

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee
held at the Town Hall, Peterborough on 24 May 2011

Members Present:

Councillors – North (Chairman), Serluca (Vice Chairman), Casey, Hiller, Stokes, Todd, Lane, Harrington, Martin and Winslade

Officers Present:

Simon Machen, Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services
Lee Collins, Area Manager Development Management
Vicky Hurrell, Principal Development Management Officer
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)
Carrie Denness, Principal Solicitor
Gemma George, Senior Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Simons.

Councillor Winslade attended as a substitute.

2. Declarations of Interest

4.1 Councillor Stokes declared that part of her Ward adjoined Junction 1 on the parkway.

3. Minutes of the Meetings held on:

3.1 12 April 2011
3.2 26 April 2011

The minutes of the meetings were approved as true and accurate records.

4. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

The Chairman addressed the Committee and stated that a request had been received to allow an extension to the speaking times. This extension would allow fifteen minutes for objectors and fifteen minutes for supporters. Members agreed the extension to the speaking times.

4.1 09/01369/OUT – Development of up to 65 Hectares of employment land (B1, B2 and B8 including safeguarding of a site for a household recycling centre / park and ride). Associated highway infrastructure (including pedestrian, bridleway and cycle routes), and car parking for all uses. Foul and surface water drainage networks (including suds and lakes) at land to the east of Alwalton Hill, Fletton Parkway, Peterborough

The application site, which was 87.42 hectares in size, was currently in agricultural use. It was bounded to the north by Fletton Parkway (A1139) beyond which was the township of

Orton. To the west was land at Alwalton Hill beyond which lay the A1(M). Located on the west side of the A1(M) was the village of Haddon.

To the east was Orton Pit Special Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI) / Special Area of Conservation (SAC), a site of international ecological importance and beyond this the existing development of Hampton.

Immediately south of the application site was a wooded area known as "Two Pond Coppice" and "Chambers Dole", and beyond it the site of the Great Haddon Core Area where it was proposed to locate a housing development with associated infrastructure (see section 4 and planning application 09/01368/OUT). The woodland was within private ownership and did not form part of the proposed Great Haddon development. To the south west of the site was the old Great North Road along which there were a number of individual houses. To the south of the core area was the A15 and the villages of Yaxley and Norman Cross.

Bridleway Number 1 which was part of the Green Wheel ran through the length of the application site from the Old Great North Road to junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway. Connected to the bridleway at the north of the site was a footpath/cycleway which led to a bridge over the Fletton Parkway and the township of Orton.

The site was relatively flat although there was some change in levels across it from the Fletton Parkway. There were a number of existing trees, hedges and drainage channels associated with the agricultural use of the land and 3 small ponds were also located within the site.

Two outline planning applications, with all matters reversed for detailed consideration at a later stage, were submitted in December 2009 for a new urban extension known as Great Haddon.

This application was for the employment site. The main elements of the proposal could be summarised as follows:

- The provision of 65 hectares for employment land;
- A total floor area of 324 500 square metres (Gross External Area), comprising a mix of B1 (business, including offices - 15% or 48 675 square metres (sq.m)), B2 (general industry - 40% or 129 800 sq.m.) and B8 (warehouse and distribution - 45% or 146 025 sq.m);
- Maximum building heights of 15 metres, except tranche E7 with a maximum height of 17 metres along with associated ground works;
- A new site access road from junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway. Also proposed is a new vehicular connection with the Old Great North Road to the south west;
- Diversion of the northern section of Bridleway Number 1 (to facilitate the new access road connection with junction 1 of Fletton Parkway);
- Safeguarding of 1.5 hectares (for a 6 years period of time) for a Householder Recycling Centre or Park and Ride;
- A buffer zone of 30 metres with Orton Pit SSSI/SAC with the buildings within the adjacent plots to be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the boundary of the site;
- Measures to control unauthorised access into Orton Pit SSSI/SAC;
- Areas of ecological mitigation (areas OS5 and OS2) and habitat enhancement;
- Associated attenuations ponds and surface water drainage;
- Associated foul drainage infrastructure; and
- Provision of a private bus service for employees.

Based on a generic 'industry standard', the applicant had predicted the amount and type of development proposed could create in the order of 8,500 jobs.

