

Item number 4

Planning and EP Committee 10 November 2015

Application Ref: 15/01235/FUL

Proposal: Provision of three new gas compressors and enclosures, a new vent stack, site office, administration and welfare buildings and associated infrastructure

Site: 1650 Lincoln Road, Peterborough, PE6 7HH,
Applicant: National Grid

Agent: Hyder Consulting

Site visit: 21.08.2015

Case officer: Mrs T J Nicholl
Telephone No. 01733 454442
E-Mail: theresa.nicholl@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

1 Description of the site and surroundings and Summary of the proposal

The existing National Grid gas compressor site comprises an area of approximately 6.157 hectares of land in a roughly square shaped parcel of land located to the west of Gasworks Road. This site contains the existing 3 gas turbine engines (identifiable in the vicinity by the red coloured stacks), vent stack, offices and other plant and ancillary buildings. The site is surrounded on all sides by agricultural land. Waterworks Lane is approximately 190 metres to the north and there are sporadic properties along the southern side of Waterworks Lane the rear elevations of which face the existing site. To the west of the site is a field and then Brooks Drain which runs in a roughly south/north direction. A further drain runs along the southern boundary of the site. To the east, the A15 Parkway is separated from the existing site by the highway verge landscaping and Gasworks Road, an arable field and a thicker tree belt which borders the eastern boundary of the site. Beyond the A15 to the east is Lincoln Road which contains residential properties. These properties are approximately 370 metres away from the edge of the existing site.

The proposal includes most of the existing site within the application area and requires the utilisation of a further 5.5 hectares of the land to the east of the current site. The application red line site comprises 6.89 hectares with the other land within National Grid's control shown in blue on the site location plan.

The current site was developed in the early 1970s. It is one of the 24 gas compressor stations placed at strategic sites within the National Transmission Network (NTS) of over 7,600km of steel high pressure pipelines. The purpose of the gas compressor stations is to raise the pressure of gas at key points in the system to ensure that the gas moves around the NTS efficiently and safely so it can be delivered to homes and businesses. It is fair to say, therefore, that the site is of strategic national importance in terms of energy provision. The site is heavily regulated through permitting by the Environment Agency.

The proposal is part of a national programme of upgrades being undertaken by National Grid to satisfy future supply and demand patterns, the physical state of the asset and most importantly the tightening of regulations requiring reductions in emissions levels, critically oxides of nitrogen (NOx). The proposed new units would result in NOx reductions of more than 90% and carbon dioxide (CO2) of more than 15% over 20 years.

The proposals include the provision of 3 new compressors, gas cleaning equipment and valves and other ancillary infrastructure within the area of the current site boundary. The new gas compressors would be located to the north of the existing compressors. It should be noted that only two compressors are required to be running at any one time. Also proposed is a new site office, surface water and foul water treatment plant, car park and vent stack within the area of land (currently part of the field) to the east of the site. The application also includes new fencing, lighting and landscape screening – especially to the north and east of the “new” site area. The existing vent stack and gas cleaning equipment will be removed.

The new compressors would be a maximum of 21.5 metres high above slab level. The existing exhaust stacks are 11.5 metres high. The proposed vent stack would be up to 25 metres high above slab level. The existing vent stack is 10.4 metres high. The vent stack is required to disperse process gas (unodorised natural gas being moved around the NTS) in the local environment in the event that a compressor or other station pipework needs to be emptied of gas for maintenance, shutdown, or very rarely, in a potential emergency situation.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
15/00002/SCREEN	Screening opinion for proposed works to existing gas compressor station	Comments	22/01/2015

3 Planning Policy

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

EN1 Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Section 1 - Economic Growth

Planning should encourage sustainable growth and significant weight should be given to supporting economic development.

Section 4 - Assessment of Transport Implications

Development which generates a significant amount of traffic should be supported by a Transport Statement/Transport Assessment. It should be located to minimise the need to travel/to maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel and be supported by a Travel Plan. Large scale developments should include a mix of uses. A safe and suitable access should be provided and the transport network improved to mitigate the impact of the development.

Section 6 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Housing applications should be considered in this context. Policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if a 5 year supply of sites cannot be demonstrated.

Section 7 - Good Design

Development should add to the overall quality of the area; establish a strong sense of place; optimise the site potential; create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses; support local facilities and transport networks; respond to local character and history while not discouraging appropriate innovation; create safe and accessible environments which are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. Planning permission should be refused for development of poor design.

Section 10 - Development and Flood Risk

New development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the impacts of climate change. Inappropriate development in areas of flood risk should be avoided by directing it away from areas at higher risk. Where development is necessary it shall be made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Applications should be supported as appropriate by a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, a Sequential Test and, if required, the Exception Test.

Section 11 - Natural and Local Environment

Should be enhanced through the protection and enhancement of valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils; recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services; minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity. New and existing development should not contribute to or be put at unacceptable risk by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution and land instability.

Section 11 - Development on Agricultural Land

Where deemed necessary areas of poorer quality land should be used in preference to that of a higher quality.

Section 11 - Biodiversity

Development resulting in significant harm to biodiversity or in the loss of/deterioration of irreplaceable habitats should be refused if the impact cannot be adequately mitigated, or compensated. Proposals to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted and opportunities to incorporate biodiversity into new development encouraged.

Development within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest or other specified sites should not normally be permitted where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely. An exception should only be made where the benefits clearly outweigh the impacts.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development requiring Appropriate Assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered or determined.

Section 11 - Contamination

The site should be suitable for its intended use taking account of ground conditions, land stability and pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation. After remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

Section 11 - Noise

New development giving rise to unacceptable adverse noise impacts should be resisted; development should mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising. Development often creates some noise and existing businesses wanting to expand should not be unreasonably restricted because of changes in nearby land uses.

Section 11 - Light Pollution

Lighting should be designed to limit pollution on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and areas of nature conservation.

Section 12 - Conservation of Heritage Assets

Account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining/enhancing heritage assets; the positive contribution that they can make to sustainable communities including economic viability; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of a new development great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Planning permission should be refused for development which would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance unless this is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh the

harm/loss. In such cases all reasonable steps should be taken to ensure the new development will proceed after the harm/ loss has occurred.

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)

CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside

The location/ scale of new development should accord with the settlement hierarchy. Development in the countryside will be permitted only where key criteria are met.

