Application No: 14/3371M

Location: Land North Of, CHELFORD ROAD, OLLERTON, WA16 8SA

Proposal: Change in use of land and the construction of a single-storey building to

create a golf driving range with associated car parking and new access

Applicant: Mr Brian Coutts

Expiry Date: 14-Oct-2014

### **SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION**

Approve subject to the prior completion of a S106 legal agreement

### **MAIN ISSUES**

- Whether the proposal complies with Green Belt policy and if not, whether there are any very special circumstances that would overcome the harm caused by inappropriateness and any other harm to the Green Belt
- Whether the visual impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area is acceptable
- Whether the access and parking arrangements are acceptable
- Whether the proposed use is sustainable in this location
- Whether the proposal would significantly injure the amenity of nearby residents
- Whether the proposal would have any adverse impact on nature conservation interests or on existing trees and landscaping

#### **REASON FOR REPORT**

As the application site is a 5 hectares site, it constitutes a large scale major application which, in accordance with the Council's constitution, is required to be dealt with by the Strategic Planning Board.

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

The application relates to a piece of agricultural land located to the north of Chelford Road, in the parish of Ollerton. The land forms part of the agricultural holding of Beeches Farm, with other land located adjacent to the application site and on the opposite side of Chelford Road. There is an existing field gate providing access onto Chelford Road at the eastern end of the site boundary with Chelford Road. There are a number of existing trees and hedges on the site and a number of ponds are located within adjacent fields. A public footpath runs to the

west of the application site, with another footpath located to the east of the site. The site is generally relatively flat, with the topography of the site running downhill from south to north, though there are areas of undulation throughout.

There are three residential properties fronting Chelford Road located to the east of the site. Oakwood Nurseries is also located to the east of the site and contains a dwelling.

The site lies in the Green Belt.

### **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

Planning permission is being sought for a golf driving range. The proposal is to provide a 20 bay, single storey driving range building and associated facilities including a new vehicular access off Chelford Road, the creation of a 40 space car park, a mini pitch and putt and a putting green. The fairway would consist of small mounds created through the importation of material. The range would be unlit and would not contain netting fencing.

No proposed hours of opening are stated on the application form. Should permission be granted the following hours of opening are proposed:

- 08.00 16.00 hours during the months of November, December and January;
- 08.00 -18.00 hours during February, March and October;
- 08.00 -20.00 hours during April and September;
- 08.00 -21.00 during May;
- and 08.00-22.00 hours during June, July and August.

These hours are consistent with those attached to applications 08/0332P and 12/1147M (see below).

Additionally the hours of use condition would state "All lighting in for the development shall be turned off no later than 15 minutes after the permitted closing time". Again this would be in line with the previous consents and relates to any lighting within the range building and ancillary lighting to the car park etc and does not relate to the range itself which would be unlit.

### **RELEVANT HISTORY**

10/3232M

Golf driving range and building with 9 hole golf course.

Withdrawn 24.01.11

There have also been 3 applications for a similar proposal made by the applicant on land owned by him on the opposite side of Chelford Road. They are:

12/1147M

### **EXTENSION OF TIME TO APPLICATION 08/0332P**

Approved 11.07.12 (remains extant until 11.07.15)

#### 08/0332P

Golf driving range and 9 hole pitch and putt golf course including alterations to vehicular access

Refused and appeal allowed 27.05.09

#### 07/1856P

Golf driving range and 9 hole pitch and putt golf course including alterations to vehicular access

Refused 24.10.07

The applicant has stated that, if approved, the intention is to only implement one of the golf driving range schemes (12/1147M or current proposal), not both. As such, no objections would be raised to a legal agreement which would ensure that only one planning permission for a golf driving range is implemented, not both.