The application was supported by the following documentation:

- Design and Access Statement;
- Planning Statement;
- Environmental Statement;
- Access Management Strategy for Orton Pit SSSI/SAC; and
- Transport Assessment and Travel Plan

Under separate consideration was an application for the Great Haddon core area. Outline planning permission was sought for a maximum of 5350 dwellings, with three new primary schools and one secondary school, a district centre and two local centres, open space and drainage.

With the exception of the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan the supporting information submitted relates to both applications. They were originally to be progressed in tandem but in December 2010 the employment site was sold to Roxhill (Peterborough) Limited.

The core area application was the subject on going negotiations and would be reported separately to Members at a later date.

The adjacent site of Alwalton Hill was also under the control of the applicant, Roxhill (Peterborough) Limited. The site had detailed planning consent (reference 09/00725/REM) for some 172 000 square metres of B8 floor space (warehousing and distribution) with ancillary offices, in five 15 metre high buildings, a new access road from junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway including an associated diversion of the bridleway, internal access roads, drainage and associated landscaping. This existing permission was a material consideration in the determination of the current application although the scheme had not yet been implemented.

The agent acting on behalf of the applicant had confirmed that the phasing of the development, including the Alwalton Hill site, would be market led. Parcels of land would be developed as and when the demand arose. Roxhill would, however, manage the site, retaining control over the strategic areas of open space, landscaping, drainage and highways infrastructure. It would also co-ordinate the building materials so that the development clearly showed the Roxhill 'brand'.

A full application had also been made for the new access road through the employment land from junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway to a point some three quarters of the way through the site (reference 10/00320/FUL). The proposal included a connection to adjoining land at Alwalton Hill. This application had been progressed in parallel with the outline planning application subject to the report presented to the Committee for consideration. As the principle of a new access road in the location proposed would be established under this outline planning application, should planning permission be granted, the application for the road would thereafter be determined under delegated powers.

The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services addressed the Committee and introduced the item. Members were advised that the application was extremely complex and important for the city. The site had been allocated in the adopted Core Strategy as a key employment site for the growth of the city over the next 15 years. It would deliver over half of the new jobs in the city, in conjunction with the neighbouring Alwalton Hill site, over that period. The Core Strategy had been found to be sound by an appointed Government Inspector therefore the principle of development was acceptable and Members were to consider the detailed impact assessments around the application.

An extensive project management framework had been established and project working groups had been implemented in order to look over a number of issues. Issues had been overcome and a scheme had now been developed which was key for the critical growth

agenda. Development would follow quickly, if Members were minded to approve the application and the site could yield 8,500 jobs for the city.

The Principal Development Management Officer gave an overview of the proposal and its main elements. Members were advised that a number of the representations received against the proposal had been in relation to the loss of green land or the loss of agricultural land for food production. These issues had been considered during the Core Strategy allocation process and therefore could not be revisited as part of the current application.

The development at Alwalton Hill had permission for 172,500 square metres of warehousing with offices in five 15 metre high buildings and a new access road from Junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway. The consented buildings were located close to the Fletton Parkway and the A1(M).

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. Additional comments had been received from Huntingdonshire District Councillor Nick Guyatt raising concerns with regards to the visual impact of the development, potential flooding concerns and reiterating his concerns around vehicle access onto the Great North Road.

An update from Cambridgeshire County Council Officers had also been received. Members were advised that the application had been presented to their Cabinet and it was highlighted that the scheme was an ideal opportunity to incorporate a sustainable urban drainage system and this should be secured and implemented through appropriate planning conditions or S106. Also, subject to the satisfactory completion of a S106 and the conditions requested by Cambridgeshire County Council being secured, in particular around transport, the Council removed its Holding Objection to the proposals.

An additional representation from a member of the public had also been received outlining an objection in relation to HGVs being allowed to access the Great North Road and subsequently becoming a danger to cyclists using the Green Wheel route.

A summary of the Great Haddon consultation to date was also outlined within the additional information report.