CS14 - Transport

Promotes a reduction in the need to travel, sustainable transport, the Council's UK Environment Capital aspirations and development which would improve the quality of environments for residents.

CS16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

Design should be of high quality, appropriate to the site and area, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, be accessible to all users and not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

CS17 - The Historic Environment

Development should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment including non scheduled nationally important features and buildings of local importance.

CS20 - Landscape Character

New development should be sensitive to the open countryside. Within the Landscape Character Areas development will only be permitted where specified criteria are met.

CS21 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

Development should conserve and enhance biodiversity/ geological interests unless no alternative sites are available and there are demonstrable reasons for the development.

CS22 - Flood Risk

Development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will only be permitted if specific criteria are met. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate.

Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Mineral and Waste Core Strategy DPD (2011)

CS26 – Mineral Safeguarding Areas

Development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the mineral concerned is no longer of economic value, the mineral can be extracted prior to development taking place, the development will not inhibit extraction in the future, there is an overriding need for the development and prior extraction cannot be reasonably undertaken or the development is not incompatible

Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)

PP01 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Applications which accord with policies in the Local Plan and other Development Plan Documents will be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are no relevant policies, the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

PP02 - Design Quality

Permission will only be granted for development which makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment; does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area; is sufficiently robust to withstand/adapt to climate change; and is designed for longevity.

PP03 - Impacts of New Development

Permission will not be granted for development which would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, public and/or private green space or natural daylight; be overbearing or cause noise or other disturbance, odour or other pollution; fail to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder.

PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access by all user groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including highway safety.

PP16 - The Landscaping and Biodiversity Implications of Development

Permission will only be granted for development which makes provision for the retention of trees and natural features which contribute significantly to the local landscape or biodiversity.

PP17 - Heritage Assets

Development which would affect a heritage asset will be required to preserve and enhance the significance of the asset or its setting. Development which would have detrimental impact will be refused unless there are overriding public benefits.

PP18 - Ancient, Semi-Natural Woodland and Ancient and Veteran Trees

Permission will not be granted for development which would adversely affect an area of ancient, semi-natural woodland or an ancient or veteran tree unless the need for it or public benefits outweigh the loss.

PP19 - Habitats and Species of Principal Importance

Permission will not be granted for development which would cause demonstrable harm to a habitat or species unless the need for, and benefits of it, outweigh the harm. Development likely to have an impact should include measures to maintain and, if possible, enhance the status of the habitat or species.

4 Consultations/Representations

Glinton Parish Council (17.09.15)

Objects to the proposal for the following reasons;

- Prior to the application being submitted, National Grid met with the Parish Council but there was a lack of detail in these presentations but there are now a number of details in the submission which are of concern to the Parish Council
- Using the land to the east of the site uses higher quality land than the other options (west, south and north) and will increase the negative impact on nearby residents in terms of visual appearance and noise
- As the submission indicates a design life of 40 years we need to be mindful that whatever is constructed will affect Glinton's residents and village environment for at least two generations and therefore should be constructed to the highest possible standards
- The Parish Council disagrees that the development is not Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Development
- The submission refers to noise levels 2dB greater than daytime background levels and 5dB greater than night time background levels and acknowledges the possibility of sleep disturbance. National Grid should be made to reduce the noise levels to even lower levels than the existing plant.
- The felling of trees to the east of the current site should be kept to a minimum and not a level determined by convenience
- The submission refers to adverse impacts lasting 15 years after planting of trees to mitigate this. GPC finds this unacceptable. Screen planting should utilise already mature trees and should be planted early in the project to shield residents from the impact of the work and longer term visual impact
- The height of the compressors and vent stack is considerably higher than at present. The vent stack is closer to Werrington Parkway thus magnifying the impact of the taller

structure. GPC request that the stack be moved further back into the site as it is at present

- The plant should not be painted black as proposed. The impact would be lessened by a stainless steel finish
- The submission shows that construction work will be carried out 10 hours or more a day, 7 days a week including bank holidays, especially in the summer months. This is unacceptable to the quality of life of nearby residents.

Since further recent consultation was carried out, the following additional comments have been received from Glinton Parish Council;

- Further technical reports have been added to the application but the detail of the application itself does not appear to have changed
- The Parish Council remain vigorously opposed to the application in its present form and retain their previous objections
- Furthermore, the archaeological reports strengthen the contention that the vent stack should not be located within the eastern field but within the existing site thus reducing the need for the volume of tree removal and impact on land with archaeological merit.

PCC Transport & Engineering Services (04.10.15)

No objections subject to conditions concerning construction management and turning within the site

PCC Rights of Way Officer (17.08.15)

The Public Right of Way appears to have been severed several years ago by the creation of Werrington Parkway. The applicant has applied to extinguish this Bridlway known as Peterborough 47 and the Public Right of Way comments will be dealt with via this process

PCC Pollution Team (24.09.15)

No objections subject to the imposition of conditions relating to noise levels emitted from the site, lighting and unsuspected contamination

Archaeological Officer (26.08.15)

No objections. Recommends that following geophysical and trial trenching work, two areas identified in the north and south parts of the site be openly excavated and that this be conditioned

Lead Local Drainage Authority (19.08.15)

No objections. Prior to any construction the applicant will need to expand the drainage strategy to consider confirmation that the Environment Agency are content with proposed discharge rates and the detailed design of the proposed surface water drainage system.

Landscape Architect (Amey) (08.09.15)

No objections.

A detailed response has been received from the consultant employed via Amey. Whilst there is some disagreement with elements within the LVIA, the landscape architect agrees with the conclusions of the LVIA that the magnitude of impact of the development would be moderate adverse. In terms of landscape impact "the proposed scheme is highly industrial in nature...whilst the vent stacks would be taller by some 9 metres and closer to the road, the development would be an extension to the industrial facility which already exists, and which influences the local landscape's character. In fact it has become a familiar feature in the area."

In terms of views and visual amenity there would be major adverse effects on certain residential properties near to the site with views towards it. New planting will in long term (15 years +) help to screen views except for views from Woodcroft Villas. However it must be borne in mind that these receptors already have views of the existing facility and therefore the change is not as great as if the existing views were unspoilt.

The levels of harm to landscape character and visual amenity are not unacceptable and there is no objection in principle. It is recommended that a condition be imposed requiring a joint long term (25 years) management plan for ecology and landscaping.

PCC Tree Officer (04.09.15)

No objections. Recommends conditions regarding tree protection and tree planting

PCC Wildlife Officer (26.08.15)

No objections subject to conditions regarding badger and water vole mitigation, provision of bat, great crested newt and reptile refuges and provision of bird nesting boxes.

Health & Safety Executive

HSE does not advise against granting planning permission (PADHI response)

Environment Agency (22.10.15)

Withdraw their objections subject to imposition of conditions requiring a scheme(s) to be submitted which set out how the risk of contamination is to be dealt with and unsuspected contamination (if found during construction). The EA also suggests a number of informatives.

Natural England - Consultation Service (20.08.15)

No objections. Natural England is satisfied the proposal is unlikely to have any adverse impact on designated sites. PCC should apply Natural England's standing advice on protected species to assess the adequacy of the surveys undertaken.

Historic England (10.09.15)

The first response from Historic England was based upon them not viewing the submitted Cultural Heritage report. In their later response (dated 18.10.2015) Historic England are critical of the lack of detail in the Desk Based Assessment concerning the impact of the proposal upon significant built heritage assets set further out than 1km from the site. However, they note that the Landscape and Visual Assessment adopts a study area of 2.5km and concludes that the proposed development would have a minor effect on the views from Woodcroft Castle in winter. Notwithstanding the shortcomings of the assessment, Historic England state that their previous advice remains unaltered i.e. there will likely be a slight effect on Woodcroft Castle.

Werrington Neighbourhood Council

No comments received

Peterborough Local Access Forum

No comments received

The Open Spaces Society

No comments received

Ramblers (Central Office) (25.08.15)

No objections

GeoPeterborough (Sites Of Interest)

No comments received

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 44

Total number of responses: 4 (one of these is Glington PC)

Total number of objections: 3

Total number in support: 0

Three letters have been received from residents at a property on Waterworks Lane and two

properties on Lincoln Road, Glinton who raise the following objections/comments;

- The view will be changed from our house from fields to compressors and a vent stack up to 21 metres high. This is a vast change, will create an ugly view and will totally change our outlook
- We would want landscape screening. There should be a good shield of trees and hedges
- We do not want construction works to be undertaken at weekends. The construction works will create additional noise
- Will the “danger zones” around the compressor site be re-calculated?
- Concern about safety issues near the Parkway
- Why does the development have to take place in this locality
- Residents living in the locality have no supply therefore the development is of no benefit to us
- There is noise from the compressor station when pressure is released and it will be more so
- What is dispersed into the atmosphere?
- Residents are not being informed – only by letter saying planning is being put forward

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The key issues for consideration are;

1. The principle of the development
2. Transport
3. Scale/design and impact on neighbours
4. Impact on landscape character and landscaping
5. Biodiversity/ecology
6. Heritage/archaeology
7. Noise
8. Odour/pollution
9. Flood Risk/Drainage
10. Other issues

Principle of Development

The principle of having a gas compressor station in this location was established when the current site was approved and constructed in the early 1970s. Due to the nature of the development and its connection to the gas pipelines, it is not feasible or viable to consider relocating the station elsewhere. The proposal requires the utilisation of part of the adjacent field to the east of the site upon which to locate the new vent stack, office, foul and surface water treatment plant and other associated infrastructure. Policy CS1 of the spatial strategy within the adopted Peterborough Core Strategy sets out that development in the open countryside will be restricted to that which is demonstrably essential to a limited type of developments including utility services. The proposal would fall within this potential exception. The supporting documentation accompanying the application explains that the larger site area is required for operational and safety purposes, to enable the applicant to build new compressors which adhere to the industry safety standards (including isolating the vent stack) and crucially which enables the continuing operation of the site whilst the development takes place. It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with policy CS1 and the development is acceptable in principle.

Transport

A Transport Statement accompanies the application. This sets out that once the development is completed there will be no change in operational traffic visiting the site. It is proposed to reduce the current on-site parking from 32 to 20 spaces as this will adequately serve the employees and provide 8 visitor parking spaces.

Construction traffic will generate a maximum of 38 vehicles and hour and a maximum of 200 across a day. There are a small number of trips which will involve low loader and crane

movements which will require temporary traffic arrangements on the A15 to allow the vehicle to exit Waterworks Lane safely onto the A15. Therefore on occasion temporary traffic arrangements will need to be agreed with the Highway Authority and the police.

A construction compound will be created between the site and Gasworks Lane (as shown on the phasing plans) and temporary traffic access points will be created into the compound directly off Gasworks Lane. The construction compound will remain in place throughout the lifetime of the development and then restored back to agricultural land.

The Highway Authority raised no objections to the application and recommends that conditions be imposed concerning construction traffic management.

It is considered that the application accords with policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Scale/Design and impact on neighbours

The proposed plant is utilitarian in nature. It's positioning within the site and its scale and design are largely determined by factors including the need for the applicant to use Best Available Technology (BAT), the need to comply with regulations including safety distances and height/space ratios to ensure noise limits will be met and emissions can be dispersed safely.

In terms of scale, the most noticeable elements of the new plant will be the new gas cleaning equipment which will be 11 metres high, the three new compressors which will be up to a maximum of 21.5 metres high and the proposed vent stack which will be 25 metres high. The latter will be situated within the extended site area. The proposed compressors are also more utilitarian in appearance than the current cabs which are enclosed. They are located just to the north of the existing cabs and so are closer to some properties along Waterworks Lane, particularly Woodcroft Villas (pair of semi-detached houses). There is a belt of mature trees along the northern boundary of the site which will help to partially screen the compressor cabs but they will be highly visible from Waterworks Lane. However, as the landscape architect (PCC consultee) points out, the compressors are located within an existing industrialised site. The proposed compressors are approximately 240 metres from the rear elevations of Woodcroft Cottages.

It is unfortunate that additional land needs to be used to accommodate the vent stack, but for operational and safety reasons, the new development cannot all be accommodated within the confines of the existing site. Extending the site north was discounted due to the closer proximity to properties on Waterworks Lane. Extending west and south were discounted because of higher flood risk and ecological constraints and therefore extending east was chosen by the applicant as the best option. This means, however, that the proposed vent stack will be visible to properties to the east in Lincoln Road, Glinton (to the east of the A15) and to properties along Waterworks Lane and the part of Lincoln Road, Glinton that is to the west of the A15.