#### **POLICIES**

## **Local Plan Policy**

NE2 Landscape Protection and Enhancement

NE11 Nature Conservation

**NE17 Nature Conservation** 

BE1 Design Guidance

GC1 New Buildings

RT18 Golf Courses

T2 Integrated Transport Policy

DC1 New Build

DC3 Amenity

DC6 Circulation and Access

DC8 Landscaping

DC9 Tree Protection

DC13 Noise

DC33 Outdoor Commercial Recreation

### Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version (CELP)

Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, decision-takers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and

• The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

In view of the level of consultation already afforded to the plan-making process, together with the degree of consistency with national planning guidance, it is appropriate to attach enhanced weight to the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy - Submission Version in the decision-making process.

At its meeting on the 28 February 2014, the Council resolved to approve the *Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version* for publication and submission to the Secretary of State. It was also resolved that this document be given weight as a material consideration for Development Management purposes with immediate effect.

The following policies are relevant:

- MP1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- PG3 Green Belt
- SD1 Sustainable Development in Cheshire East
- SD2 Sustainable Development Principles
- EG2 Rural Economy
- SC1 Leisure and Recreation
- SC2 Outdoor Sports Facilities
- SE1 Design
- SE3 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- SE4 The Landscape
- SE5 Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland

#### Other Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework National Planning Policy Guidance

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

Highways: no objections subject to conditions regarding parking, access and visibility splays.

**Environmental Health:** no objections subject to conditions regarding construction hours restriction, submission of lighting plan if lighting proposed in the future, pile driving and floor floating controls.

**Environment Agency:** reference to standing advice for this type of development.

Public Rights of Way Unit: no objection subject to the imposition of an advice note.

Flood Risk Manager: not aware of any significant flood risk issues associated with the site.

Leisure: no comments received.

### VIEWS OF THE PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL

Ollerton with Marthall Parish Council: object to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Lack of current robust business plan
- Enterprise is not viable
- Business is not sustainable
- Lack of land contour survey land has a natural fall away from the driving range building and if land is to be levelled through commercial tipping, this would create traffic and disturbance for a prolonged period of years
- Openness of the space will be altered
- Loss of amenity to neighbouring properties
- Contrary to Village Plan
- Concern that applicant seeking to obtain brownfield status for the land

### OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

No representations had been received at the time of writing the report.

### APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING INFORMATION

A number of supporting documents have been submitted with the application. These can be viewed on the application file and include:

- Planning, Design & Access Statement
- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
- Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Drainage Scheme
- Arboricultural Statement
- Ecological reports
- Geological report
- Transport statement

# OFFICER APPRAISAL

### **Principle of Development**

Paragraphs 89 and 90 of the NPPF lists the types of development that are considered to be acceptable in the Green Belt. Paragraph 89 deals with the construction of new buildings and states that these are generally inappropriate but lists a number of exceptions including:

"provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemetaries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it". (this differs slightly from the wording of Local Plan Policy GC1 which allows for "essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation").

Paragraph 90 of the NPPF relates to other forms of development, including engineering operations, but does not make reference to the change of use of land. As such it is

considered that the principle of the construction of new buildings and associated building operations in connection with outdoor sport and recreation can be acceptable in principle subject to them being "appropriate facilities". Engineering operations are not inappropriate provided they preserve openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. However, the change of use of land is not acceptable in principle as there is no provision within the NPPF for such a change of use of land. In order for this element of the proposal to be acceptable, very special circumstances would need to be demonstrated that outweigh the harm caused by inappropriateness and any other harm to the Green Belt.

## **Policy**

All relevant policies are listed earlier in the report.

Local Plan policy DC33 deals specifically with proposals for outdoor sport and recreation uses such as golf driving ranges and sets out various criteria against which proposals will be assessed. Some of the criteria listed are not relevant to the site but the following criteria are considered relevant.