The Area Manager, Development Management, addressed the Committee and outlined the key impacts of the development and highlighted the views of officers in relation to those impacts. These included:

- *The Impact on Peterborough's Road Network:* In the first instance, Members were advised that the surrounding road network was managed by three different bodies, all of which had been heavily involved in assessing the scheme. Members were informed that the section of the Fletton Parkway between Junctions 2 and 17 of the A1(M) currently operated close to its capacity during the morning peak hour. In order to prevent unacceptable delays along Fletton Parkway, junction improvement works and widening would be necessary. Members were also advised that the traffic modelling information had shown that drivers travelling towards the A1(M) between Junctions 3 and 1 of the parkway experienced delays to their journeys of around 1 ½ minutes during peak hour. The modelling had predicted an increase in this time to around 4 minutes until the widening and improvements works had been implemented. Officers and the Highways Agency had considered the length of this delay to be unacceptable. A cap on development, limiting the amount of floor space was therefore recommended with the remainder of development being built once the widening of Fletton Parkway had been carried out. As a result of this cap on development, the traffic modelling predicted a delay of around 2 ½ minutes, this was considered to be within acceptable limits. A condition limiting the development to specific thresholds was therefore recommended.

- *Impact on the Strategic Network (A1(M) and Junction 17):* Following technical detailed discussion and assessment of the information, the Highways Agency had removed its Holding Direction subject to the imposition of two conditions. The first requiring works to Junction 17 including the introduction of signals on the approach to the A605 and the second, the widening of Fletton Parkway in line with the outlined caps on development. Members were informed that the Highways Agency had not raised any objection regarding the impact of the development on Junction 16 of the A1(M).
- *Impact of Cambridgeshire County Council's Network:* Officers had advised that, in their view, the proposed work to Junction 17 would mitigate the impact of the development on the A605. The traffic modelling had predicted that the development would not result in a significant increase in traffic along the A15. Members were further informed that the application sought to establish the principle of a new vehicular link from the employment site to the Old Great North Road. HGVs would be prevented from using this link. Highways Officers from Cambridgeshire County Council had not raised any objection to the principle of the link, subject to the inclusion of physical measures to prohibit HGVs accessing the road. The link to the Great North Road would be necessary to alleviate the pressure on Junction 17 of the A1(M) and Members were advised that it was important to note that without the link, the Highways Agency would not have withdrawn its Holding Direction.
- *Sustainable Travel:* A private bus service had been proposed and would be available at key times, the exact route to be agreed by the Head of Planning Transport and Engineering Services as development progressed. The S106 would require that the service ran for five years after completion of the development.
- *Impact on the Character of the Area and Residential Amenity:* There had been a number of objections received raising concerns with regards to the adverse impact of the proposal upon the existing rural character of the area. Members were advised that it was accepted that as a result of the development the character of the area would change. This proposal could not be delivered without such an impact and it was significant to note that the change to the character of the area had previously been accepted with the granting of the planning permission for the Alwalton Hill scheme. A number of objections had also been received alluding to the fact that the development would redefine Peterborough as primarily a warehouse and industrial centre, however a strategic decision had been taken to develop this area, including the Alwalton Hill site, through the Core Strategy process in order to improve the variety of employment land available in the city. The development would increase the usage of the old A1 to approximately 10% of its capacity during the morning peak hour and under 5% in the evening peak. Whilst it was acknowledged that this would mean the road would be busier, it would be considered appropriate to make use of the road and the traffic volumes would remain well within capacity. Members were advised that concerns had also been raised with regards to the potential impact for 'rat-running' through Haddon village to the west of the site. It was considered that the majority of employees would work within Peterborough, therefore travelling through Haddon village would represent an 8 or 9 mile diversion. It was therefore considered unlikely that Haddon Village would be used as a 'rat-run' by employees.
- *Impact on the Visual Amenity of the Surrounding Area:* With regards to building height the character of the area would be changed, however the buildings would be in line with the Alwalton Hill scheme except tranche E7. Members were advised that the proposed Great Haddon development would sit behind the Alwalton Hill scheme therefore taking into account the existing planning permission, the impact of the application was considered acceptable from that perspective. With regards to tranche E7, it was considered that in view of the consented scheme and the distance from Haddon Village, it would not appear unduly prominent from the west. There would be some views of the site from along the Great North Road including residential properties located approximately 340 metres from the southern end of tranche E7, but due to the bend in the road and landscaping, there would be no

direct views from the residential properties to tranche E7. The houses also faced directly onto the Great North Road and not onto the development.

