.

Commercial property consultants, Savills have advised the applicants on this issue and they have noted that whilst there is a growing trend in demand from B8 occupiers requiring an intermodal solution, the form and scale of rail provision required is now better



understood and defined (on the part of both developers and occupiers) as the market has become better educated and increasingly refined. Savills have confirmed that occupiers require access to intermodal facilities (i.e. a terminal capable of handling containers) rather than a private siding (capable of handling wagons). The design of terminals has become increasingly sophisticated and the latest generation now provides for full length 750m unbroken trains. The latest generation of schemes are for 4 to 8 million ft<sup>2</sup> of accommodation, both to make schemes viable and to generate sufficient levels of rail freight traffic. Basford West does not conform to these market requirements as it can only provide a maximum of 500 metre length of rail line at the site which is not within a large conurbation.

Given the changed market conditions since the grant of outline permission, the applicants are now seeking further flexibility for their scheme at Basford West. The applicants remain committed to provide a rail link should any occupier require it. However, for the reasons set out above, they do not consider that this should be a “requirement” to be undertaken for the third phase of development as this will necessitate significant capital expenditure to meet a requirement which may not exist and could therefore preclude the ability to bring forward Phase 3 of the development. This will also necessitate having to secure rights to link to the existing rail network which are time consuming and expensive.

The construction of any link to the national rail network is clearly an expensive infrastructure project. However, where that link is a requirement of the planning permission it creates a situation where Network Rail has a “ransom” over the developer in terms of the amount which they can charge for the connection. This, in turn, is having a significant impact on the viability of the scheme. Reducing the rail link to an option rather than a requirement would significantly reduce the fee that Network Rail are able to command and would result in an equally significant improvement in viability.

The NPPF stresses the importance of viability as a material planning consideration. Paragraph 173 states:

*Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable*

Improving the viability of the scheme is of paramount importance in order to facilitate the delivery of this regionally important employment site, which is critical to the implementation of the Crewe Vision (All Change for Crewe) and the delivery of the Crewe Green Link Road.

The applicant considers that the conditions attached to the outline planning permission and the Section 106 Agreement (Schedule 4), and the resolution in respect of the more

recent application, should be changed to remove the “requirement” for the rail link. They should instead “safeguard” the future opportunity for the rail link.

In the light of the above considerations, this is considered to be appropriate and acceptable in principle.

## **Highways**

The applicants recognise that, by removing the requirement for the rail link, this may result in less freight movement by this mode and additional HGV vehicle movements may ensue from Phase 3 of the Development than were originally envisaged. Whilst the outline permission has a “cap” on the overall vehicle movements associated with the development, the applicants recognise that the financial contribution agreed as part of the overall package of transportation improvements towards the Crewe Green Link Road, may need to be re-negotiated to reflect this.

The Strategic Highways Manager has considered the traffic implications of the proposal and advised that, should the rail link not be provided as part of phase 3, then an additional highways contribution of £524,040.60 (index linked to the date of the original S106) will be payable. This will not form part of the contribution to Crewe Green Link Road as it is anticipated that this scheme will be in situ at the time of development / reserved matters for Phase 3. As such this contribution will be put towards highway improvements to the *Strategic A500 corridor and/or Gresty Road / South Street Corridor*. This would be secured through the proposed Deed of Variation to the existing Section 106 Agreement.

If the rail link is provided, the Deed of Variation should make provision for the highways contributions to remain as per the original Section 106. Furthermore, changes to the provisions of the Travel Plan as set out in the section 106 are recommended to ensure that if the rail link is provided the maximum trip generation for the whole site is constrained to 861 vehicles as originally specified but if the rail link is not provided as part of phase 3 of the scheme then the maximum total Basford West traffic generation is constrained to 1003 vehicles.

Subject to these provisions, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of highways and traffic generation. In the absence of any objection from the Strategic Highways Manager, it is not considered that a refusal on these grounds could be sustained.

## **9. CONCLUSION**

The local plan allocation and previous consents have established the acceptability of employment development on this site. These were subject to conditions / Section 106 Agreements requiring the provision of a rail link into the site. Changes in rail freight technology and increasing train lengths mean that the proposed siding would have a very limited number of potential users. Furthermore, the requirement to construct the side is giving Network Rail a “ransom” over the developer, both of which are seriously impacting the viability and deliverability of the site. The applicant is therefore seeking to vary the

Section 106 Agreement and conditions, to amend the requirement to provide for the rail link to a requirement to safeguard the option for a rail link.

This will significantly improve the viability of the scheme and will enable the proposed development site to come forward in accordance with policies in the Regional Spatial Strategy, policies in the Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011, the NPPF, Planning for Growth and the Crewe Vision. It will deliver job creation to the area both in the constructional and the operational phases of development. It will achieve the government's key objectives and the Council's aims of promoting employment, helping to create and maintain sustainable communities.