The vent stack will be approximately 320 metres from the front elevation of 4 Lincoln Road, approximately 400 metres from 3 Lincoln Road and approximately 330 metres from the front elevation of "Jodi" on Waterworks Lane. Although the vent stack may be up to 25 metres tall, it is a slim piece of plant (in the context of the site).

The existing trees (those to be retained) together with the proposed tree planting belts will, over time help to screen the lower parts of the development from the occupiers of the nearest properties. It is accepted that no amount of screening can totally hide the view of the new compressors and vent stack. During the construction a temporary soil bund to the north of the site which will be created from topsoil on the site, will assist with screening.

In terms of visual impact on residential property, policy PP3 of the Planning Policies DPD states that development shall not be granted planning permission where it will result in unacceptable loss of light to and/or overshadowing of any nearby property or result in being overbearing on any

nearby property. The proposed development is too distant from any property to result in loss of light, overshadowing or be overbearing. It is acknowledged that the proposals will affect the views from some residential properties, particularly those directly facing the site along Waterworks Lane and to a lesser extent those on Lincoln Road, Glinton. However, the development is set against a current industrial site albeit with lower existing buildings. A right to a view is not a material planning consideration. Sometimes distant buildings can be of such a scale as to make dwellings “undesirable places in which to live.” Such a test is often applied to large wind turbines, although turbines have the issue of constant movement. In this instance, although visible, the proposals will not affect the nearest properties to such a degree that they become undesirable places in which to live. Also, whilst there is some visual impact, it is not so significant to conflict with policy PP3. The visual impact that will occur must also be weighed against the need to upgrade essential national energy infrastructure. In terms of visual impact on residential property the proposal complies with policy PP3.

In terms of design quality, the character of the surrounding area will be affected by the height of the new infrastructure but this can be mitigated to an extent by imposition of conditions relating to materials and new tree planting. The applicants propose that the new plant will be light grey in colour (not black). As the new planting will take at least 15 years to have maximum impact and is proposed in part to mitigate views of the development from residential properties, it is proposed to impose a condition requiring a 25 year management plan for the landscaping.

Given the nature of the development, it is considered that the applicant has used best practicable means to site the new plant in appropriate areas and to mitigate its appearance through colour of materials and tree planting. Therefore, the proposals comply overall with policies CS21 and PP2.

Impact on landscape character and landscaping proposals

The application is accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The LVIA essentially assesses the current baseline with regard to landscape character, assesses the impact of the development on landscape character and with mitigation. Landscape character concerns the intrinsic landscape value of areas such as topography, planting, buildings, field patterns etc. The Peterborough Landscape Character Assessment 2007 sets out the character and sub character areas for Peterborough. Visual impact concerns the impact of development upon peoples’ perceptions through views from key “receptors” i.e. residential dwellings, public footpaths etc.

Visual impact has been dealt with in the previous section. The LVIA included assessments of wider viewpoints within a 2.5 km radius of the site. The landscape architect advising PCC has not raised concerns about visual impact on other receptors except the nearest residential properties – as set out above. She has advised that although there will be visual impact the proposals will not cause enough harm to be in conflict with any national or local planning policies.

With regard to landscape character, the LVIA assesses this to be poor. In the opinion of the Landscape Architect advising PCC, this should at least be low to moderate in line with the Peterborough Landscape Character Assessment. Nevertheless, she agrees with the LVIA’s conclusion that the magnitude of the impact of development would be moderate adverse. She also notes that the development is an extension of an existing industrial feature which has become a familiar feature of the area. Woodland is not a characteristic of the area and the trees to be removed to facilitate the development were planted at the time the existing station was developed. Whilst woodland is not a characteristic here, it is considered necessary for visual screening and has become a familiar landscape feature associated with the facility. The proposed tree planting will just be in a slightly different location. In terms of landscape character, the proposals would comply with paragraph 65 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Core Strategy policies CS1, CS17 and CS20.

With regard to the proposed tree removal and new landscape scheme, the Council's Landscape Officer does not object to the proposals subject to conditions requiring submission of landscape details, tree protection measures and soil protection.

The submission shows that existing trees to the north of the existing site will be retained. A large block of trees to the east of the existing site will need to be removed. Some trees within the belt along the edge of Gasworks Lane will need to be removed to make the temporary access points. A new belt of trees to the north and east of the site extension will be planted to mitigate for the tree loss and to help with screening. Such mitigation (with conditions) is acceptable and complies with policy PP16 of the Planning Policies DPD.

Biodiversity/Ecology

The applicant submitted an extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report and a Protected Species Survey Report with the application. The surveys found no presence of great crested newts (GCN), reptiles or water voles but there are potential habitats in and around the site to support such species. Bat surveys indicated bat activity on site (several species) but found no evidence of bat roosts within the site. A badger survey confirmed that there are no badger setts within the site or area surrounding the site although badgers may move through the area. Further surveys will be required to assess whether there are water vole present in the drain area to the south of the site.

Proposed mitigation measures include; replacement of the lost trees with new planting, provision of bird and bat boxes, provision of reptile and amphibian refuges within the scrub area and design of lighting to be sympathetic to bats.

Natural England has commented on the Air Quality Assessment and notes the predicted reductions in NOx concentrations which may have beneficial impacts for both annual mean and maximum daily mean NOx concentrations at all designated habitat sites including Nene Washes Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site, Barnack Hills and Holes SAC and Orton Pit SAC. Natural England is therefore satisfied the proposal is unlikely to have any adverse effect on such sites.

With regard to the protected species, the Council's Wildlife Officer has raised no objections subject to the required further survey work and mitigation measures being secured by conditions.

Conditions are proposed to secure the measures required. As such the proposals accord with policy CS21 of the Core Strategy and policy PP19 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Heritage/Archaeology

The NPPF sets out in paragraphs 131 to 136 how local planning authorities should deal with applications that may affect heritage assets. These might be designated such as listed buildings and Conservation Areas or non-designated. The planning judgement/weighting will depend on the significance of the asset concerned and the level of harm that might be caused e.g. substantial or less than substantial. Archaeological remains are also heritage assets.

Policies CS17 of the Core Strategy and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD are consistent with the NPPF.

A Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment has been submitted with the application. With regard to built heritage it is noted that there are no designated assets within a 1km radius of the site and that there are several listed buildings within Ginton.

Historic England first commented on the application (their response dated 10 September 2015 having not viewed the Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment). They comment that in their opinion St. Benedict's Church and Manor House and its stables in Ginton (first grade 1 and the latter grade II*) would be screened by the village from the development. Woodcroft Castle, an

unusual medieval fortified house listed at grade II* stands at some distance from the site and would be screened both by the planting within which it is set and by other planting in the landscape. To some degree the presence in the landscape of the proposed development would compromise its historic rural character, but the effect of this on the significance of the castle would seem likely to be slight.

In their later response (dated 18.10.2015) Historic England are critical of the lack of detail in the Desk Based Assessment concerning the impact of the proposal upon significant built heritage assets set further out than 1km from the site. However, they note that the Landscape and Visual Assessment adopts a study area of 2.5km and concludes that the proposed development would have a minor effect on the views from Woodcroft Castle in winter. Notwithstanding the shortcomings of the assessment, Historic England state that their previous advice remains unaltered i.e. there will likely be a slight effect on Woodcroft Castle.

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to a less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use. It is considered that in this case the provision of the upgraded gas compressor station which has national importance in terms of energy delivery provides public benefits which do outweigh the less than significant harm the development might have on Woodcroft Castle. It must also be acknowledged that the existing site already affects the character of the historic rural landscape.

Sections 66 and 72 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act places a special duty upon local planning authorities to have regard to the desire to preserve or enhance the special architectural and/or historic character of listed buildings and conservation areas and their settings. Whilst there might be a slight effect on views from Woodcroft Castle, the change in character of the area, given the presence of the existing site is not so great as to cause noticeable harm. The local planning authority has had regard to their duty under this Act and finds the development acceptable.

The applicant undertook a geophysical survey of the site, the results of which have been submitted in the Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment together with details of archaeological recorded finds in the locality. In consultation with the Council's archaeologist, the applicant has undertaken trial trench work. A report on this Archaeological Evaluation by Oxford Archaeology East was submitted in September 2015. Twelve trenches were excavated across 5.3 hectares of the field to the east of the current gas compressor site i.e. the area which would become the extended site.

Subsequently, the applicant has submitted a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) dated 24 September 2015. This sets out that there is to be further excavation in two areas which have been agreed with the Council's Archaeologist who has requested that the scheme of investigation set out in the WSI be secured by condition. Investigation of the archaeological remains prior to the development taking place and then ensuring that this is reported and archived is acceptable and accords with policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Noise

The current gas compressor station is subject to the following noise condition;

"The compressor station should be so designed that at points 175 metres and 275 metres from the boundaries of OS field no 0369 the noise level when the station is operating at full load does not exceed 45dB(A) and 37dB(A) at night."

National Grid has two recorded complaints concerning noise, one from 1999 and the other from 2005. In previous assessment taken for the site, the 175m measurement is taken to be from Woodcroft Villas and the 275m measurement has been taken to be the property "Jodi" (renamed from Kabul).

Consultation was carried out with the Principal Pollution Control Officer at pre-application stage.

The noise report concludes that during the daytime the predicted noise levels will be below levels that will cause any adverse effects. At night time and when the gas turbines are operating at full load (in winter) there may be some adverse effects relating to sleep disturbance (the Pollution Control Officer confirmed that it is acceptable to assume that in winter windows are less likely to be open as in summer and also background noise levels are more likely to be higher). However, the compressors will be operating within the ranges set out for the existing compressors and these have not led to any complaints other than those set out above (this is confirmed by the Pollution Control Officer). The applicant has used Best Available Technology to build mitigation into the design of the compressors at additional cost to the project. The applicant states that further reductions in noise would not be possible without enclosing each gas turbine machinery train enclosure in a separate stand-alone building. This option is not available to the applicant for operational, maintenance, programme, land take and funding reasons which could potentially impact on National Grid's ability to meet its legal gas supply obligations. The case officer comments that the applicant discussed the noise level limit with officers before producing a design of gas turbine to meet those noise level limits.

The Principal Pollution Control Officer has not objected to the proposal subject to the noise level condition being imposed as set out below. In recommending a noise limit, the Pollution Control Officer has taken into account the following matters;

- The existing planning condition and the basis for the noise limits described therein.
- The level of noise from the source above the background noise levels.
- The likely variation in the background noise levels.
- The existing noise levels and tonality associated with existing plant.
- The intermittent operation of the plant.
- The periods during which the plant would most likely be operational.
- The introduction of a new source into the locality that may attract attention.
- The potential for reasonable noise complaint, and the consequences to the operator and the Local Authority in those circumstances.

He has also stated that;

“This noise level (set by the proposed condition) is lower than that previously specified since it incorporates a penalty for noise characteristics (the “rating” level, that wasn't included in the existing noise limit). The applicant was of the opinion that a simple swap of conditions would suffice since there was a history of little complaint, however the new noise source may have been very different in character, so this Section was unable to support such a position and recommended the condition as proposed.”

It is considered that the proposal is in accordance with policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD as it will not cause unacceptable noise disturbance for the occupiers or users of any nearby property or land.

Odour/Pollution

The Air Quality Assessment submitted with the application concludes that emission levels from the plant will be improved at the indicative stack height of 14.7 metres with further but less marked improvements as the stack height might increase to a maximum of 21.4 metres. The final design of the compressors would be conditioned up to a maximum stack height of up to 21.4 metres.

Impacts from the construction phase will be negligible from traffic sources. There may be fugitive dust from activities such as demolition, earthworks excavation, on site construction vehicle movement, material transfer etc. This can be kept to a minimum by operation of a dust management regime on site and it is proposed to secure a dust management plan by condition.

The Pollution Control Officer has not commented on air quality issues because emissions from the plant itself are heavily regulated through the permitting regime which is enforced by the Environment Agency. It is not for planning to duplicate regulatory functions covered by the Environment Agency.

The application therefore complies with policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD as it will not result in unacceptable odour and pollution.

Flood Risk/Drainage

The NPPF sets out that local planning authorities should direct inappropriate development away from areas at the highest risk of flooding. Paragraphs 100 to 103 are most relevant. Policy CS 22 of the Core Strategy reflects the advice in the NPPF.

The current Environment Agency Flood Maps show that the current gas compressor site is partially in flood zones 2 and 3 (most at risk of flooding). The proposed extension to the site is in Flood Zone 1.

The application was accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and flood modelling for the Brook Drain catchment (by Jacobs) which demonstrates that apart from a small, undeveloped portion which is in flood zone two, the whole site is in flood zone 1. The applicant also submitted a Hydrology/Hydrogeology report. The Environment Agency has accepted the FRA and as such have withdrawn their objections. The Agency has requested conditions be imposed which deal with contamination.

The Council's Drainage Team has raised no objections and has requested a condition requiring a surface water drainage scheme be submitted.

Therefore in terms of flood risk and drainage the proposal accords with the above policies and is acceptable.

Other Issues

Agricultural Land Classification

Paragraph 112 of the NPPF states that where development of significant agricultural land is necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality in preference to that of higher quality. Higher quality land is defined as falling within classes 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC). The agricultural land which will form the extension of the site falls within ALC 3, but it is not known if this is all or partially 3a or 3b. Therefore, taking the worst case scenario, the land could be class 3a. However, it is considered that even if this is the case, the need for the development in terms of energy provision outweighs the loss of approximately 5 hectares of potentially class 3a land. The land required has been kept to a minimum necessary and the area that will serve as the development compound will be returned to agricultural use once the development is complete.

Minerals Safeguarding

The eastern most part of the application site boundary i.e. part of the extension of the site into the field to the east, just encroaches into the mineral safeguarding areas for sand and gravel and brick clay. The development will not prejudice possible future extraction within the remaining field area. It would not be feasible or viable to extract the amount of mineral possibly affected by this development. The proposal is not therefore in conflict with policy CS 26 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD.

Parish Council Comments

The above report has covered the key issues raised by Glinton Parish Council and by residents but the following points are in response to some of the issues raised. For the purpose of clarity, 44 letters of notification were sent out to nearby residents, eight site notices were posted in locations close to the nearest residential properties and the application was advertised in the press. We have received three letters from residents as well as the comments from the Parish Council.

- The case officer accepts that the field to the east is the most viable option for the extension to the compressor station. It is acknowledged that the vent stack will represent a new and obvious feature in the landscape but considers its visual impact on neighbours is not so significant to warrant refusal of the application. The proposed screening will help over time to partially screen the stack. It is not possible to introduce a quick screening option here but with a good planting scheme and a 25 year management regime the landscaping will be acceptable. There is no evidence that the proposals will cause additional noise to residents and in fact the condition proposed is more stringent than the current condition because it refers to rating levels of noise (whereas the previous does not). This takes into account tonal variances.
- The Parish Council disputes the fact that the development is not EIA development. The proposals were screened under the regulations set out in the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. The case officer stands by the screening opinion issued which was undertaken with careful consideration and adherence to the regulations. The fact that the development is not EIA development does not mean that the development has no effects on the environment at all. It means that it is not EIA development for the purpose of the EIA Regulations. The application submitted is of a standard normally associated with EIA development and is of a quality better than many EIA applications. The consideration by officers of this proposal is no less rigorous than had the development been EIA development.
- Noise level issues have been clearly set out above. The Pollution Control Officer insisted on a more stringent noise level condition than is currently in place and the proposed plant has been designed to ensure that this noise level is met.
- The removal of the belt of trees to the east of the current site is necessary for the safe operation and clearances for the plant and pipework. Whilst it is never good to see trees removed, the proposed planting scheme provides acceptable mitigation. The trees to be removed are not protected by Tree Preservation Orders. All new planting schemes unavoidably take time to establish but when agreeing a landscape scheme we can look at whether planting larger trees (rather than whips) might be appropriate.
- As set out above the height of the compressor units and vent stack is determined by safety issues, operational issues and permitting issues in meeting air quality standards. The height of the vent stack is related to the proposed extension site area amongst other matters. If the stack were lowered a larger site area would be required. The heights of the compressor units and vent stack are maximums and covered by condition. The final heights will need to be agreed.
- It was never the case that the buildings and plant would be painted black. The application form states grey colours. Final material colour for the main plant and buildings is to be conditioned.
- The case officer discussed working hours with the applicant. Working hours also includes testing and commissioning of the plant and much work that will not create noise. The main construction work will take place during daytime hours. Due to the nature of the site and the need to maintain the gas supply and working of the current plant, timing of certain works is critical. It would not be reasonable to limit working hours. The applicant intends to continue to keep a dialogue with local residents as the development progresses and will provide details of a construction manager on site. PCC officers will of course respond to any legitimate concerns raised to them.
- The archaeology found within the extension site does not prevent the development of the site as long as it is properly excavated and recorded in line with the submitted Written Scheme of Investigation. This has been discussed and agreed with the Council's archaeologist and is covered by condition.

6 Conclusions

The proposed development to the Peterborough Gas Compressor Station is part of a national programme of upgrades for key operational sites in the National Transmission System of gas energy supply. The primary focus of which is the reduction of emissions to meet the European Union Directive for Large Combustion Plants. The proposals are supported by EN 1, the overarching National Policy Statement for Energy. The reduction in NOx and CO2 will benefit the local environment. The proposals will result in a development which will be more visible than the current gas compressor site, in particular the new gas turbine compressor units and the vent stack (which is to be located on the proposed extended site to the east of the current facility). It is accepted that for operational and safety issues as well as planning issues such as flood risk, the eastern extension of the site is the most viable and that the principle of the development is acceptable in accordance with policy CS1 of the Core Strategy. The application details have been assessed and the key issues relating to the following matters have been identified;

Transport

Scale/design and impact on neighbours

Impact on landscape character and landscaping

Biodiversity/ecology

Heritage/archaeology

Noise

Odour/pollution

Flood Risk/Drainage

Of these issues, scale and design (impact on views) and noise have been noted as of particular importance to those residents who have made comments.

These issues have been considered against national policies contained in the NPPF and the relevant development plan policies, and whilst there will be some impact on visual amenity, it is not significant enough to result in the application being contrary to policy. In terms of noise, the proposal will be no worse than the existing plant and indeed the proposed noise condition is more stringent than that currently imposed. All other issues have been satisfactorily dealt with and/or can be covered by the imposition of conditions. There have been no objections raised by statutory or other consultees. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that proposed development which accords with an up to date local plan should be approved. In this instance, the local plan (the development plan) is up to date because the relevant policies accord with the NPPF. There are no other material considerations which indicate that the development should not be approved in line with the development plan.

7 Recommendation

The case officer recommends that Planning Permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
2. The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following drawings unless amended by any drawings submitted and approved in respect of condition 3;

PAC2697-002 Rev 0

PAC2697-004 Rev 1

PAC2697-003 Rev 0

PAC2697-008 Rev 0

Existing Site Layout

Site Layout – Disinvestment/demolition and tree removal

Proposed Site Layout Plan

Proposed Gas Cleaning Equipment

PAC2697-013/01 Rev 1	Revised Construction Phasing Plan
PAC2697-013/02 Rev 1	Revised Construction Phasing Plan
PAC2697-013/03 Rev 1	Revised Construction Phasing Plan
PAC2697-005 Rev 0 (1 of 4 plans)	Existing and Proposed Side Elevations
PAC2697-009 Rev 0	Proposed Vent Stack
PAC2697-010 Rev 0	Proposed Site Office Floor Plan
PAC2697-001/02 Rev 0	Site Location Plan
PAC2697-006/1-2 Rev 0	Proposed Site Office elevations, facades and roof
PAC2697-011 Rev 0	Proposed Infrastructure and Buildings without Detailed Elevation Drawings
PAC2697-012 Rev 0	General Construction Arrangement

Reason: To clarify what is hereby approved

3. The proposed gas compressors (cabs D, E & F) shall be located in the position shown on the approved site layout plan PAC2697-003 Rev 0. The overall height of the compressor units (i.e. to the stop of the stacks) shall not exceed 21.5 metres as measured from the top of the slab base to the top of the stack. Prior to any construction of the compressor units above slab base, drawings of their final design shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The compressor units shall not be constructed other than in accordance with the approved drawings.

Reason: To clarify what is hereby approved and in the interests of visual amenity, neighbour amenity and landscape character in accordance with policies CS16 and CS20 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and policies PP2, PP3 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

4. Prior to the erection of any new permanent external lighting or the relocation of existing external lighting within the site or the area edged blue on the approved site location plan, a scheme of lighting (or schemes on a construction phase by phase basis) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme(s) shall be informed by a "lighting study" to be undertaken by the developer as set out at paragraph 4.8.3 of the submitted Design and Access Statement. The submitted scheme(s) shall demonstrate that the external lighting does not exceed the obtrusive limitations for sky glow, light into windows, source intensity and building luminance as set out in the Institution of Lighting Engineers document "Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011. No permanent external lighting shall be erected unless in accordance with the approved scheme(s). Where a reasonable complaint is thereafter made to the Local Authority concerning the resultant lighting levels, the developer shall submit a report (by a suitably qualified person) to the Local Planning Authority within 2 months of being requested to do so which demonstrates compliance with this condition (the approved scheme(s) and obtrusive light limitations) or otherwise sets out measures with a timetable to secure compliance. Such measures shall be fully implemented within the agreed period with the Local Planning Authority, together with any such other measures as specified by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity, protected species habitats and reduction of night time sky glow in accordance with policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and policies PP3 and PP19 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

5. Prior to the commencement of any demolition or construction in any phase on the site or within the area edged blue on the approved site location plan, a Dust Mitigation Scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full from the commencement of that phase of development or the first demolition takes place (whichever is sooner) until the completion of that development phase.

Reason: In the interests of protection of residential amenity in accordance with policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition because the dust mitigation must be agreed before the potential for nuisance through fugitive dust can occur.

6. Subsoil and/or topsoil stripped from the site or from land within the applicant's control (land edged blue on the approved site location plan), shall be stored in separate mounds in the area shown as "temporary soil storage area" on the approved General Construction Arrangement plan PAC2967-012 Rev 0. The soils shall be stripped, stockpiled and maintained in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Construction Code of Practice for Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites, Defra, 2009.

Reason: In order that the soil will be suitable for re-use on site (as proposed) and not therefore permitted to degenerate into an unfit state for re-use in accordance with paragraph 109 of the NPPF and to prevent wind-blown soil affecting the amenity of nearby residents in accordance with PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

7. Prior to the commencement of the development details of the following species habitat mitigation measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;
 - (1) Bat roosting boxes
 - (2) Bird nesting boxes for a variety of species
 - (3) Great Crested Newt and Reptile refuges (within the new scrub habitat area)

The details shall include the numbers, locations and timetable for the provision of each refuge/box and shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details (and timetable) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In order to preserve protected species and habitats in accordance with policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and policy PP19 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition because potential habitat will be removed/disturbed early in the development and the mitigation must be agreed in order it can be provided as soon as feasible in the development programme.

8. Prior to the commencement of any development within 5 metres of the watercourse running along the southern boundary of the site, further surveys shall be undertaken in respect of water voles and the results of the surveys together with any necessary mitigation measures (including implementation timetable) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Should mitigation measures be necessary, these shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. With regard to badgers, no works shall take place except in complete accordance with the recommendations set out in the Memorandum "Peterborough Compressor Station Pre-Construction Badger Survey" by Jacobs dated 22 September 2015.

Reason: In order to preserve protected species and habitats in accordance with policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and policy PP19 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

9. Prior to the commencement of development a tree protection plan for all retained trees and details of tree protection measures in accordance with BS 5837:2012 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented in full throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, landscape character and ecology in accordance with policies CS20 and CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and policies PP3 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition because the retained trees must be protected from damage at the outset of the development.

10. A landscaping scheme for all retained, new and restored areas of planting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the 2016 install as shown on plan PAC2697-013/01 Rev 1. The scheme shall include a plan and schedule which shows numbers of trees/shrubs to be planted, locations, spacing of plants, size of plants and species together with a timetable for undertaking the planting. The approved landscaping scheme shall be carried out in full in accordance with the approved details and timetable.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, landscape character and ecology in accordance with policies CS20 and CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and policies PP3 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

11. The landscaping scheme (as required by condition 10) shall be accompanied by a long term (minimum 25 years) combined ecology and landscape management plan which must be approved prior to the commencement of the 2016 installation as shown on plan PAC2697-013/01 Rev 1. The approved management plan shall be implemented in full from the date the first planting is undertaken. The management plan shall include a timetable and methodology for reporting on the health and success of the implemented landscaping and ecological mitigation over the term of the management plan. Such reports together with any further necessary mitigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the approved timetable and thereafter implemented in full.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, landscape character and ecology in accordance with policies CS20 and CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and policies PP3 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

12. The rating level of noise emitted from the site shall not exceed 45dB $L_{Aeq, 1 \text{ hour}}$ between 07:00 and 23:00; and 45 dB $L_{Aeq, 15 \text{ minutes}}$ at any other time. The noise levels shall be determined at any residential dwelling. The measurements and assessment should be made according to BS:4142:2014.