- The design, siting, scale and materials of any necessary buildings or structures should harmonise with the existing landscape setting and should not significantly harm or detract from the visual character of the site and its surroundings. Wherever possible new buildings should be sited in close proximity to existing non-residential/non-sensitive buildings to minimise visual impact
- The site should be able to accommodate any necessary lighting without undue intrusion or significant adverse impact upon the immediate locality or wider environment
- The proposal should not have a significant adverse impact upon existing residential amenity
- Car parking provision and access into the site should be to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. The site should have good access to an existing network of main roads (A Roads)
- Full details of existing and proposed contours, public rights of way, tree and vegetation cover and proposed landscaping should be submitted with the application

#### **Green Belt**

#### Buildings and building operations

The proposed driving range building would be of a similar scale and appearance to that allowed at appeal on the opposite side of the road under application reference 08/0332P. Whilst the range building proposed by this application is slightly larger, the increase in size is not considered significant (floorspace increase of appx 33 sq m from 576 sq m to 609 sq m) and in any event the relevant test is now whether the facilities are "appropriate" rather than "essential" i.e. a lesser test than that previously applied. As such the proposed golf driving range building is not considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

The formation of the proposed access and car parking areas as building operations can also be considered under Paragraph 89 of the NPPF. Whilst the proposed car park would be slightly larger than that considered at appeal on the other side of Chelford Road (40 spaces

as opposed to 30), the car park together with the access facilities are considered to be appropriate facilities and as such not inappropriate.

## Other development including change of use of land

The formation of the mounds and green areas of the driving range together with any works to form the mini pitch and putt and putting green would constitute engineering operations. As these works would not conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt and provided that they preserve openness (see below), then these aspects of the proposal would not be inappropriate and would be compliant with Paragraph 90 of the NPPF.

However the change of use of land to form a golf driving range, a mini pitch and putt and a putting green is considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As stated above, this is due to the fact that paragraph 90 of the NPPF makes no provision for this type of development in the Green Belt.

Paragraph 87 of the NPPF states that as with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

### Impact on the openness of the Green Belt

As stated above, the proposed range building is of a similar size to that allowed at appeal on the other side of the road. As with the appeal proposal a new access is proposed together with a parking area adjacent to the building. The main change being that this proposal includes a 40 space car park, 10 spaces more than the appeal proposal. Additionally this proposal would involve some changes in levels across the site.

When considering the previous appeal the Inspector noted that "the substantive use of the site would maintain the openness of the Green Belt" further commenting that "the proposed access and car park would cause a small loss of openness, especially when cars are present on them, but they would occupy a relatively small part of the site and be necessary for the development". It was not considered that the driving range building would impact on openness.

As with the similar scheme on the opposite side of the road, it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant impact on openness. Whilst this site is arguably more prominent, the scale and design of the proposal is such that it is considered that the openness of the Green Belt would be maintained.

### **Very Special Circumstances**

The applicant's agent recognises that the change of use of land element of the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, for which very special circumstances are

required. A number of very special circumstances have been put forward and are summarised below:

- The proposed development cannot be accommodated within the existing built up area or on land outside of the Green Belt:
- The proposed development would meet the requirements of paragraph 28 of the NPPF by assisting in the sustainable growth, expansion and diversification of the rural economy;
- The proposed development would meet the requirements of paragraph 81 of the NPPF by making beneficial use of the Green Belt for sport and recreation;
- It would deliver a sport/recreation use in an accessible location, assisting to promote the health and well being of the community and meeting the requirements of paragraph 73 of the NPPF
- There is an extant consent for a very similar development on land also owned by the applicant on the opposite side of the road. This remains extant and capable of implementation until July 2015.

With regard to very special circumstances, particular reference is made to a High Court Judgement (Fordent Holdings Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Cheshire West and Chester Council [2013] EWHC 2844) which considered the issue of a change of use to a leisure use.

As stated, harm to the Green Belt has been identified as the proposed change of use constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt to which significant weight should be attached. No other harm to the Green Belt has been identified that would need to be outweighed by very special circumstances.