- *Residential Amenity:* With regards to a number of issues affecting residential amenity, such as noise, odour, construction impacts etc. it was recommended to control these by implementing a number of conditions.
- *Flood risk and Drainage:* There had been an objection received by the Norman Cross Action Group in relation to the inadequacy of the flood risk assessment undertaken and they were concerned with the potential for flooding especially near to the A1(M). The site fell within a low flood risk zone as defined by PPS25 and was not next to any rivers. The drainage system had been designed to accommodate 1 in 100 year flood events and had factored in an additional 30% for climate change. The Environment Agency had been consulted on the proposals and had raised no objections. It was therefore considered that the proposals were compliant with PPS25 on flooding and were therefore acceptable.
- *Ecology and Landscaping:* Detailed proposals had been put forward to mitigate against the impact of development on the adjoining Orton Pit Nature Reserve, a number of species and existing landscaping. The proposals were considered to be acceptable by officers and had allowed Natural England to remove its objection.
- *Energy Efficiency:* In order to deliver energy efficiencies as part of the development and to meet the environmental objectives set out in policies CS10 and CS11 of the Adopted Core Strategy it was recommended that a condition be imposed upon any permission requiring energy efficiency measures 10% over and above those required by the Building Regulation standards in operation at the time when the reserved matters application was submitted (unless the standards require a zero carbon development).

Members' attention was drawn to further information contained within the update report and it was highlighted that a technical note in respect of potential impacts on properties at Hoylake Drive with regards to air quality had been submitted by the applicant. A technical assessment had been completed and reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health Section and on the basis of the information provided the conclusions of the technical assessment had been accepted. No additional conditions were therefore recommended.

There were also a couple of minor alterations suggested to conditions C18 and C26 and a change to, and inclusion of a number of informatives.

The Appropriate Assessment for the development had been completed and signed off by Natural England and the Head of Planning Transport and Engineering. It concluded that in light of the mitigating measures secured, there would be no adverse impact upon the integrity of the site. In light of this, the recommendation contained within the committee report had now been amended to remove reference to the Appropriate Assessment and the recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions and the completion of a S106 agreement.

Councillor Nick Guyatt, on behalf of the Norman Cross Action Group, addressed the Committee. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- Norman Cross Action Group had consistently accepted that this land would be developed, it only sought to ensure that the development fulfilled the aspirations of Peterborough City Council for its future, while having the least adverse effect on local residents. This proposal did neither of those things,
- The site had not been through the allocation list procedure and had therefore not been vetted by an independent inspector
- Concerning Peterborough City Council's aspirations, the plans did not meet its published wishes. The Council had expressed its intention to provide highly skilled and professional employment opportunities to match that of Cambridge. The aspirations remained largely unfulfilled. There were a number of employment sites

located near to the city centre which remained unused and a number of vacant warehouses. The current proposal would ensure that these sites remained un-let

- There was an aspiration in the past for a science park to come to Peterborough. Unfortunately, this appeared to have been given up on
- One of the main objections was the proposal to link the site to The Great North Road, and southwards to the A1(M) and eventually to the proposed housing development
- The developer had agreed that there should be a limit to the number of cars using this entrance
- For the Norman Cross Action Group members living down the Great North Road and for the people of Haddon the road would become a rat-run
- When the houses were built, there would be a dangerous build up of traffic as the road entered the A15 and the A1(M) junctions
- The road was designed to be underused by motor traffic, it was part of a national cycle route and was used by cyclists and pedestrians with very few cars using it
- A footpath would need to be provided if traffic was to increase to gain proper segregation between pedestrians, cyclists and cars. There appeared to be no proposals as to who would fund this
- Many roads within the rural parts of Peterborough were under used, did that mean that large developments could automatically be housed nearby?
- The removal of the access onto Great North Road was of high importance to the residents and should not be ignored
- Could Officers be certain of their traffic projections? All forecasts were tenuous
- An expert witness had been provided who had stated that surface water would not be controlled and sent down to Stanground in the event of a 1 in 100 year rainfall
- In 1998 the rainwater drained from the fields and twice flooded the roads under the A1(M). The flow, with development, would be much greater
- The expert had stated that the pond appeared to be of insufficient size to serve 65 hectares of buildings and car parks so that the adjacent areas and Stanground would not get flooded
- There should be redundant pumps and a standby generator to provide a high integrity solution. That was not much to ask to make sure people did not get flooded
- The Green Wheel ran from the town to the country, now it would run from town, through a housing estate to a warehousing complex. Not very appealing and not very green
- There had been little consideration as to how the development would look from the Green Wheel and the A1(M)
- The fields currently composed the first view a traveller got of the south of Peterborough. They would be confronted by a very overdeveloped site masked by a few trees and with little or no attempt to integrate into the landscape
- The attractive side of the development, the offices and car parking, would face into the development. The plan should be reversed around
- You should be able to drive past the development in 17 years time, when it was completed, and be proud of it in design and employment terms and its lack of negative impact on the environment and its neighbours
- Would the proposal bring the maximum economic benefit to Peterborough and its neighbours for the minimum amount of collateral damage?
- The estimate of 8,500 jobs could be wrong
- The proposal had not gone through the Site Allocation process

