

Application Ref: 17/00645/FUL

Proposal: Erection of a Farm Shop, cafe/restaurant with associated vehicular access, parking, hard and soft landscaping pursuant to relocation and expansion of Willowbrook Farm Shop

Site: The Elms, Helpston Road, Etton, Peterborough
Applicant: Mr & Mrs GE and RJ Morton

Agent: Mr John Dickie
 John Dickie Associates

Site visit: 13.06.2017
Referred by: Head of Planning Services
Reason: This is an application of wider public interest

Case officer: Mrs J MacLennan
Telephone No. 01733 454438
E-Mail: janet.maclennan@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

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

Site and surroundings

The application site is approximately 0.9 hectares and is part of large rectangular field on the northern side of Glinton Road, Helpston and situated 600m to the east of the village envelopment of Helpston and 500m south west of the village envelope of Etton. The site comprises arable land situated to the east of existing agricultural buildings within Elm Tree Farm; both are land within the applicant's ownership.

The site sits in line with the existing agricultural buildings at Elm Tree Farm but set back from the road, and opposite residential properties on the south side of Glinton Road. The site is generally flat and open. A hedgerow runs to the front of the site.

Proposal

The application proposal seeks approval for the erection of a farm shop, butchery, bakery, café/restaurant and educational element including, a craft workshop associated with the relocation of an existing facility at Scotsman's Lodge on Stamford Road, Marholm operating as 'Willowbrook' farm shop.

The building would be single storey and have an 'L'-shaped footprint with a floorspace of 720m². A new access would be created off Glinton Road (B1443) and the site would provide 39 car parking spaces.

The scheme as initially submitted referred to a second phase development of an events area. Phase 2 has since been deleted from the scheme and the application assesses the acceptability of phase 1 only.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
10/01682/FUL	Extension of farm buildings for agricultural use - proposed grain store	Permitted	15/03/2011
11/01464/DISCHG	Discharge of condition C2 (Surface Water Drainage), C4 (Planting), C5 (Bat and Bird Boxes) of planning permission 10/01682/FUL - Extension of farm buildings for agricultural use - proposed grain store	Determined	07/11/2011

Planning history for the existing facility at Scotsman's Lodge

03/00120/FUL	Change of use from farm storage building to meat processing and sale	Permitted	20/03/2003
08/00257/FUL	Change of use of part agricultural building to tea room	Permitted	29/05/2008
08/01154/FUL	Change of use of part of ground floor of existing barn for tea room and associated ancillary space	Permitted	27/10/2008
10/00187/WCPP	Variation of C1 of planning permission 08/01154/FUL to extend the opening hours to 0700 - 2400 seven days per week	Permitted	01/04/2010

3 Planning Policy

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

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Section 2 - Retail Development Outside Town Centres

A sequential test should be applied to applications (except in relation to applications for small scale rural offices or other development). Proposals which fail the sequential test or would have an adverse impact should be refused.

Section 3 - Rural Economic Growth

Should be encouraged through sustainable growth and the expansion of business/ enterprise including sustainable rural tourism/leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside, via the conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings. The retention and development of local services and community facilities should be promoted.

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 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 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.

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.

CS15 - Retail

Development should accord with the Retail Strategy which seeks to promote the City Centre and where appropriate the district and local centres. The loss of village shops will only be accepted subject to certain conditions being met.

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.

Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012)

SA04 - Village Envelopes

These are identified on the proposals map. Land outside of the village envelope is defined as open countryside.

Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)

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.

PP08A - (a) Tourism, Leisure and Cultural Uses in Villages/the Open Countryside

Permission will be granted for development of an appropriate scale; which would support the local community; is compatible with the surrounding character / would not harm the open countryside; is easily accessible; and is supported by a robust business plan.

PP09 - Development for Retail and Leisure Uses

A sequential approach will be applied to retail and leisure development. Retail development outside Primary Shopping Areas or leisure development outside any centre will be refused unless the requirements of Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy have been satisfied or compliance with the sequential approach has been demonstrated.

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.

PP13 - Parking Standards

Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

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.

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.

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

MW26 - Mineral Safeguarding Areas

Mineral Safeguarding Areas identify potentially economic deposits of mineral to ensure they are not unknowingly or needlessly sterilised.

MW27 - Mineral Consultation Areas

Mineral Consultation Areas are buffers around existing or planned mineral sites. Development will only be permitted in these areas where it is demonstrated that it will not prejudice existing or future mineral extraction.

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Preliminary Draft)

This document sets out the planning policies against which development will be assessed. It will bring together all the current Development Plan Documents into a single document. Consultation on this document took place between December 2016 and 9 February 2017. The responses are currently being reviewed. At this preliminary stage only limited weight can be attached to the policies set out therein.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Peterborough Highways Services – No objection - The Local Highways Authority (LHA) appreciate that the applicant/agent wanted to provide comprehensive information to address Phase 1 and 2 but for the purposes of this planning application it is not required. At present the proposals and site layout do not include the events facility e.g. coach parking etc would be required as part of the planning layout. The events facility is not included in this application as a land use. It may be that the proposed access dimensions are acceptable to accommodate the turning requirements of the largest vehicles likely to visit the site but the trip generation and parking requirements for the events facility shall need to be assessed under a separate planning application.

It is possible that when the events facility is implemented that Section 278 works shall be required in the adjacent public highway (as mentioned previously at pre-application stage). An addendum to the TA was submitted for Phase I and the LHA raises no objections subject to the appending of conditions.