It is acknowledged that in the event that the rail link is not provided, there would be a corresponding increase in traffic generation on the surrounding highway network. However, the Strategic Highways Manager has assessed the extent of the impact and has identified a suitable additional financial contribution towards off-site highway improvements. The proposed Deed of Variation to the Section 106 agreement would secure this payment in the event that the rail link was not forthcoming. In addition, further conditions would be added to place caps on the number of vehicle movements to and from the site.

In summary, for the reasons stated above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and accordingly, it is recommended for approval subject to completion of a Deed of Variation to the relevant Section 106 Agreements and conditions as set out below. It is also recommended that the previous resolution

## **10 RECOMMENDATION:**

### **APPROVE APPLICATION 12/1157N SUBJECT TO:**

- 1. Deed of Variation to Section 106 Agreement attached to planning permission P03/1071 to make provision for the following:**
  - **Provision of rail links from the main line to the to the application site to be provided prior to the development of rail linked units (Phase 3). The trigger being at 4,645 sq m B1 development, 18,580 sq m B2/B8 development and 47,844 sq m B8 development.**
  - **Should the rail link not be provided then an additional highways contribution of £524,040.60 (index linked to the date of the original S106) will be payable.**
  - **This contribution will be put towards highway improvements to the Strategic A500 corridor and/or Gresty Road / South Street Corridor.**
  - **Travel Plan to make provision for, if the rail link is provided the maximum trip generation for the whole site to be constrained to 861 vehicles and if the rail link is not provided as part of phase 3 of the scheme then the maximum total Basford West traffic generation is constrained to 1003 vehicles**
- 2. The following conditions**

- 1-3. Standard outline conditions to include 10 years for the submission of reserved matters, including details of “landmark features”.
4. Amended plans
5. The phasing of the development to be as given in drawings 2000-068/024 C except that the spine road to be constructed in its entirety in phase 1.
6. Uses of land and principles of development in accordance with each character area to be as shown on drawing 2000-068/025B except that building heights shall comply with limitations set in Basford West Development Brief.
7. Floor spacing not to exceed the limits of each character area as given on drawing 2000-068/025B
8. No development to commence which exceeds 25% floor area (i.e. 4,645 sq m of B1 floor space and 22,868 sq m of B8 floor space) to commence until scheme for works at junction 16 of M6 submitted and agreed.
9. No development to be brought into use, which exceeds 4,645 sq m of B1 floor space and 22,868 sq m of B8 floor space before works approved under the above condition in relation to junction 16 of M6 have been implemented.
10. Development not to exceed 4,645 sq m B1 offices, 18,580 sq m B2 and 120, 770 sq m B8 development at any time.
11. Reserved matters applications to include cross sections through the site and details of existing and proposed levels to demonstrate impact of the proposed development on the locality.
12. Provision of spine road in phase 1, remaining roads in accordance with phasing plan, all in accordance with drawings to be submitted and approved.
13. Landscape scheme for spine road including street furniture and public art, to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of construction of spine road.
14. Scheme to provide the opportunity for development of rail linked units including levels and provision of rail links to all plots at phase 3 of the development
15. Principles of structure planting for whole development site to establish principles of landscaping and public art/ “landmark features” to be submitted as part of the first reserved matters application, together with a timetable for its implementation.
16. Implementation of structural planting in accordance with a timetable to be agreed.
17. Size/ dimensions of landscape bunds to be in accordance with submitted plans.
18. Mitigation measures for protected species in each phase, to be submitted with first application for each phase.
19. Strategic planting scheme in each phase to be submitted with first reserved matters application for each phase
20. Each reserved matters application to include a noise assessment and mitigation measures to be detailed in the application.

21. Building heights not to exceed limits of Development Brief as approved April 2004. (12m to the west of the spine road, up to 25 m adjacent to railway and 18m elsewhere)
22. Area 4 parking/service areas to be located between the building and the spine road.
23. No 24 hour working in the northern part of Area 6 between extension to Crewe Road and new spine road.
24. Programme of archaeological work.
25. Protection to public right of way unless diversion/ alteration otherwise approved.
26. Details of changes of level throughout phase 3 to be submitted as part of the first reserved matters for phase 3.
27. Any infilling material to be non-leachate forming.
28. Surface water regulation scheme.
29. Oil interceptors.
30. Water from vehicle washing to foul sewer.
31. Scheme for storage and handling of fuels, oil, chemicals and effluents.
32. Driver overnight facilities at each individual unit or as may be agreed.
33. Provision of covered secure cycle parking at each development together with shower/changing facilities.
34. Framework construction management plan to be submitted and approved with the first reserved matters application, to control works during construction to protect residential amenities. To be detailed up for each phase. Details of construction management plan for each phase to be submitted with first reserved matters application for that phase.
35. Flood Risk Assessment as part of the first reserved matters application for units.
36. Acoustic barrier in relation to rail activities in phase 3.
- 37 Drainage to be based on principles of sustainable drainage.
38. Lighting Strategy to be submitted with the first reserved matters application for each phase.
39. New water course in phase 3 to include ecological measures to promote biodiversity.
40. No development at Phase 3 to be constructed or provided which would impede access to land outside the application area, situated to the south of the site.
41. Need for flexibility as regards the relocation of Crewe Railway Station to Basford Hall.
42. Waste separation and storage facilities.