Having considered the very special circumstances put forward and having regard to the Fordent Holdings Ltd judgement, it is considered that the very special circumstances put forward in this case are sufficient to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. In particular, significant weight is attached to fact that the proposed change of use would provide an opportunity for outdoor sport and recreation and would be in accordance with paragraph 81 of the NPPF. Additionally significant weight is attached to the extant consent that exists for a similar proposal on the opposite side of the road.

## **Visual Impact**

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application. This has been undertaken in accordance with the 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment' (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition). It concludes that the implementation of the development proposals will not have a detrimental effect upon the landscape setting and character of the site or surrounding area.

The Council's Landscape Officer has been consulted on the application and broadly agrees with the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment that has been submitted and raises no objections to the application on landscape and visual impact grounds.

It is considered that the proposed building and associated access and car park have been designed so as to minimise their visual impact. The use of appropriate facing and surfacing

materials will help the development integrate with its surroundings. These matters could be controlled by condition.

A landscape plan has been submitted with the application. Whilst the details included within it are generally considered to be acceptable, there is some concern regarding proposed tree planting along the access drive and trees/hedging around the car park. Therefore unless satisfactory alterations can be made to the landscape plan prior to determination, should permission be granted, a landscaping condition would be imposed requiring the submission of an amended landscape scheme.

Whilst there will be some change in levels across the site, the mounds proposed are between 0.5m and 3.5m high, with the largest being located at the north west corner of the site, which is the lowest part of the application site. This is much lower than what was proposed as part of the previously withdrawn scheme (up to 8m high and with mounding close to Chelford Road). The levels changes now proposed are considered to be acceptable as it is not considered that they would adversely affect the landscape character of the area.

### **Highways**

A new vehicular access is to be formed off Chelford Road providing access to the site. A 40 space car park is also proposed.

As previously stated, a Transport Statement has been submitted with the application and the Strategic Highways Manager has been consulted. He notes that the proposed access is suitable for the development proposal and that the traffic impact of the development proposal will be relatively minor with only a very modest level of peak hour traffic movements at the site access. The level of car parking provision is considered to be sufficient, though it is considered that 2 disabled spaces should be included within the spaces proposed. Although the proposal is not particularly well located to make use of sustainable modes of transport for access, the use is primarily a car-borne recreational activity in any case and employee levels are low.

Subject to conditions regarding the provision of parking and provision of the new access and associated visibility splays, the Strategic Highways Manager raises no objections to the proposal.

### Design

The design of the proposed range building is broadly similar to the one that was allowed on appeal and to other range buildings elsewhere and as such no objections are raised to it on design grounds.

### Amenity

As stated, there are a number of residential properties located adjacent to the site. Local Plan policies DC3 and DC33 address the impact of proposals on residential amenity and state that there should be no significant adverse impact upon existing residential amenity. Local Plan policy DC13 specifically relates to noise generating developments.

3 residential properties are located to the east of the application site and front onto Chelford Road. The proposed site access would be located approximately 80m away from the nearest residential property, approximately 50m away from the garden boundary of this property. Given the scale of the development proposed, the likely amount of traffic that would be generated by the proposal, existing traffic levels on Chelford Road, the distances involved and given the existing screening along the garden boundaries, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the occupiers of these properties.

The only other residential property located close to the site is the dwelling at Oakwood Nurseries which is located approximately 30m to the east of the application site. However, given the distances involved and extensive boundary screening, it is not considered that the amenity of the occupiers of the dwelling at Oakwood Nurseries would be significantly affected by the proposal.

To date, no objections have been received from nearby residential occupiers.

#### **Trees**

The site contains a number of trees and hedgerows and the Council's Forestry Officer has been consulted on the application.

He states that the development proposals seek to utilise an existing and relatively open area of pasture land bordered by hedgerows and mature trees.

The only direct impact in terms of losses, relates to the removal of the length of hedgerow located on the Chelford Road frontage, and identified within the submitted Arboricultural Statement. Removal of the identified 50 metre length is required to facilitate access into the site. No details have been provided in respect of the 1997 Hedgerow Regulations in order to assess if this hedge is "important". This information is required in order to fully assess the impact of this loss of hedgerow. It has been requested from the applicant and any additional information received will be reported to Members in the form of an update.