Reason: To minimise noise disturbance to occupiers of nearby residential properties in accordance with policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

13. No development shall take place until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority;

1. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
 - All previous land uses
 - Potential contaminants associated with those uses
 - A conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
 - Potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site
2. A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
3. The results of the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
4. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: Based on the Phase 1 Land Quality Assessment dated July 2015 by Jacobs, there has been past use of the site that could have caused contamination. A Phase II report is

required to address any potential risk posed to controlled waters in accordance with paragraph 120 and 121 of the NPPF and policy PP20 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition because any contamination must be adequately dealt with before development takes place to prevent further contamination to the local environment including groundwater from taking place.

14. No part of the development authorised by this permission shall be brought into use until a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a "long-term monitoring and maintenance plan") for longer term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan. The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that if any remedial work is required for land contamination, that is undertaken as per an approved Remediation Strategy and that a Verification Report is produced in accordance with Environment Agency CLR 11 "Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination" and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 120 and 121 and Policy PP20 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

15. If, during development, contamination not previously considered is identified, then the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately and no further work in that area shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a scheme for dealing with the suspect contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure all contamination within the site is dealt with in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 120 and 121 and Policy PP20 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

16. The construction compound area shall be laid out and managed in accordance with the submitted details through the lifetime of the development. All delivery vehicles shall unload within the site or the land edged blue on the approved site location plan and all vehicles shall exit the site in a forward gear. Prior to the commencement of the development, details of the wheel washing facilities for construction vehicles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved wheel washing facilities shall remain operable on site whilst development is taking place.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

17. No development shall take place in the two Mitigation Excavation Areas (as shown on plan in the approved Written Scheme of Investigation - WSI) until the archaeological investigations set out in the WSI by Oxford Archaeology East dated 24 September 2015 have been completed in accordance with the WSI. Thereafter, the investigations and findings shall be reported, published and archived in full and in complete accordance with the WSI and the timetable contained therein.

Reason: To secure the obligation on the planning applicant or developer to mitigate the impact of their scheme on the historic environment when preservation in situ is not possible, in accordance with paragraphs 128 and 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012). This is a pre-commencement

condition because archaeological investigations will be required to be carried out before development begins.

18. The vent stacks shown on approved drawing PAC2697-009 Rev 0 shall be no higher than 25 metres above the top of the slab base.

Reason: To clarify what is hereby approved and in the interests of visual amenity, neighbour amenity and landscape character in accordance with policies CS16 and CS20 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and policies PP2, PP3 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

19. No above ground development in a particular construction phase shall take place until details of external materials to the compressor units, vent stacks and buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details submitted for approval shall include the name of the manufacturer, the product type, colour (using BS4800) and reference number. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

20. Prior to the commencement of development the detailed design of the surface water drainage scheme, including discharge rates shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not take place except in complete accordance with the approved drainage scheme.

Reason: In order to ensure that a sustainable drainage scheme is used where feasible and to minimise flood risk in accordance with policy CS 22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy. This is a pre-commencement condition because surface water drainage will need to be agreed and provided for early in the development programme.

21. Prior to the commencement of the relevant phase of development containing the following buildings/plant (as shown in the approved phasing plans);

Vent Stack
Gas Compressors (cabs D,E and F)
Gas Cleaning Equipment
Site Office
Surface Water and Foul Water Treatment

details of the external materials and colour for each building/plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall only take place in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance in accordance with policy CS 16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and policies PP02 and PP03 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Informatives

1. "Development" for the purposes of the conditions attached to this permission has the same meaning as set out in Section 55.10 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
2. The advice contained within the Environment Agency's letter dated 22 October 2015 should be noted and acted upon as appropriate.

3. Highways Act 1980 - Section 184, Sub-sections (3)(4)(9)
This development involves the construction of a new or alteration of an existing vehicular crossing within a public highway.

These works MUST be carried out in accordance with details specified by Peterborough City Council.

Prior to commencing any works within the public highway, a Road Opening Permit must be obtained from the Council on payment of the appropriate fee.

Contact is to be made with the Transport & Engineering - Development Team on 01733 453474 or email HighwaysDevelopmentTeam@peterborough.gov.uk who will supply the relevant application form, provide a preliminary indication of the fee payable and specify the construction details and drawing(s) required.

4. The development is likely to involve works within the public highway in order to provide services to the site. Such works must be licenced under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. It is essential that, prior to the commencement of such works, adequate time be allowed in the development programme for; the issue of the appropriate licence, approval of temporary traffic management and booking of road space. Applications for NR & SWA licences should be made to Transport & Engineering - Street Works Co-Ordinator on 01733 453578.
5. It is an offence to intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy, obstruct or disturb any structure or place which a bat uses for shelter or protection. Trees and structures subject of this application should be inspected to ensure bats are not present before works start.

If any proposed works are likely to destroy or disturb bats or their roosts, Natural England must be notified, and allowed a reasonable time to advise on whether any action is necessary and, if so, the method to be used. Natural England can be contacted on 0845 601 4523 or email wildlife@naturalengland.org.uk

6. It is an offence to take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while it is being built or in use. Trees, scrub and/or structures likely to contain nesting birds between 1st March and 31st August are present on the application site. You should assume that they contain nesting birds between the above dates unless survey has shown it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present. Planning consent for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution. The protection of nesting wild birds remains unchanged even when planning permission is granted. For further information on surveys contact Peterborough City Council's Wildlife Officer (wildlife@peterborough.gov.uk)
7. The applicant is reminded that under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981(Section 1) (as amended) it is an offence to take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built. Trees and scrub are likely to contain nesting birds between 1 March and 31 August. Trees within the application should be assumed to contain nesting birds between the above dates unless a survey has shown it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present.

Copy to Cllrs Holdich OBE and Cllr Lamb