**AMEND PREVIOUS RESOLUTION TO APPLICATION 12/1959N TO READ AS FOLLOWS**

**APPROVE subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement in relation to the following matters:-**

- a) Define areas of landscaping and wildlife mitigation, including land along southern boundary as well as areas to the south east of the development. Mitigation areas to be phased in accordance with details approved

pursuant to the S106 attached to the outline permission for the main part of the site.

- b) The extension of the Southern Boundary scheme to include screen planting, wildlife measures as well as ponds approved pursuant to the S106 attached to the outline permission for the main part of the site to the current application site. (Phase1 of the development of Basford West as a whole.)
- c) The extension of the ecological Framework approved pursuant to the S106 attached to the outline permission for the main part of the site to the current application site.
- d) Mitigation schemes for protected species, Great Crested Newts, bat and bird boxes.
- e) Timetable for phasing of the ecological works (to co-ordinate with the timetable for the ecological works on the wider site).
- f) Extension of the Management plan with monitoring for habitat / landscape areas minimum of 15 year time period approved pursuant to the S106 attached to the outline permission for the main part of the site to the current application site.

And the following conditions:

- 1. Standard outline
- 2. Standard outline
- 3. 10 years for the submission of reserved matters
- 4. Approved plans
- 5. Uses of land and principles of development in accordance with each character area 5 as shown on drawing 2000-068/025B approved under the outline permission for the main part of the site except that building heights shall comply with limitations set in Basford West Development Brief.
- 6. Floor spacing not to exceed the limits of character area 5 as given on drawing 2000-068/025B the outline permission for the main part of the site.
- 7. No development to be brought into use, which exceeds 4,645 sq m of B1 floor space and 22,868 sq m of B8 floor space before works approved under the above condition in relation to junction 16 of M6 have been implemented.
- 8. Development on the application site, when combined with the land edged blue on the location plan not to exceed 4,645 sq m B1 offices, 18,580 sq m B2 and 120, 770 sq m B8 development at any time.
- 9. Reserved matters applications to include cross sections through the site and details of existing and proposed levels to demonstrate impact of the proposed development on the locality.
- 10. Extension of phasing plan to include access road

11. Scheme to provide the opportunity for development of rail linked units including levels and provision of rail links to all plots
12. Extension of principles of structure planting for whole development site to establish principles of landscaping and public art/ “landmark features” to be submitted as part of the first reserved matters application, together with a timetable for its implementation.
13. Implementation of structural planting in accordance with a timetable to be agreed.
14. Size/ dimensions of landscape bunds to be in accordance with submitted plans.
15. Mitigation measures for protected species, to be submitted with first reserved matters application.
16. Strategic planting scheme to be submitted with first reserved matters application
17. Each reserved matters application to include a noise assessment and mitigation measures to be detailed in the application.
18. Building heights not to exceed 25m
19. Programme of archaeological work.
20. Protection to public right of way unless diversion/ alteration otherwise approved.
21. Details of changes of levels to be submitted as part of the first reserved matters.
22. Any infilling material to be non-leachate forming.
23. Surface water regulation scheme.
24. Oil interceptors.
25. Water from vehicle washing to foul sewer.
26. Scheme for storage and handling of fuels, oil, chemicals and effluents.
27. Driver overnight facilities at each individual unit or as may be agreed.
28. Provision of covered secure cycle parking at each development together with shower/changing facilities.
29. Extension of Framework construction management plan approved pursuant to outline approval of main site to cover application site to control works during construction to protect residential amenities. Detailed construction management plan to be submitted with first reserved matters application.
30. Flood Risk Assessment as part of the first reserved matters application for units.
31. Acoustic barrier in relation to rail activities.
32. Drainage to be based on principles of sustainable drainage.
33. Lighting Strategy to be submitted with the first reserved matters application.
34. New water course to include ecological measures to promote biodiversity.
35. Waste separation and storage facilities.

*In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Board'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 Development Management and Building*

***Control Manager, in consultation with the Chair of the Strategic Planning Board is delegated the authority to do so, provided that he does not exceed the substantive nature of the Board's decision.***

---



(c) Crown copyright and database rights 2012. Ordnance Survey 100049045, 100049046.