All the existing trees can be retained and protected in accordance with current best practice BS5837:2012.

Subject to the receipt of additional information demonstrating that the loss of hedgerow is acceptable, the proposal raises no significant issues in relation to trees.

### **Ecology**

A Great Crested Newt Survey and Mitigation Report and a Badger Survey Report have been submitted with the application and the Council's Nature Conservation Officer has been consulted.

### **Great Crested Newts**

A number of ponds are located within 250m of the proposed development. Small numbers of great crested newts have been identified at a number of these ponds. However the

application site offers limited habitat for great crested newts. In order to address the risk posed to great crested newts the applicant's ecological consultant has recommended a suite of 'reasonable avoidance measures' and designed-in mitigation measures. The Council's Nature Conservation Officer advises that provided these measures are implemented the proposed development would be highly unlikely to result in a breach of the Habitat Regulations. Consequently, it is not necessary for the Council to have regard to the Habitat Regulations during the determination of this application. If planning permission is granted, a condition is required to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted great crested newt report.

## **Badgers**

A badger sett has been recorded just outside the red line of the application site. To avoid any potential impacts upon the sett the applicant's ecologist recommends that an undeveloped 30m buffer zone be marked out on the ground prior to the commencement of development. If permission is granted a condition is required to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted Badger Survey Report, including the provision of the 30m buffer area.

## **Hedgerows**

Hedgerows are a UK biodiversity action plan priority habitat and hence a material consideration. The proposed development will result in the loss of a section of hedgerow to facilitate the site entrance. The Nature Conservation Officer advises that this loss could be compensated for by the proposed screening planting provided appropriate species are used. This matter may be dealt with by means of a standard landscaping condition if planning consent is granted.

### **Breeding Birds**

If planning consent is granted a condition would be required regarding breeding birds to ensure that surveys for nesting birds are carried out if vegetation is to be removed between 1st March and 31st August.

### **Ecological enhancements**

The submitted ecological reports include proposals for ecological enhancements including the construction of a new wildlife pond and the enhancement of the existing ponds. If planning consent is granted a condition is required in order to ensure that the ecological enhancements including the creation of a new wildlife pond, the enhancement of the existing ponds and associated terrestrial habitat are provided to the satisfaction of the Council prior to first use of the golf driving range facility.

Subject to the conditions recommended above, no objections are raised to the proposal on ecological grounds.

## **Public Rights of Way**

As previously stated, there are two public rights of way within the vicinity of the site, the nearest one, Ollerton No.17, being located approximately 50m to the west of the site.

The Council's Public Rights of Way Unit have been consulted on the application and raise no objections to it subject to the addition of an informative regarding the public right of way should permission be granted.

#### Flood Risk

A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Sustainable Drainage Scheme (SuDS) has been submitted with the application. The FRA concludes that whilst no flood data is available for the site, as it falls within Flood Zone 1, the risk of flooding is low. The conceptual SuDS scheme has been designed so as to ensure that the proposed development of the site does not increase the flood risk and that the main flooding risk from pluvial (surface water) flooding on the highway on Chelford Road will continue to soakaway to ground.

The Environment Agency and the Council's Flood Risk Manager have been consulted on the application. The Environment Agency has referred to its standing advice for this type of development. The Council's Flood Risk Manager states that he is not aware of any significant flood risk issues associated with the site.

### **Other Matters**

A number of other matters, not already considered within the report have been raised by the Parish Council. These will be dealt with in turn.

A number of the concerns raised by the Parish Council relate to the sustainability/viability of the proposed business and lack of a robust business plan. As previously stated by the Inspector when dealing with the appeal against the refusal of 08/0332P, the viability of the business is a matter for the commercial judgement of the applicant and is not a material planning consideration to be given weight in the determination of this application.

Concern has been raised regarding the lack of a contour survey and queries regarding commercial tipping and the impact that would have in terms of traffic and disturbance for what could be a considerable length of time. With regard to levels information, the Council's Landscape Officer is satisfied with the information regarding levels that has been provided with the application. Whilst reference is made within the submitted Planning Statement to the importation of material to enable the formation of small mounds within the proposed fairway, given the relatively limited scale of the mounds, it is not anticipated that this would involve commercial tipping on a large scale. The applicant's agent has confirmed that there would be no commercial tipping on the land.

The Parish Council state that the proposal is contrary to the Village Plan. Whilst the Ollerton with Marthall Parish Plan is a material planning consideration and whilst it states that there is concern regarding the proliferation of businesses and markets affecting the A537 the plan also indicates that the matters of prime concern to residents are the appearance of, and noise and light pollution and traffic associated with commercial uses. For the reasons outlined within the report, it is not considered that the proposal would result in an adverse visual appearance or a significant increase in noise, light pollution or traffic.

Finally it is stated that the application is an attempt to remove the land from agricultural use and achieve brownfield status within the Green Belt. Whilst the land would become brownfield if permission is granted and implemented for the proposal, any future redevelopment of the site would need to be assessed against relevant policies and assessed on its own merits. Any speculation as to the applicants intentions is not a matter to be considered as part of the assessment of this application.

With regard to the conditions suggested by Environmental Health, it is not considered that these are necessary given the nature and location of the proposal and given that other proposed conditions are considered to adequately address the issue of lighting.

#### **Heads of Terms**

Should Members be minded to approve this application, as it would not be acceptable in planning terms to grant planning permission to the same applicant for very similar developments in close proximity, a S106 legal agreement is required to secure the following:

 Mechanism to ensure that either this proposal or that approved under application reference 12/1147M be implemented, not both.

## Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations:

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

- (a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) Directly related to the development; and
- (c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

The mechanism to ensure that only one permission for a golf driving range is implemented is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and in particular to protect the Green Belt. It is directly related to the development and is fair and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development having regard to relevant policy, including the NPPF.

### CONCLUSIONS AND REASON(S) FOR THE DECISION

This application is for an outdoor sport and recreation facility within the Green Belt. The proposal is considered to be a sustainable form of development.

The proposed golf driving range and associated facilities is, in part, inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It is not considered that the proposal would have a significant impact on openness. It is considered that very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm caused by inappropriateness. In reaching this conclusion, particular regard was had to that fact that in providing an opportunity for outdoor sport and recreation the proposal is compliant with paragraph 81 of the NPPF and to the fact that there is an extant consent for a very similar proposal on the opposite side of the road. It is not considered that the proposal would adversely affect the visual amenity of the area and the proposal does not raise any significant concerns with regard to design, amenity, highways or ecology. Further information

is required regarding a loss of hedgerow, subject to this issue being resolved, the application is recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions and the prior completion of a S106 legal agreement.

# Application for Full Planning

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subejct to a Section 106 Agreement and the following conditions

- 1. A03FP Commencement of development (3 years)
- 2. A02EX Submission of samples of building materials
- 3. A01LS Landscaping submission of details
- 4. A04LS Landscaping (implementation)
- 5. A15LS Submission of additional landscape details
- 6. A16LS Submission of landscape/woodland management plan
- 7. A13TR Retention of existing trees
- 8. A02HA Construction of access
- 9. A03HA Vehicular visibility at access (dimensions)
- 10. A01AP Development in accord with approved plans
- 11. A02NC Implementation of ecological report
- 12.A06NC Protection for breeding birds
- 13. Layout of car park
- 14. Extraneous matter
- 15. No ancillary uses
- 16. Lighting
- 17. Control over additional lighting
- 18. Fencing/Netting
- 19. Opening times
- 20. Development in accordance with Badger Survey including provision of a 30 buffer zone
- 21. Ecological enhancements to be agreed and implemented