PCC Pollution Team – No objections – The premises is 50m from the nearest residential property therefore noise, odour and light from the site will have to be controlled. It is recommended that the opening times, delivery hours, extraction (noise and odour) details and lighting are secured by condition.

PCC Tree Officer – No objections - There is no objection to the proposal if there is a robust landscaping scheme. The Proposed Site Layout outlines a slightly different arrangement of boundary screening to that of the Landscape Mitigation Proposals plan with the preference for the latter. On the southern boundary the preference would be of strengthening the existing hedgerow whilst on the eastern boundary the planting of a native hedgerow with occasional hedgerow trees.

On the western boundary where a bund is identified on the Proposed Site Layout. The bund is not ruled out if construction the planting is likely to establish well and that being smaller native specimens such as hazel, dogwood, gelder rose, hawthorn, blackthorn, spindle etc.

PCC Travel Choice – No objection – The Framework Travel Plan submitted is concise and covers everything that would be expected. Once the site has been occupied a tailored workplace Travel Plan should be submitted detailing current staff travel patterns, along with home postcode details so that initiatives and actions contained in the Travel Plan can be tailored to increase sustainable travel behaviour. Consideration should be made for the provision of shower/changing facilities for staff that walk/cycle to work.

Archaeological Officer - A programme of archaeological investigations carried out in February (geophysical survey) and September (trial trenching) 2016 revealed linear features, including the remains of medieval plough furrows. Thick subsoil, particularly over the eastern side of the site, appeared to mark the position of a 'headland' created where the plough was turned in an area of ridge and furrow. The remaining, undated, ditches could represent a continuation of the Iron Age to Roman enclosures recorded to the west of the farm. No artefacts pre-dating the medieval period were retrieved during the investigation. On the basis of the results from the investigations, there is no need to secure further archaeological work, as the site has been sufficiently characterised.

PCC Wildlife Officer – No objection - The proposal is unlikely to impact on any protected species or habitats. However opportunities to enhance the scheme for biodiversity, for example by installing a range of bird nesting features that cater for a number of different species such as House Sparrow, Starling & Swift would be welcomed. Details regarding numbers, designs and locations may be provided by the applicant which would be acceptable via a suitably worded condition. It is recommended that a range of native tree, shrub and plant species as part of the new tree and hedgerow scheme as well as the meadow area are used. The pond should be planted with a range of native, marginal wetland plants. The details could be secured by condition. The officer advises that subject to the details being incorporated into the scheme there would be a net gain in biodiversity.

PCC Minerals And Waste Officer (Policy) – No objection - The site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area to the south of Maxey quarry and the associated Mineral Consultation Area. The current planning permission for Maxey Quarry and the remainder of the allocated site (M1E) to the north east demonstrate that it is unlikely the mineral within the proposal site is of economic or potential value and would not conflict with policy CS26 of the MW Core Strategy.

It is noted that the proposal site lies fractionally beyond the Mineral Consultation Area (M9N) associated with Maxey Quarry (the southern extension area). MCA's are allocated to ensure that existing or future working of reserves will not be prevented or prejudiced by other forms of development. The new business in this area may bring noise complaints in the future, particularly Phase 2 which may bring additional outdoor recreational use which may prejudice the existing Maxey Quarry.

There are noise level conditions on the planning permission for the quarry as well as a condition for working hours.

The Officer has no objections to the proposal however, the second phase may not be compatible with the neighbouring quarry. The applicant should also be made fully aware of the implications of developing the proposal site adjacent to the existing quarry (i.e. no actions will be taken against the quarry operators as long as they are working within the controlled hours and noise levels). Furthermore, it is considered that a landscape screen to the rear (north) of the proposal site may offer additional amenity mitigation.

PCC Drainage - The details submitted are a little sparse however reference is made to a SuDs/drainage Strategy. It is not known if the infiltration/ soakaways will be practical. The applicant may need to apply to Welland and Deeping Internal Drainage Board to gain permission to discharge their water into the adjacent watercourse if the ground conditions are not found to be favourable. Requests a drainage condition be appended requiring construction details of permeable surfacing along with confirmation of how roof water is being managed. Information on ground conditions, flows etc are also required.

Welland & Deeping Internal Drainage Board – No objection - The Board's Etton Cross Road Drain runs to the southern boundary of the site and a new vehicle crossing is proposed. An application to the Board is required in advance and the technical details agreed. The drain is also afforded the protection of a 9m byelaw distance which prevents any structures within the area without the Board's consent.

Anglian Water - No objection subject to foul drainage condition.

Landscape Architect (Amey) – No objection - On the basis that detailed mitigation measures are proposed to address the principles of the LCAP 'Landscape Strategy' "improve and conserve" for LCA sub-area 3a) Welland Valley and taking into account the findings of the visual assessment, then I see no reason to object to the application on the grounds of Landscape and Visual matters

Etton Parish Council – Objects - The NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to sustainable development. The application fails to meet the three dimensions of sustainable development:

Economic: We do not believe there will be any economic benefit to the village. There is no guarantee that any new jobs created will be given to the local people of Etton. There are only 50 houses in the village and many people are retired or commuters or still in education. Most staff will simply transfer from the existing business. The application mentions a £30m investment and we wonder what the overall project will be and would like to see what the overall plan is. The application states that 40% of the produce would be locally sourced which seems low, most would be from the applicant's farm and so would not bring any benefit to the community of Etton.

