

## COMMITTEE REPORT

**Date:** 18 April 2019                      **Ward:** Osbaldwick And Derwent  
**Team:** Major and                              **Parish:** Holtby Parish Council  
                    Commercial Team

**Reference:** 18/02937/FUL  
**Application at:** R S Cockerill York Limited Stamford Bridge Road Dunnington  
                            York YO19 5AE  
**For:** Erection of 3 no. extensions to packing building.  
**By:** Providence Holdings Ltd  
**Application Type:** Full Application  
**Target Date:** 25 April 2019  
**Recommendation:** Approve

### 1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 The application site relates to the R S Cockerill site, which lies to the north of Stamford Bridge Road (A166). The village of Holtby lies approximately 600 metres to the north east and Dunnington is approximately 450 metres to the south. The character of the area is rural farmland with field boundaries comprising a mix of timber post and rail fencing, hedgerows and trees. The site itself contains a cluster of existing buildings in use for a mix of agriculture and potato packing. There also ancillary buildings including an office with staff car parking. The ground between the buildings is predominantly hard standing to allow for vehicle movements. Access to the site is from Stamford Bridge Road with a widened access for heavy goods vehicles.

1.2 The site lies within the general extent of the York Green Belt and within flood zone 1.

1.3 Full planning permission is sought for the erection of three no. extensions to the existing potato packing building at the northern end of the site. The existing building has an area of 4730 square metres. The original floor area was approximately 2230 square metres and an extension to the building measuring approximately 2500 square metres was approved in 2008. The existing building has a shallow dual pitch roof and varies in ridge height between 6.4 and 10.5 metres in height.

1.4 The proposed extensions total 974 square metres in area, with the total reached as following:

Front (south) extension would have an area of 378 square metres and up to 8.4 metres in height with a dual pitched roof.

Side (west) extension would have an area of 298 square metres and up to 10.5 metres in height with a dual pitched roof.

The proposed rear (north) extension would have an area of 298 square metres and up to 8 metres in height with a catslide roof.

1.5 An existing lean to is to be demolished measuring 63 square metres in area meaning the increase in the built form totals 911 square metres.

### Planning History

1.6 There is extensive planning history relating to this site, which is summarised below;

08/00856/FULM - Extension to pack house to provide additional potato washing, grading, packing, storage and staff facilities and covered loading bays and additional vehicular manoeuvring space. Installation of wastewater treatment plant - Permitted - 08.08.2008

12/01528/AGNOT - Erection of agricultural building - No objections

15/00871/FUL - Erection of potato store - Permitted - 07.07.2015

17/02813/AGNOT - Erection of agricultural building - No objections

18/01063/AGNOT - Erection of general purpose agricultural building - No objections

## **2.0 POLICY CONTEXT**

2.1 Yorkshire and Humber Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) 2008 (Revoked)

Saved Policies

YH9(C) Green belts

Y1(C1 and C2) York sub area policy

2.2 Publication Draft Local Plan 2018

DP1 York Sub Area

DP2 Sustainable Development

DP3 Sustainable Communities

SS1 Delivering Sustainable Growth for York

SS2 The Role of York's Green Belt

EC5 Rural Economy

D1 Placemaking

D11 Extensions and Alterations to Existing Buildings

GI1 Green Infrastructure

GI2 Biodiversity and Access to Nature  
GI4 Trees and Hedgerows  
GB1 Development in the Green Belt  
ENV2 Managing Environmental Quality  
ENV5 Sustainable Drainage  
T1 Sustainable Access

2.3 Draft 2005 Development Control Local Plan

### **3.0 CONSULTATIONS**

Internal

3.1. Highways (Network Management) - No response received

3.2 Environmental Protection Unit - No objection. Informatives recommended regarding construction time, possible contamination and machinery operation.

3.3 Flood Risk Engineer - Pre-commencement condition suggested regarding surface and foul water drainage (Verbal response)

External

3.4 Holtby Parish Council - Having reviewed the planning application, which seems to be on an annual basis with Cockerill's, there is a pattern of gradually increasing the size of the site which brings complaints from the residents of Holtby. Floodlighting, operating hours and noise need to be controlled as to reduce the impact on the village. We are not against a local business being successful and requiring expansion so we ask that CYC take a look at the overall size and use of the site to make sure that the local impact is kept to a minimum.