Mr Martin Eckersall, from Roxhill Development, Mr Ron Henry, from Peter Brett Associates, Mr Mike Foster, from LDA Design and Mr David Shaw, Planning Consultant, addressed the Committee jointly and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- The application had been submitted in December 2009 by O&H following extensive consultation stretching back a number of years
- The Great Haddon employment land had been part of a larger O&H scheme which included residential to the south
- Towards the end of 2010 O&H looked to sell the employment land and concentrate on the residential side
- Roxhill purchased the land in December 2010
- Roxhill signed a development agreement with Milton Estate for the Alwalton Hill land
- In February 2011, Roxhill had submitted a regulation 19 application which effectively separated the employment scheme from the residential scheme
- Roxhill aimed to create a high end, high quality development, to attract high calibre employers
- Roxhill had an established design code in order to help establish a high quality site, with a high quality brand, feel and look
- The site, once built, would be maintained to a high standard. A management company would be established where tenants would contribute to the maintenance of the landscaping, with Roxhill being the golden shareholder and subsequent tenants coming on board
- The consultation on the site had been going on since 2004
- Alwalton Hill already had planning permission, but had not been developed because of the legal arrangements around the entry to the site. No agreement had been reached by O&H and Milton Estates. The problem had now been overcome by Roxhill taking over the sites
- An estimated 1500 jobs had been lost due to the non-development of the Alwalton Hill site
- The first occupier was keen to come in and they needed to be on site by August 2012. The timetable was extremely tight to achieve everything by this date
- The jobs available would be a mixture of jobs including high level financial, logistical office jobs as well as warehouse jobs. A cross section of employees would be attracted
- There were problems with the current infrastructure as it stood. Therefore the contributions agreed would help to deliver needed works
- The site would be accessed from Junction 1, Fletton Parkway, which was wholly acceptable as an access route
- The concerns around Great North Road were understood and had been listened to and it was highlighted that only 10% of development traffic was likely to utilise the Great North Road. This had been identified through the traffic modelling
- There would be no HGVs using the Great North Road and the connection to the road would not happen until the end of the scheme
- The HGVs would be restricted by a width restriction, which would go through full technical approval. Height restrictions could also be considered and an additional condition to ensure a proper functioning scheme could be considered
- An objection would not be lifted by the Highways Authority without the link to the Great North Road
- With regards to east to west traffic movement, the A605 junctions, as well as the A47 had been assessed in terms of operational acceptance with the employment site and were considered to be satisfactory
- There were approved sustainable travel measures in place and the aspirations were to promote and obtain a strategy management plan
- There were also proposals which had been touched upon for a bespoke bus service
- There would be substantial improvements to A1(M) Junction 17, Junction 1 and the contribution to enable Fletton Parkway to be widened
- The Great North Road was 10 metres wide, therefore a substantial piece of infrastructure with ample capacity
- With regards to flooding and drainage, the proposals were in accordance with national policy PPS25 and Environmental Agency approval had been given as well

as Natural England approval to the drainage proposals, as well as PCC Drainage Officer approval

- There would be a controlled outfall from the site
- The visual assessment information had been produced through a technical exercise and was a realistic view of the proposals
- The overall visual prominence of the site and development benefitted from existing woodland screening
- 40% of the whole Great Haddon development would be kept green
- The site had been subject to numerous ecological surveys, with very little ecological interest being highlighted
- New habitat within the area would be provided for species found
- The loss of a small number of trees would occur and some existing hedgerows. This would be compensated by the planting of a substantial number of hedges and trees
- Impacts on the bridleway and the users of the bridleway had been fully considered
- The proposals were for an energy efficient scheme, there were proposals for green roofs and rain water harvesting and there would also be charging points for electric cars

The meeting was adjourned for ten minutes.