Social: The NPPF states a development should support a strong, vibrant and healthy community...through accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural wellbeing. This development fails to meet this criterion. The Parish Council is concerned that phase two would have a considerable impact on the Golden Pheasant Public House, which is the only amenity in the village, which regularly hosts parties and weddings and is a focal point for the community. This development would we believe have a detrimental effect on this business, which many use in the village as a means of socialising and forms a centre role in community events. There was no mention of this business on the applicant's documents.

Environment: The LVIA takes no account of the Conservation Area Status of the village of Etton. The application does not include any material visual impact mitigation by means of landscaping and planting. There is mention of a bund, similar to the Maxey Quarry extension and we would like more details on what is proposed. The Transport Assessment is generally of a poor standard and does not comprehensively assess the transport impacts. The baseline assessment assumes a regular hourly flow of traffic whereas the reality, due to the constant opening/closing of the Helpston level crossing, there is significant variation and volume peaks. This already results in extended queuing for westbound traffic turning right on Helpston Road. This should be taken account of and assessed.

Similarly, the TA assumes a spread of arrivals and departures however the report also assesses the transport impacts of the phase 2 event/conference facilities proposal. This type of facility for up to 250 attendees typically have fixed start times for events causing peaks of vehicles arriving and leaving potentially resulting in much larger numbers of vehicles needing to turn right across the path of oncoming vehicles.

The TA takes no account of the number of deliveries required, HGV movements or refuse collection vehicles nor the noise impacts associated with out of hours/early morning deliveries, the use of reversing alarms etc.

The parking provision of 62 spaces is not in accordance with Peterborough City Council's maximum car parking standards. This includes spaces for Phase 2 which does not form part of this planning application. The number of car parking spaces should be based on the application as submitted rather on an assumption that a future phase 2 will subsequently be approved.

There are parts of this planning application that will provide infrastructure and assesses the impacts of the phase 2 planning application. Therefore, it is unclear why the phase 2 proposal is not included with this application given its prominence to the business plan and in supporting documents.

The vehicular access to the site lacks appreciation for traffic movements of this road. It will mean there will be two junctions within a short distance of each other, which would cause a safety issue.

There will be a visual impact on the houses which currently overlook the field where the proposed development will take place. We note from these residents that they have not been notified by the planning department. The nature of the landscape means that noise pollution from the venue could have a detrimental impact on residents.

Reference is made to the 'ex?buildings' on the proposed plan. These buildings are currently in use as grain stores by the applicant. We also note, from the application that this is part of a 30 million project, however no more details were supplied regarding this and how it may impact Etton village.

Helpston Parish Council – No objection in principle. However consideration should be given to two matters of concern. The proposed access and exit splays to the site cross a very busy cycleway/footpath. This cycleway is used by many children from Helpston making their way to the Arthur Mellows Village College at Glington on bicycles. Their right of way at the access and egress points to this development must take priority and must be made completely safe. This requires proper dropped kerb installations, proper indicators to local road vehicles of child cyclists rights of way upgrading of the cycleway surfaces to enable smooth cycle movements in this area and general full safety provision for the inattentive children.

Vehicles use the B1443 run up to the level crossing in Helpston to accelerate toward the crossing gates, increasing speeds to get through the crossing before the gates come down at just the point where the new access and egress points to the new shop will be. It is requested that Highways establish an extension to the 30mph limit to the east of these accesses.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 2

Total number of responses: 13

Total number of objections: 12

Total number in support: 1

12 letters of objection have been received raising the following issues:

- This would be detrimental to the village of Etton
- Huge negative impact on the conservation areas of Etton
- The proposal will impact on the quiet tranquil atmosphere in Etton
- The fields and open space around the village are an inherent part of its beauty
- The proposal will be obstruction of views from my house, especially once the existing bund is extended by Tarmac.
- The erection of the large green barn was bad enough
- This is simply not the right site for an events facility.
- Etton is in danger of becoming an island with no local amenities. This would damage property prices
- This is type of development is unwelcome!
- PCC should be looking to reduce its carbon footprint.
- It would set a precedent for further development which would destroy the village environment
- There is no landscaping/screening proposed in the application
- It would increase cut-through traffic in the village of Etton
- The additional traffic will cause noise and pollution and wear and tear on a narrow back road
- The road has recently been closed for 3 months for essential resurfacing. This would be required more frequently to the detriment of village life.
- The country lane is barely wide enough for two cars to pass
- Increased traffic on Helpston Road will exaggerate the safety issue for traffic turning right on either side of the crossing
- Traffic approaching the crossing will also have to wait for vehicles attempting to cross the increased flow into the proposed business, causing consistent build-up further along the road to a much heavier degree.
- I hope the Council will cut the verges outside my house regularly so I can see the oncoming traffic
- Object to the conclusions of the traffic statement which was carried out 14 months ago
- Helpston Road is a racetrack
- Vehicles often tail back to my driveway from the crossing
- The entrance is near my driveway making it a 4 way crossing
- I have to reverse where the new entrance will be; it should be relocated to the existing farm entrance
- The traffic survey was not carried out during the school run
- Reduce speed through the area
- Put yellow lines for 100m from junction with A15 to prevent bottle neck
- Erect screening to prevent headlights from cars existing the site in winter as they will shine directly into my lounge

The access is on a 60mph road where cars often speed due to either being stuck at the railway crossing for so long or trying to get to the crossing before the gates go down.

- The access would be hazardous as it crosses a cycle/footpath used to access schools in Helpston and Glinton.
- Etton already suffers from vehicles using the village as a rat run
- Creating a retail/leisure facility will increase numbers of vehicles from Market Deeping and the north. This should be assessed the Transport Statement.
- This is a working farm with machinery in and out of the driveway; how can it be safe to have Children's play in the same vicinity
- There would be unwanted noise
- The presence of a 'bund' has not only been detrimental to my visual landscape and the conservation area status of the village but invasive noise level are still constantly audible
- increased noise levels i.e. music, generators, refuse collection, reverse alarms, machinery, unsocial able behaviour and car engines
- I am presuming phase 2 of the proposed development would exist as a second floor unit increasing visual impact and noise
- The proposal does not include any noise assessment for impact on neighbouring properties
- There is insufficient information regarding further development of this site.
- There is no economic benefit to Etton
- Most of the residents in Etton are elderly and would be unable to access the facility
- The proposal would impact on the custom of the Golden Pheasant public house which does well in the summer by passing cyclists using the green wheel path.
- Potential loss of business, livelihood and possible closure of Golden Pheasant, the village's meeting point
- This is a huge development so close to my business, which is of a similar nature
- It has taken years to build up my business and the proposal will draw on my trade
- If my business closes this will impact on local staff and deny residents of a community facility in walking distance
- As there produce will be their own supply they will have an unfair advantage and we cannot compete
- As I will be able to see this from my back garden why was I not notified?
- The residents of Etton have not been consulted and it only came to light three days before the deadline
- I am very worried about the second phase of this development. I understand that this £2 million project is part of a £30 million project. I am concerned that this may be a property development.
- A property development would impact on the conservation area of Etton and put a drain on John Clare School which is already over-subscribed.
- I am not opposed to the relocation of the farm show at its current size the proposed development is too large

One letter has been received in support of the application however it also raises concerns regarding traffic as cars often tail back to the proposed access point from the Helpston Crossing.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

Background

The existing enterprise 'Willowbrook' has been operating at Scotsmans Lodge since 2004. It is understood that the business is now well established and successful, however the business is unable to expand at the current facility due to the lack of space within the existing site.

The principle of development

The site lies within the open countryside and there are strict local and national planning policies which restrict development in the open countryside to that which are demonstrably essential for the effective operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and so on. The proposal is however an established business wishing to expand. The development would be closely related to the agricultural use of the site 'Elm Tree Farm' and would support the agricultural units within the locality and the viability of the Enterprise. It is considered that the proposal would have a social, environmental and economic benefit in accordance with advice within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), notwithstanding the comments made by Etton Parish Council.

The NPPF encourages sustainable economic growth in rural areas both through the conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings. It also supports the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in rural service centres.

Furthermore, policy PP8 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD supports the development of tourism, leisure and cultural uses where the development would be consistent with the scale and size of its location without unacceptable environmental impacts; would not adversely affect existing services and facilities and would be compatible with or would enhance the character of the area and would not cause harm to the countryside. Such proposals need to be supported with a robust business plan that demonstrates (i) the demand for the development and (ii) that the facilities to be provided would constitute a viable business proposition on a long-term basis.

Whilst the proposal may not strictly fall within a 'tourism, leisure and cultural' use, this is an existing business which does generate visitors to the farm site. It is considered that the current facility is closely related to the open countryside location and contributes to the local rural economy. It is proposed that the new facility would also provide a craft workshop and educational facilities for example cookery demonstrations.

A business plan has been submitted in support of the application which provides details of income and profits over the coming years. It is considered that given the success of the business so far, the need for expansion and the investment proposed in the facility it is likely that the business would remain viable in the long term. It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with policy PP8 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policy DPD.

It is acknowledged that the proposal is in part, a retail development outside of a designated centre and therefore consideration is given to policy CS15 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy and policy PP9 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD. Essentially as the site lies outside of a centre a sequential approach to site selection should be followed which would demonstrate that there are no alternative sites available higher up the search hierarchy. In this case the applicant was asked whether alternative sites were considered either in a village location or on another farm.

'Willowbrook' is now a recognised local brand and an important requirement for a new location is that the site needs to be in the same geographical area in order to capitalise on the established customer base. The requirements for the business need a catchment area of six miles from its current location at Scotsmans Lodge. The applicant considers that anything beyond this area would be unsuitable for the expansion of the business.

The applicant asked a local agent to carry out some research on potential sites in the area. An in depth search was undertaken and a number of local land owners and agents were approach however there were no alternative sites that were either suitable or available. There are currently no farms for sale in the catchment area or any plots of land.

The question was also asked regarding the feasibility of utilising the existing agricultural buildings at Elm Tree Farm. The applicant has advised that the existing agricultural buildings are in use as part and parcel of the Morton Family farming business. Converting these barns to a Farm Shop use would therefore compromise the functionality of the Farm. Aside from the Grain Store built in 2010, the other buildings were constructed in the mid 20th century with extensive use of asbestos based materials. The cost of removing the asbestos materials and replacing with contemporary compliant materials would result in hugely abnormal construction costs - the build cost per sq ft would likely exceed that for a completely new structure. Also converting an existing building would not achieve a 'low carbon' development.

It is also argued that part of the customer appeal is the backdrop of an old stone barn at Scotman's Lodge and whilst the proposed new buildings can replicate that setting, converted mid 20th century agricultural storage and workshop buildings would fall short in terms of the desired brand image.

The applicant was asked why does the facility have to be located at the Elms and why could it not operate from an existing centre of within a village location. The applicant responded that there were no village locations that were either available for suitable. This is because the model of the business is based around produce which is grown alongside the facility - from soil to counter in just a few yards; a model the applicant argues is highly sustainable with zero 'food miles' for much of the produce range. Operating alongside a working farm (as with Scotsmans Lodge) is very much part and parcel of the Willowbrook brand. Willowbrook is a 'real' farm shop in that the Morton family are genuine local farmers selling (mostly) their own produce. The Elm Tree Farm development will enable this to continue and expand. The applicant considers that having the facility in an existing retail centre would be an entirely different form of business.

Finally, the educational aspect of the new Willowbrook proposal is an important feature. Scotsmans Lodge is extremely constrained and school visits are challenging. The new development will allow students (young and old) to grow their own vegetables on site and prepare them under professional supervision and tutelage in the proposed large scale commercial kitchen - a 'farm to fork' (in some cases 'farm to school') culture will be promoted. The facility will focus on agricultural education, will enable more and more consumers to understand and appreciate how farms work thus enabling more integration with rural life.

Whilst it is accepted that some trade may be drawn away from designated centres, it is considered that the farm shop would provide an exclusive range of goods which would not generally compete with shops found in a designated centres. Additionally, the business model proposed which includes a craft centre and education facility requires a close connection with a farming activity which could be provided at Elm Tree Farm. As this is an existing business and subject to restricting the products for sale the proposal would be unlikely to have a material impact in this regard.

The proposal therefore accords with policies CS1 and CS15 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policies PP8 and PP9 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and sections 2 and 3 of the NPPF

It is not considered that the proposal would impact on the viability of the city centre or designated centre. The proposal would enable the expansion of an existing successful rural business and would support the agricultural use of the area and the viability of the Enterprise.

Concerns have been raised regarding the proposal setting an undesirable precedent for future applications for similar uses. However, in this instance this is an established business and a well-known brand within the area and inherently connected to an agricultural enterprise and not a fledgling enterprise. Each application is judged on its merits.

Reference is also made by objectors to the impact the proposal would have on the Golden Pheasant Public House in Etton. It is accepted that the proposal would offer customer choice in the area, however the phase I is essentially a Farm Shop and café/restaurant which is not the same use as the public house. The facility also has the potential to bring additional custom to the area to the benefit of local services including the Golden Pheasant Public House.

There have been a number of objections to the proposed Phase II, however as stated above this second phase is not part of this proposal and the acceptability of Phase II would be considered should a formal application be submitted in the future.

Design and visual amenity

The design of the building would be in keeping with the context of the open countryside. The building is considered to be low key and intended to capture the local vernacular 'farmyard' architecture. The proposed materials would be of timber, coursed limestone rubble walling with dressed stone arches, quoins, etc under a pantile roof. A landscaping scheme has been submitted as part of the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment which proposes native trees and shrubs to the site boundary. The building would have an 'L' shaped footprint extending 40m north-south and 28m west-east and the height would be 6.8m at ridge height and 2.6m at eave height. The building would be set in from the road by some 30m.

Solar panels are to be used on the adjacent farm building to serve the facility.

It is considered that the design of the facility would assimilate with the open countryside setting. The proposal therefore accords with policy PP2 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD, policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and section 7 of the NPPF.

Impact on the Landscape Character

Peterborough CS20 (Landscape Character) requires that new development in and adjoining the countryside should be located and designed in a way that is sensitive to its landscape setting, retaining and enhancing the distinctiveness of the local landscape character area and sub-area.

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) supports the application. The LVIA follows standard procedure. It assesses the ways in which the proposed developments would have an effect on the existing landscape character and visual amenity of receptors in the surrounding area. The site lies within National Character Area NCA 75: Kesteven Uplands. At a local level, the site lies within Landscape Character for Peterborough City Council Landscape Character Area (LCA) "3 Welland Valley: Welland Valley Fringe". The site lies well within this LCA, with the nearest different LCA some 1.1km to the northwest.

The applicant undertook a desk top analysis and a site survey in January 2017 when vegetation was free of leaf cover to demonstrate a worst case view to determine the baseline character, visual nature and condition of the application site, including perceptual and aesthetic factors which contribute to character.

The topography of the area is flat and open. The LVIA considers that the local vegetation and built form prevent views of the site from the west and generally further to the south, east and north. The landscape impacts are predicted to be slight adverse. The proposal and mitigation affect only the immediate area of Landscape Character Type "Welland Valley: 3a Welland Valley Fringe". Visual impacts are predicted to be slight adverse initially, with the potential for reduction to negligible adverse impacts, or even beneficial in places, with the implementation of the mitigation proposals.

The LVIA has been considered by a Landscape Consultant. It is considered that the methodology used for the assessment is robust although additional viewpoints from the crossing point of the National Cycle Route (NCR)21 with the B1443 and immediately adjacent to the Elm Tree Farmhouse should have been included. However the methodology used is considered to be robust and sufficient information is provided for conclusions to be drawn.

It is agreed that the proposal is unlikely to give rise to significant landscape and visual effects in the 'wider' landscape due to the scale of the development and that the proposal will generally be skylined by adjacent agricultural buildings at Elm Tree Farm on the western boundary. This greatly reduces the area of visual influence, and an agricultural profiled building would generally not be uncharacteristic of the Landscape Character Area. No significant effects are expected on designated nature and heritage assets. The Overall Magnitude of Effect on the Site as a receptor is "Slight Adverse" and the Overall Visual Effect is also "Slight Adverse". A single View Point (VP) to the north experienced a rating of "Moderate/Slight Adverse" visual impact. It is noted that a VP was not considered from the adjacent Elm Tree Farm which would have elevated impacts due to its proximity to the site.

The assessment is considered to be appropriate for the Phase I development however further details would be required regarding landscape mitigation. It is considered that the wider landscape is robust enough to absorb this proposal due to its proximity to the existing built mass at Elm Tree Farm. Subject to detailed mitigation measures to address the principles of the need to "improve and conserve" for LCA sub-area (3a) Welland Valley and taking into account the findings of the visual assessment the consultant does not object to the proposal on Landscape and Visual matters. The proposal therefore accords with policy CS20 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

Highway implications

A Transport statement supports the application which considers the transport, traffic, access and safety aspects of the relocated development. The Transport information as originally submitted included both phases of the development and assessed the impact of the development based on both phases being implemented. The applicant was advised to amend the information to include information only relating to Phase 1 and an addendum has been submitted.

For Phase 1 a robust assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the infrastructure network revealed that the retail activity could potentially generate 103 x 2way vehicle movements at Saturday peak.

The site would be accessed off Glinton Road at a point central to the site. The development would provide 39 formal car parking spaces of which 3 would be dedicated to blue badge users; and an additional 25 spaces would be provided in the form of grasscrete. The development would also provide 10 cycle stands (20 cycle parking spaces).

The site is within walking distance to the villages of Helpston and Etton and there is a pedestrian and cycle link (designated shared use) on the northern side of Glinton Road. This links to a footbridge over the A15 to Glinton.

The village of Helpston is served by a regular bus service although the nearest bus stop is approximately 600m from the site. However whilst the site is located within a rural part of Peterborough it is possible for the site to be accessed via sustainable means of travel.

Analysis of road traffic accident data has been undertaken, and it is considered that the modest increase in trips arising from the development is unlikely to have an adverse impact on highway safety on the local network.

An Interim Workplace Travel Plan has been prepared which promotes sustainable travel measures and sets realistic targets. The Travel Plan will be submitted alongside this report to support the planning application. A Travel Plan will be secured by condition.

Objections have been received from local residents and the Parish Councils regarding the impact on the highway network. There is particular concern regarding speeding vehicles coming out of the railway crossing and those attempting to get over the crossing before the gates come down. As stated above the traffic generation at peak times would not be significant to warrant any highway safety measures and the LHA does not raise any objections to phase I. It is unreasonable to seek ways to address existing behaviour on the adjacent highway.

Helpston Parish Council has raised concern regarding the safety of cyclists that would cross the access point, particularly as this is a route for children from Helpston making their way to the Arthur Mellows Village College at Glinton on bicycles.

It is the view of the LHA that during the summer months the traffic generation to and from the site shall be slightly higher than the winter months however it is thought that the proposed farm shop (phase 1) will not generate a significant amount of traffic overall to and from the site.

Peak travel times for Glinton school and the farm shop shall also differ significantly. It is thought that Saturday and Sunday lunch times during the summer months shall operate as the peak times for the farm shop. Peak times for schools are the AM peak (8.15 to 9.15 approximately) and PM peak (around 3.15 in the afternoon) therefore the traffic travelling to and from the site shall be minimal whilst children are travelling to school from Helpston to Glinton.

To provide pedestrians and cyclists on the adjacent footway/cycleway priority over motorists entering/leaving the site, the LHA are proposing that a simple dropped crossing kerb arrangement is utilized which would grant priority to users of the adjacent footway/cycleway. The LHA also intend to keep the access as narrow as practically possible. A bellmouth design access with junction radii would not be appropriate as this would grant priority to motorists.

Considering the small scale of the development and the fact that it is not expected to generate significantly high levels of traffic the LHA could not expect the applicant to provide signage or to upgrade the footway/cycleway at this time (for Phase 1).

However the LHA could ensure, as part of the design, that channel blocks are placed across the access at the back edge of the footway complete with white 'Give Way' markings behind the channel blocks. This shall indicate to motorists leaving the site that users of the adjacent footway/cycleway have priority in crossing the access.

Helpston Parish Council has also suggested extending the 30mph speed limit to the east of the access however, the LHA is of the view that it is not appropriate for a single carriageway rural road.

Glinton Road is a long straight road with good visibility and the LHA's concerns are that motorists would not abide by the speed limit and also that it may encourage overtaking of cars. This is not something that the LHA would want to encourage (the Police may even raise objections).

A 30mph speed limit is more likely to be applied in the vicinity of a development if there were lots of houses nearby with small front gardens which gives the illusion of a more enclosed feel to the area. The imposing of a 30mph speed limit may create a highway safety issue where at present there is none.

It is not considered that the proposal would result in any adverse highway implications and no further measures are required for the highway network. In addition the proposal would provide adequate parking facilities within the site in accordance with parking standards. Hence the proposal accords with policies PP12 and PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Neighbouring Amenity

The site is fairly isolated in nature however there are two residential properties opposite the site on the south side of Glinton Road. The facility would be positioned well into the site however, consideration has to be given to the amenity of the neighbouring properties. Hours of use shall be restricted to prevent unacceptable impact during unsociable hours, from the general activity of customers and deliveries. Conditions would be appended to the decision regarding noise levels from mechanical equipment and extraction/ventilation.

In addition due to the countryside location which is relatively dark the level of lighting will have to be controlled.

Subject to the controls indicated above it is not considered that the proposal would unduly impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and hence the proposal accords with policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16b of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

Heritage Assets

There are no Heritage Assets affected by the proposals. The Etton Conservation area boundary is approximately 340m from the site and it is not considered that the proposal would impact on the character and appearance of this area.

There are no listed buildings within close proximity to the site which would be affected by the proposal.

Landscaping and Biodiversity

The site is sparse of trees and landscaping features, limited to a fairly young hedgerow to the front of the site. The scheme proposes a Landscape Mitigation Plan within the application. This includes the continuation of the hedge on the southern boundary, the planting of a linear woodland belt or hedgerow. It is suggested that spoil from the site could be formed into bunds which could increase the height of the screen. It is noted that when bunds are usually formed the soils are compacted and these ground conditions are not conducive for long term tree growth. Therefore, the use of bunds onsite is not advised to enhance vegetative screening where trees are required.

The Tree Officer raises no objections to the proposal if there is a robust landscaping scheme agreed. It is noted that the Proposed Site Layout outlines a slightly different arrangement of boundary screening to that of the Landscape Mitigation Proposals plan with the preference for the latter. On the southern boundary the preference would be of strengthening the existing hedgerow whilst on the eastern boundary the planting of a native hedgerow with occasional hedgerow trees.

On the western boundary a bund is identified on the proposed site layout. The bund is not ruled out if construction the planting is likely to establish well and that being smaller native specimens such as hazel, dogwood, gelder rose, hawthorn, blackthorn, spindle etc. These details could be secured by way of a Landscaping condition.

The site is an arable field and there are no ecological implications resulting from the development. It is proposed that a pond would be included to the south eastern corner of the site. The planting of native species would also be welcomed. A condition would be appended to the decision requiring a range of bird nesting features along with enhanced landscaping.

The proposal would not result in the loss of landscaping features and there is the potential for the development to enhance the existing landscaping features as well as the biodiversity of the site. Hence the proposal accords with policy PP16 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Flooding and Drainage

The site does not lie within an area at risk of flooding. However, a sustainable drainage scheme would be required. The applicant has stated it is intended to use infiltration in order to dispose of storm water from impermeable areas. The surfacing of the access road and parking areas would be permeable surfaces. It is not known at this stage whether infiltration/soakaways will be practical and permission may therefore need to be sought from the Drainage Board. A detailed SUDS scheme secured by condition.

It is not considered that the proposal would result in flood risk and would accord with policy CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

Minerals and Waste

The site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MW policy CS26), to the south of Maxey quarry and the associated Mineral Consultation Area (allocation M9N and MW policy CS27). The Minerals and Waste Officer considers that it is unlikely the mineral within the proposal site is of economic or potential value.

The site, however, lies fractionally beyond the Mineral Consultation Area (M9N) associated with Maxey Quarry (the southern extension area). MCA's are allocated to ensure that existing or future working of reserves will not be prevented or prejudiced by other forms of development. The Officer raises concern regarding the noise implications from the Quarry, particularly for the Phased II of the development (not for consideration for this application) as the outdoor recreational use (potentially an additional sensitive receptor) may prejudice the existing Maxey Quarry.

There are however sensitive receptors within the existing MCA and the working quarry is restricted to noise levels. Additionally working hours at the quarry are controlled such that works shall only be undertaken between 07:00 - 19:00 hours Mondays to Fridays and 07:00 - 13:00 hours Saturdays (with no Sunday or public holiday working permitted). Temporary works, such as bund formation and restoration works are allowed for up to 8 weeks in any calendar year, and noise levels for such works may be up to 70 dB LAeq, T. Full details of the quarry permission can be found against permission ref. 10/00151/MMFUL.

The Officer has no objections to the proposal however the applicant should be made aware of the implications of developing the proposal site adjacent to the existing quarry. An informative would be appended to any decision to grant permission.

Misc

Comments have been received regarding consultation. All nearby neighbours were consulted and a site notice was erected. In addition the Parish of Etton and Helpston were consulted. It is therefore considered that consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

6 Conclusions

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

- The development for the relocation of an existing Farm Shop would enable the expansion of a successful rural business which would be closely related to the agricultural use of the site 'Elm Tree Farm';
- The 'model' of the business requires a rural location associated with local agriculture and as such it is not considered that the proposal would impact on the vitality and viability of any commercial centre or set an undesirable precedent;
- The design of the building and boundary treatment would not impact on the visual amenity of the character area and appropriate mitigate would assimilate the development in to the open countryside;
- The site would provide adequate parking provision and it is not considered that the proposal would result in any adverse highway implications;
- The proposal would not unduly impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers; and
- The proposal would result in an enhancement to the landscaping features of the site and a net gain in biodiversity.

Hence the proposal accords with policies PP2, PP3, PP8, PP9, PP12, PP13 and PP16 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD, policies CS1, CS14, CS16, CS17, CS20, CS21 and CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and sections 2, 3, 4, 7 and 11 of the NPPF.

7 Recommendation

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

- C 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).

- C 2 No development shall take place other than groundworks and foundations samples of the materials to be used in the external elevations of the building hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The samples shall be made available for inspection of site. 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).

- C 3 Prior to occupation of development the spaces shown on drawing no. SITE 001 shall be laid out for vehicles to park and turn clear of the public highway and t hose areas shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking and turning of vehicles.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- C 4 Prior to commencement of development other than groundworks and foundations details of the proposed access into the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans prior to occupation of the development.

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

- C 5 Prior to commencement of development details of the temporary facilities that shall be provided clear of the public highway for materials storage and for the parking/turning/loading/unloading of all vehicles visiting the site during the period of construction shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policy PP12 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition as the details shall need to be agreed prior to works commencing on site.

- C 6 Prior to commencement of development a wheel cleansing system for construction vehicles including a contingency measure should this facility become in -operative shall be installed on site. The wheel cleansing equipment shall be capable of cleaning the wheels, underside and chassis of all construction vehicles that shall visit the site during the construction phase.

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

- C 7 No development shall commence until a foul water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be brought into use until the works have been carried out in accordance with the foul water strategy.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding and in accordance with policy CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition as the details shall need to be agreed prior to works commencing on site.

- C 8 No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the following:

- Construction details of permeable surfacing along with confirmation of how roof water shall be managed
- Confirmation that ground conditions are suitable for infiltration of surface water; if conditions are found to be less than favourable confirmation that the body responsible for the receiving watercourse is content to received additional flows from the site. This would in turn need to accompany details of how flows would be restricted.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the building being occupied.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, both on and off site in accordance with policy CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition as the details shall be to be agreed prior to works commencing.

- C 9 Within six months of the development being brought into use a tailored workplace Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall provide details of current staff travel patterns along with home postcode details so that initiatives and actions contained in the Travel Plan can be tailored to increase sustainable travel behaviour. The development should also provide shower/changing facilities for staff that walk or cycle to work. The travel plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport, in accordance with Policies CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP12 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

- C10 Notwithstanding the details hereby approved a range of bird nesting boxes shall be installed that cater for a number of different species such as House Sparrow, Starling & Swift. The details regarding numbers, designs and locations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details prior to the development being brought into use and thereafter retained.

Reason: In the interest of promoting biodiversity within the site and in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

C11 No development shall take place above slab level until a scheme for the landscaping of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the following:-

- Proposed finished ground and building slab levels
- Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting
- Use of a range of native tree, shrub and plant species as part of the new tree and hedgerow scheme as well as the meadow area
- Details of a range of native, marginal wetland plants (pond).
- An implementation programme
- Details of any boundary treatment

The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and then enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policy CS21 of the adopted Core Strategy and policy PP16 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.

C12 Any trees, shrubs or hedges forming part of the approved landscaping scheme (except those contained in enclosed rear gardens to individual dwellings) that die, are removed or become diseased within five years of the implementation of the landscaping scheme shall be replaced during the next available planting season by the developers, or their successors in title with an equivalent size, number and species to those being replaced. Any replacement trees, shrubs or hedgerows dying within five years of planting shall themselves be replaced with an equivalent size, number and species.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

C13 Notwithstanding the details hereby approved the planning permission relates to phase I only and includes, Farm shop, Butchery, Bakery, Cafe/Restaurant and Craft Workshop and Training area.

Reason: The planning implications have been assessed on Phase I only and for the avoidance of doubt.

C14 The development hereby approved shall not be open to customers outside the following hours 08.00hrs to 18.00hrs on Monday to Saturday and 09:30hrs to 16.00hrs on Sunday and Bank Holidays.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the adjoining occupiers from noise generation, in accordance with Policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

C15 No deliveries shall be taken at or despatched from the development hereby permitted outside the hours of 07.00 and 19.00 Monday to Saturday, nor at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the adjoining occupiers from noise generation, in accordance with Policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

- C16 The rating level of noise emitted from the site should not exceed (35) dB LAeq, 1 hour between (07:00) and (23:00) Monday to Friday and (30) dB LAeq, 15 minutes at any other time. The noise levels should be determined at (the nearest noise sensitive premises.) The measurements and assessment should be made according to BS:4142:2014.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the adjoining occupiers from noise generation, in accordance with Policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

- C17 All ventilation of steam and cooking fumes to the atmosphere should be suitably filtered to avoid nuisance from smell, grease or smoke to persons in neighbouring or nearby properties. Details of the nature and location of such filtration equipment should be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before installation and should be installed before the use of the premises commences.

In addition to the above to ensure that odour abatement plant can be operated in compliance with the proposed noise Sound Power Level (SWL) and frequency spectrum data for the mechanical extract ventilation is required by this Department to enable an adequate assessment of the likely impact. Information should also be provided on the location of any sensitive receptors that require consideration as a result of noise emissions.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the adjoining occupiers from noise generation, in accordance with Policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

- C18 The lighting shall not exceed the obtrusive light limitations for sky glow, light into windows, source intensity and building luminance specified in environmental zone E2 in the Institution of Lighting Engineers document "Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011. Should the Local Planning Authority received complaints the operator/owner of shall be required to demonstrate compliance with the condition, e.g. by measurement or calculation, in circumstances where reasonable concern arises from resultant lighting levels.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the area, in accordance with Policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

- C19 The retail floor space hereby approved shall be limited to the areas shown on the approved plan ref. JDA/2015/475/FLOORS.001A. The retail sales shall be restricted to Farm and or locally produced items. There shall be no display for retail of any other product, including any of the following comparison goods:

- (i) Clothing and footwear
- (ii) Chemist/pharmaceutical goods
- (iii) Jewellery and luggage
- (iv) Perfume and toiletries
- (v) Sports clothing and equipment
- (vi) Audio and visual recordings
- (vii) Mobile phones and musical instruments

Reason: for the avoidance of doubt and to safeguard the vitality and viability of the City Centre and in accordance with policy CS15 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy and policy PP9 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

C20 The development shall be implemented in accordance with the following approved plans:

- * Location plan JDA/2015/475/OS.002
- * Proposed site layout JDA/2015/475/SITE.001
- * Floor plan JDA/2015/475/FLOORS.001 A
- * Proposed elevations JDA/2015/475/ELEVS.001
- * Topo survey ETF-01
- * External Materials Schedule
- * GF Soleplate layout and details 01 P1
- * GF Panel layout and details 02 P1
- * 3D Visuals P16133-100 P1

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

This page is intentionally left blank