3.5 Yorkshire Water - No response.

3.6 Foss Internal Drainage Board - The application site lies close to the Drainage Board's district. The applicant is proposing to recycle surface water which is created as a result of this application which the board supports. However no details are provided on how this will be achieved. The Board is aware that a lagoon exists on site which is believed to have a controlled discharge. The Board is however concerned that adequate surface water storage capacity is available on site. This being required to manage excess water in the event of a significant storm and also should the plant close or cease to recycle surface water. Surface water drainage condition proposed if permission granted.

3.7 Site Notice and Publicity

The application has been advertised by neighbour notification and site notice. No responses were received.

## **4.0 APPRAISAL**

### **4.1 Key Issues**

- principle of development
- case for very special circumstances
- impact on the openness of the green belt
- design
- impact on amenity and living conditions of adjacent occupiers
- highways and parking
- drainage

## **POLICY CONTEXT**

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (February 2019)

4.2 The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) was published on 19 February 2019 and sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

4.3 The NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to the achievement of sustainable development (Paragraph 7). To achieve sustainable development, the planning system has three overarching objectives; economic, social and environmental objectives. The NPPF sets out in paragraph 11 the presumption in favour of sustainable development which applies unless the application of specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

### Development Plan

4.4 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for York mainly consists of the saved policies of the revoked Yorkshire and Humber Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) relating to the general extent of the York Green Belt.

### Saved Policies of the Yorkshire and Humber RSS

4.5 The Yorkshire and Humber RSS was revoked in 2013 with the exception of the policies relevant to the York Green Belt. Policy YH9(C) states that the detailed inner boundaries of the Green Belt around York should be defined in order to establish long term development limits that safeguard the special character and setting of the historic city. The boundaries must take account of the levels of growth set out in this RSS and must also endure beyond the Plan period. Policy Y1(C1) states that plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes for the York sub area should in the

City of York LDF, define the detailed boundaries of the outstanding sections of the outer boundary of the York Green Belt about 6 miles from York city centre and the inner boundary in line with policy YH9C. Figure 6.2 of the RSS illustrates the general extent of the Green Belt.

#### Publication Draft Local Plan (2018)

4.6 The Publication Draft City of York Local Plan 2018 ('2018 Draft Plan') was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination on 25 May 2018. It is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. In accordance with paragraph 48 of the NPPF the Draft Plan policies can be afforded weight according to:

- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the previous NPPF published in March 2012. (NB: Under transitional arrangements plans submitted for examination before 24 January 2019 will be assessed against the 2012 NPPF).

4.7 The evidence base underpinning the 2018 Draft Plan is capable of being a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

#### Draft Development Control Local Plan (2005)

4.8 The Development Control Local Plan (DCLP) was approved for development management purposes in April 2005. Whilst the DCLP does not form part of the statutory development plan, its policies are considered to be capable of being material considerations and can be afforded very little weight in the determination of planning applications where policies relevant to the application are consistent with those in the NPPF.

### ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.9 Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 includes development classified as within the Food Industry, including the packing and canning of animal and vegetable products. Planning Practice Guidance (Para 017) states that if a proposal is listed in the first column in Schedule 2 of the 2017 Regulations and exceeds the relevant thresholds or criteria set out in the second column (sometimes referred to as 'exclusion thresholds and criteria') the proposal needs to be screened by the local planning authority to determine whether significant effects on the environment are likely and hence whether an Environmental Impact Assessment is required. Projects listed in Schedule 2 which are located in, or partly in, a sensitive area also need to be screened, even if they are below the thresholds or do not meet the criteria.

4.10 Projects which are described in the first column of Schedule 2 but which do not exceed the relevant thresholds, or meet the criteria in the second column of the Schedule, or are not at least partly in a sensitive area, are not Schedule 2 development. Sensitive areas include

- (a) land notified under section 28(1) (sites of special scientific interest) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981,
- (d) a property appearing on the World Heritage List kept under article 11(2) of the 1972 UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage,
- (e) a scheduled monument within the meaning of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979,
- (g) a European site;

4.11 The applicable threshold to trigger whether an Environmental Impact Assessment is required is for the area of new floorspace to exceed 1000 square metres. The proposed development is under this trigger point and does not lie within a sensitive area. It is therefore not considered to be Schedule 2 development and an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.

## PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT – ASSESSMENT OF HARM TO THE GREEN BELT

### WHETHER THE DEVELOPMENT IS INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT

4.12 The application site lies within the general extent of the York Green Belt and therefore Section 13 (Protecting Green Belt Land) of the NPPF is applicable. Policy GB1 of the 2018 Draft Plan is also relevant.

4.13 Paragraph 143 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Para 144 goes on to state 'substantial weight' should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. The construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate unless they fall within certain exceptions. The exceptions are set in Paragraph 145 of the NPPF and are as follows:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;

- e) limited infilling in villages;
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
  - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
  - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

4.14 The building to be extended as a result of this proposal was approximately 2230 square metres in area, prior to its extension in 2008. The proposed development would increase the floor area of the building by approximately 911 square metres. Taken cumulatively with the 2008 extension, this represents an increase of approximately 150 per cent in the floor area of the original building. This extension is considered to be a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building and therefore is inappropriate development. It is necessary to consider whether there are very special circumstances that would outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

#### IMPACT ON THE OPENNESS OF THE GREEN BELT

4.15 The NPPF advises that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence. There is no definition of 'openness' in the NPPF, but it is commonly taken to mean the state of being free from development, the absence of buildings, and relates to the quantum and extent of development and its physical effect on the site.

4.16 Policy GB1 of the 2018 Draft Plan states that permission will only be granted for development where:

- i. the scale, location and design of development would not detract from the openness of the Green Belt;
- ii. it would not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt; and
- iii. it would not prejudice or harm those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York.

4.17 There are unresolved objections to Policy GB1 that will be considered through the examination in public of the Local Plan and therefore it should only be afforded limited weight in the decision making process for the purposes of this application.

4.18 The existing site is a cluster of buildings with hardstanding in between to allow for vehicle movements. Two of the three extensions represent infill development, located

within the perimeter of the existing group of buildings. The third extension will lie to the rear of the existing packing building but within the existing tree belt to the north of the building, and therefore is read as within the curtilage of the site. The proposed extensions due to their nature as built development will reduce openness within this part of the Green Belt, however due to their siting within the existing site the loss of openness is considered to be limited.

## IMPACT ON THE GREEN BELT PURPOSES

4.19 The proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would lead to limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF goes on to state that the Green Belt serves five purposes. These are:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and
- f) other urban land.

4.20 The primary purpose of the York Green Belt is to safeguard the special character and setting of the historic city as referred to in Policy YH9C of the RSS and Policy SS2 of the 2018 Draft Plan, although limited weight can only be attached to the latter. The extensions lie within the curtilage of the existing site, are of continuing use to the existing building and would be of an appropriate design for the rural setting. Due to the above, the proposal is not considered to conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt

4.21 The NPPF states that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the green belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the green belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The applicant has put forward a number of other considerations which they consider would justify the proposal and these are set out and assessed in paragraphs 4.29 to 4.33 below.

## IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA

4.22 Section 12 of the NPPF sets out that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Moderate weight can be applied to Policy D1 of the 2018 Draft Plan which states that proposals will be supported where they improve poor existing urban and natural environments, enhance York's special qualities and better reveal the significances of the historic environment. Development proposals that fail to take account of York's special qualities, fail to make a positive design contribution to the city, or cause damage to the character and quality of an area will be refused.

4.23 The proposal is for three extensions, each located on a different elevation of the building. The proposed extensions will individually be subservient in scale to the current building and due to their siting will be predominantly obscured from public view. They will be no higher than the highest point of the existing building. There is a public right of way to the rear of the site, however there is an existing tree belt along the site boundary which reduces visibility into the site. The proposed materials used for the walls and the roof will match those of the existing building being Moorland Green composite cladding which is appropriate for the rural location of the site. Given this, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the existing rural character of the area and to be an appropriate design.

## IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURS' LIVING CONDITIONS

4.24 The NPPF states that developments should create places with a high standard of amenity for all existing and future users. It goes on to state that decisions should avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development. Policies D1 and ENV2 of the 2018 Draft Plan cover amenity and can be afforded moderate weight for the purposes of decision making. The proposed development is set away from neighbouring dwellings and land users with the site surrounded by agricultural fields which are in the ownership of the applicant. Neighbouring buildings are of a commercial or agricultural use. No change of use is proposed to the existing packing building to be extended. While new equipment will be installed in the building, it would be replacing existing equipment. The Council's Environmental Protection team have no objection to the proposal. Holtby Parish Council raised concerns over lighting, hours and noise. Given the proposal is an extension to an existing building and will not result in its change of use, conditions relating to noise and hours of operation would not be enforceable as the rest of the site and building could continue to operate as before. Due to the siting of the building away from other development and due to the existing use, additional control over lighting to the extensions is not considered reasonable.

## HIGHWAYS

4.25 Paragraph 108 of the NPPF advises that development proposals should ensure that safe and suitable access for all users can be achieved. Development should only be refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe (Para. 109). Policy T1 of the 2018 Publication Draft Local Plan can be applied with moderate weight and states that to provide safe, suitable and attractive access, development proposals will be required to demonstrate there is safe and appropriate access to the adjacent adopted highway. Development proposals should also create safe and secure layouts for motorised vehicles (including public transport vehicles), cyclists, pedestrians that minimise conflict.

4.26 The proposed extensions would not impact on the existing car parking areas to the site and would not, due to their siting towards the rear of the site, affect highway

safety. The number of full time employees is proposed to increase from 100 to 110. The agent has advised that there are 66 tarmac bays (plus 2 disabled parking spaces) and further overflow parking on reinforced grass areas. Car sharing is encouraged. The increase in floorspace is not considered to materially affect the level of traffic, including heavy goods vehicles, to the site to the extent that highways alterations or measures are required. There is an existing site access to the A166 with a widened splay to allow for the larger vehicles.

## DRAINAGE

4.27 Paragraph 163 states when determining applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Sustainable drainage systems should be incorporated in areas at risk of flooding. Policy ENV5 of the 2018 Draft Plan requires sustainable drainage systems be utilised for all developments. This policy can be applied with moderate weight in the decision making process.

4.28 The application site lies in flood zone 1. Surface water as a result of the activities on site is proposed to be recycled and there is an existing drainage lagoon to the rear of the site. No new foul drainage water connections are required for the development. The Council's Flood Risk Engineer has considered the proposal and notes that surface water will need to be drained at some stage. The IDB also advises that a drainage condition is required. The agent for the applicant has confirmed in principle that a pre-commencement drainage condition is acceptable.

## CONSIDERATION OF VERY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

4.29 The revised planning statement submitted by the agent makes a case for very special circumstances which is as follows:

- R S Cockerill supplies for Aldi and Lidl supermarkets which require that suppliers are 'future proofed' in terms of demand to ensure they have sufficient capacity. The statement notes that both supermarkets have expansion plans including the opening of new stores in the north and Lidl opening a new depot in Doncaster which the applicant is supplying. Additional space is required for increasing the capacity of the site due to customer demands which require a supplier must be future proofed in terms of capacity. To comply with health and safety legislation, much of the new equipment to be installed has a larger footprint.
- There are environmental benefits, with the new equipment using water more efficiently and able to pack goods using less plastic.
- Furthermore the new equipment is described as a significant step change from the existing technology and will require upskilling current staff and recruiting others. The statement advises that R S Cockerill is engaged with York College in recruiting apprentices for its Engineering and IT departments. 10 new jobs are anticipated.

- The company states it plays an integral role in the local potato supply chain and greater crop utilisations and productivity benefits can be passed back to the supply base in the form of improved returns. This would allow the company to be more competitive, enhancing job security and sustainability.
- If the development does not proceed, the company would become less competitive affecting their suppliers and local potato growers

4.30 There is no set definition of what constitutes very special circumstances with regard to considering development proposals in the Green Belt. The statement provided by the applicant sets out the direct and indirect economic benefits of the proposal including increasing the competitiveness of the company, benefits to local suppliers and providing additional local employment opportunities. There are also environmental benefits including the reduction of water usage and plastic waste.

4.31 Economic and environmental impacts are considered in Section 2 of the NPPF which sets out how sustainable development is to be achieved through three overarching objectives. These are:

a) **an economic objective** – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;

b) **a social objective** – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and

c) **an environmental objective** – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

4.32 Paragraph 83 goes onto to state that planning decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas and the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. Given the economic benefits would affect not only the company, but also local suppliers and education providers, significant weight should be applied to this benefit. The environmental benefits of reducing plastic usage and minimising the use of water should be afforded moderate weight.

## 5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 The proposed extensions are considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt and would, therefore, by definition be harmful to the Green Belt. Substantial weight is to be given to any harm to the Green Belt. In accordance with the NPPF, inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. There is limited harm on the openness of the Green Belt and limited harm to the green belt purposes. The very special circumstances are considered cumulatively to be afforded significant weight in the decision making process. The proposal is also considered to be acceptable on the other relevant matters including design, drainage and highway safety. Moderate weight is considered to be applied to these matters. Weighing up the planning balance, it is considered that with regard to this proposal, the very special circumstances set out do outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt

## 6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Approve

1 TIME2 Development start within three years

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:-

1284-1 rev B received 27 December 2018

1284-4 rev B received 27 December 2018

1284-6 rev B received 27 December 2018

1284-7 rev B received 27 December 2018

P6179-01 rev B received 27 December 2018

P6180-01 received 27 December 2018

P62141-01 received 27 December 2018

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

3 No development shall take place until details of the proposed means of foul and surface water drainage, including details of any balancing works and off site works,

Application Reference Number: 18/02937/FUL

Item No: 3d

have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with these details for the proper and sustainable drainage of the site.

4 VISQ1 Matching materials

## **7.0 INFORMATIVES: Notes to Applicant**

### **1. STATEMENT OF THE COUNCIL'S POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE APPROACH**

In considering the application, the Local Planning Authority has implemented the requirements set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 38) in seeking solutions to problems identified during the processing of the application. The Local Planning Authority took the following steps in order to achieve a positive outcome:

Requesting the applicant amend their planning statement in an attempt to justify very special circumstances to allow development in the Green Belt.

### **2. INFORMATIVE**

The developer's attention is drawn to Requirement H3 of the Building Regulations 2000 with regards to hierarchy for surface water dispersal and the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuD's). Consideration should be given to discharge to soakaway, infiltration system and watercourse in that priority order. Surface water discharge to the existing public sewer network must only be as a last resort therefore sufficient evidence should be provided i.e. witnessed by CYC infiltration tests to BRE Digest 365 to discount the use of SuD's.

If the proposed method of surface water disposal is via soakaways, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under BRE Digest 365, (preferably carried out in winter), to prove that the ground has sufficient capacity to accept surface water discharge, and to prevent flooding of the surrounding land and the site itself.

City of York Council's Flood Risk Management Team should witness the BRE Digest 365 test.

If SuDs methods can be proven to be unsuitable then In accordance with City of York Councils Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and in agreement with the Environment

Agency and the York Consortium of Internal Drainage Boards, peak run-off from Brownfield developments must be attenuated to 70% of the existing rate (based on 140 l/s/ha of proven by way of CCTV drainage survey connected impermeable areas). Storage volume calculations, using computer modelling, must accommodate a 1:30 year storm with no surface flooding, along with no internal flooding of buildings or surface run-off from the site in a 1:100 year storm. Proposed areas within the model must also include an additional 20% allowance for climate change. The modelling must use a range of storm durations, with both summer and winter profiles, to find the worst-case volume required.

If existing connected impermeable areas not proven then a Greenfield run-off rate based on 1.4 l/sec/ha or if shall be used for the above. For the smaller developments where the Greenfield run-off rate is less than 1.4 l/sec/ha and becomes impractical and unsustainable then a lowest rate of 2 l/sec shall be used.

Surface water shall not be connected to any foul / combined sewer, if a suitable surface water sewer is available.

The applicant should provide a topographical survey showing the existing and proposed ground and finished floor levels to ordnance datum for the site and adjacent properties. The development should not be raised above the level of the adjacent land, to prevent runoff from the site affecting nearby properties.

Details of the future management and maintenance of the proposed drainage scheme shall be provided.

### 3. INFORMATIVE:

The developer's attention is drawn to the various requirements for the control of noise on construction sites laid down in the Control of Pollution Act 1974. In order to ensure that residents are not adversely affected by air pollution and noise, the following guidance should be adhered to, failure to do so could result in formal action being taken under the Control of Pollution Act 1974:

(a) All demolition and construction works and ancillary operations, including deliveries to and despatch from the site shall be confined to the following hours:

Monday to Friday 08.00 to 18.00

Saturday 09.00 to 13.00

Not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

(b) The work shall be carried out in such a manner so as to comply with the general recommendations of British Standards BS 5228: Part 1: 1997, a code of practice for "Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites" and in particular

Section 10 of Part 1 of the code entitled "Control of noise and vibration".

(c) All plant and machinery to be operated, sited and maintained in order to minimise disturbance. All items of machinery powered by internal combustion engines must be properly silenced and/or fitted with effective and well-maintained mufflers in accordance with manufacturers instructions.

(d) The best practicable means, as defined by Section 72 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974, shall be employed at all times, in order to minimise noise emissions.

(e) All reasonable measures shall be employed in order to control and minimise dust emissions, including sheeting of vehicles and use of water for dust suppression.

(f) There shall be no bonfires on the site

**Contact details:**

**Author:** Tim Goodall Development Management Officer

**Tel No:** 01904 551103