The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services addressed the Committee in response to comments made by the speakers and stated that the site had been picked up in the Core Strategy as a strategic allocation. With regards to the traffic issues, the traffic modelling had been looked at by four sets of technical experts and the Holding Objection from the Highways Authority would not have been removed if The Great North Road had not been utilised.

The site would offer half of the growth in the jobs for the city over the next few years and minimising the impact of the development had been of high priority. Members were advised that concerns raised by the Committee with regards to the HGV restriction onto the Great North Road and ecology issues would be addressed.

The Highways Officer addressed the Committee and stated that the traffic model which had been used for the proposal had been developed by Peterborough City Council Officers as a strategic model for the entire city, therefore Officers had made sure it was as right as it could be.

Members commented that some of the jobs provided may not be sustainable in the long term, however, growth and additional employment in the city was welcomed. The scheme was an integral part of the Core Strategy and congratulations were extended to Officers for the extensive consultation undertaken.

Following additional comments from Members, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application including the additional conditions as proposed in the update report. The motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (Unanimously) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The prior satisfactory completion of an obligation under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in respect of the provision of a Travel Plan including contributions towards the monitoring thereof; the provision of a bus services for employees; a contribution towards off site highway improvements; the safeguarding of 1.5 hectares of land for a HRC or Park and Ride facility for 6 years; a contribution towards the Green Grid Strategy objectives; a contribution towards improvements to the Green Wheel/National Cycleway Network; provision for the long term management and

- maintenance of the SUDs; a contribution towards the upgrade of the Counter Drain (to be confirmed); Nature Conservation Objectives (if not addressed solely via conditions)
2. Conditions numbered C1 to C35 as detailed in the Committee report
 3. The minor alterations to Conditions C18 and C26 as detailed in the additional information report
 4. The informatives numbered 1 to 21 as detailed in the committee report
 5. The change to informative number 16 as detailed in the additional information report
 6. The additional informative number 22 as detailed in the additional information report

Reasons for decision:

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighting against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The principle of development was acceptable in accordance with the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008) and policies CS3 and CS5 of the Adopted Core Strategy;
- Following detailed assessment of the transport modelling the impact of the development on the surrounding highway network was considered to be acceptable in accordance with policy CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 'Transport' as amended January 2011;
- Through the provisions of the Travel Plan and bus service for employees, to be secured as part of the S106 Agreement, the development was considered to make adequate provision for sustainable travel in accordance with policy CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy;
- It was accepted that as a result of the development the existing rural character of the site would be permanently altered. However, a strategic decision had been made to develop this site for employment purposes in the Adopted Core Strategy. In this context, the visual impact of the development was considered to be acceptable in accordance with policies CS5 and CS16 of the Adopted Core Strategy;
- Following a review of all aspects of the development such as transport, noise, odour etc the impact of the development on the amenity of the neighbouring residents was considered to be acceptable in accordance with policies CS14 and CS16 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 'Transport';
- The potential impacts of the development on Orton Pit SSSI/SAC could be acceptably mitigated via the creation of a buffer zone and through the access control measures proposed. The development was, therefore, considered to be acceptable in accordance with policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity';
- Other ecological impacts of the development could also be acceptably mitigated so the development was in accordance with policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity';
- The impact of the development on existing trees and hedgerows within/adjoining the site was considered to be acceptable subject to the imposition of conditions requiring more detailed assessment as development comes forward and protection measures. New landscaping would also be planted, including the provision of new hedgerows. The development was, therefore, considered to be acceptable in accordance with policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy and policies LNE 9 and 10 of the Adopted Local Plan (First Replacement);
- Following assessment of the submitted information it was considered that the site could be adequately drained and would not give rise to an increased risk of flooding in accordance with policy CS22 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk';
- Via the imposition of a condition it was considered that the development would make a contribution towards the Council's Environment Capital objectives in accordance with policies CS9 and CS10 of the Adopted Core Strategy.

13.30 – 15.35
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank