

REGULATORY COMMITTEE
18 MARCH 2009

DURNFORD: PROPOSED ERECTION OF A NEW SALT STORE DEPOT ON LAND TO THE WEST OF THE A345 AND MAHLE TENNEX, HIGH POST, SALISBURY FOR WILTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (Application No. S/08/8002)

Purpose of Report

1. To consider the above application and to recommend that conditional planning permission be granted.

The site

2. The application site lies on an elevated chalk rise to the west of the Mahle Tennex factory and the A345, which runs between Amesbury and Salisbury. The site for the proposed salt depot is located on Grade 3C agricultural land forming part of a larger arable field to the rear of the Mahle factory. It is accessed via a minor road leading approximately 100 metres to the east to the crossroads with the A345. Bordering the site to the east is the significant industrial premises of Mahle Filter systems UK Ltd. beyond a landscape bund that rises above the site. Agricultural land borders the site's southern and western boundaries with a minor road beyond the hedgerow on the northern boundary. The site is located within a Special Landscape Area (SLA) as designated within the Salisbury District Local Plan (adopted 2003).
3. Location and site plans are attached at **Appendix 1** and **Appendix 2**.

Planning History

4. There is no planning history for this site.

Proposals

5. The County Council operates the highway maintenance functions from a number of depots across the County with support from office staff at County Hall. In 2006 the Council carried out a review of its property portfolio with a view to improving access to communities, rationalising the use of accommodation and disposing of identified land and buildings to fund the development of new facilities and to undertake improvements of existing accommodation. The applicant states that to continue to operate the highway maintenance functions from the same depots, with the same arrangements as at present, would provide little scope for future improvements.
6. The proposed salt depot would replace the Council's existing depot in Amesbury. The proposal site measures approximately 9,583 square metres and includes a salt store building, gritters garage, storage compound, staff office and associated services including car park, fuel pump, gulley waste and wash-down.

7. The infrastructure components of the proposal are:

- Site storm water drainage
- Foul water drainage
- Wash down water management
- Gulley waste water management
- Fuel forecourt drainage

The development would utilise a specialist Ecological Treatment System to deal with the waste water. All solid and liquid waste from the site (foul water, yard run-off, salt brine from the wash-down area and rainwater overflow) would be recycled and re-used. Rainwater would also be harvested for reuse in lorry cleaning operations. The proposed system uses plants, salt marsh, reed beds, ponds and swales to move and treat the water as it moves around the site.

8. The proposed buildings have been designed to reflect the context of the site and are described as a mixture of agricultural farm buildings and industrial sheds. The design is informed by the function. In the transport buildings, operations dictate bay sizes, lengths and structural openings. The materials proposed incorporate translucent corrugated Glass Reinforced Plastic (GRP) to allow natural light to permeate into the building, whilst the open slatted timber cladding allows the movement of air through the building to aerate the salt store.

9. The site would receive a diverse range of vehicles including cars, salt lorries and petroleum delivery vehicles. To minimise risk to operatives and visitors to the site, the design of the depot includes:

- Signage to entrance points reducing speed to 10 mph within the site
- Security fencing
- Car park located immediately inside the gate and next to the office building
- Pedestrian walkway site marking from rear of car parking area via a direct route to the reception
- Signing-in facility for visitors at reception.

Planning Policies

10. The following planning policies are considered relevant to this proposal:

- Policies DP1, DP14, C2, C5, C9, HE2 of the Wiltshire & Swindon Structure Plan 2016 (WSSP).
- Policies G1, C2, C3, C6, CN21 – CN23, E19 and G8 of the Salisbury District Local Plan 2011 (Adopted 2003) (SDLP).

11. All relevant planning policies are set out in the attached **Appendix 3**.

Consultations

12. **Local Member, Mr. K. Wren** – no comments received.

13. **Salisbury District Council (SDC)** – object on the following basis:

The site is located within open countryside designated as a Special Landscape Area (SLA). Planning policy generally restricts new development in open countryside, although exceptions include new development required for the provision of public utilities as long as the location can be justified. Such a justification will need to include that there is no alternative, more environmentally acceptable, site and satisfactory measures can be taken to minimise the impact on the environment and the landscape. The additional information includes a site justification statement from GVA Grimley and landscape mitigation proposals. The proposed site is visible within the landscape with open fields to the north, west and south. Whilst there is existing industrial development to the east of the proposed site there is a substantial earth bund which forms a clear break between the built development and the open countryside. The applicants have considered alternative sites at High Post, but have not demonstrated to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that there are no alternative more environmentally acceptable sites available (including the alternative site to the west of High Post on the edge of the existing factory complex identified in the site justification statement).

14. **Salisbury District Council - Environmental Health** – no observations.

15. **Durnford Parish Council** – objects to the proposal on the basis that the area is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which has already been reduced by the Mahle site, increased HGV traffic on local roads, intrusive light pollution, possible alternatives (e.g. Solstice Park), longer usage period than proposed, pollution of surrounding fields, affect on local wildlife and visual mitigation.

16. **Environment Agency (EA)** – no objection following the submission of further information pertaining to site operation and details relating to the ecological treatment systems. The EA request that a number of informatives be attached to any permission granted.

17. **Highways Agency** – no comments.

18. **Wiltshire Wildlife Trust** – no objection following the submission of further information pertaining to protected species and measures for biodiversity enhancement.

19. **County Countryside Section**

(Landscape) – no objection following the submission of further information relating to landscape character, visual context and landscape mitigation.

(Ecology) – no objection following the submission of further information pertaining to protected species and habitat mitigation and enhancement.

20. **Local Highway Authority (LHA)** – no objection following the submission of amended drawings illustrating a revised access arrangement. The LHA request a number of conditions relating to surface water discharge and surfacing.

21. **County Archaeologist** – considers there is potential to find archaeological features in the proposal area and therefore recommends an archaeological watching brief be made subject to condition.

22. Copies of the consultation replies referred to above are available for inspection in the **Members' Room**.

Publicity

23. The application has been advertised in the local press and by site notice. A neighbour notification exercise has also been undertaken. Three letters of representation have been received raising the objections and concerns outlined below:
- (i) Infringement into the countryside
 - (ii) Visual impact on the Special Landscape Area
 - (iii) Further industrialisation of the area
 - (iv) Light pollution
 - (v) Pollution of surrounding land by chemicals
 - (vi) Pollution of the water environment
 - (vii) Lack of consideration of alternative sites
 - (viii) Increase of large vehicles on local roads in the Woodford Valley
24. Copies of the representations received are available in the **Members' Room**.

Planning Considerations

25. This planning application must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
26. Having regard to the consultation responses, letters of representation and Development Plan policies, it is considered that the main issues in the determination of this application are:
- Need
 - Local Plan Policy
 - Landscape impact and countryside protection
 - Highway considerations
 - Ecological impact
 - Hydrology
 - Archaeology
 - Lighting

Need

27. Wiltshire County Council operates the highway maintenance functions from a number of depots across the County with support from office staff at County Hall. In 2006 the Council carried out a review of its property portfolio with a view to improving access to communities, rationalising the use of accommodation, decentralising services from County Hall, disposing of identified surplus land and buildings to fund the development of new facilities and to undertake improvements to existing accommodation. It became apparent to the applicant that to continue to operate the highway maintenance functions from the same depots and with the same arrangements as at present would provide little scope for future improvements. The establishment of new offices, depots and storage areas within existing depots would not be realistic given the limited size and suitability of some of the sites.
28. Wiltshire has five climatic domains for winter service purposes. The salting depots are strategically located to cater for the weather differences across the County and with the ability to operate as independent units. The current Amesbury depot serves the south division of the County and is located within the town itself. The depot buildings are in a poor state of repair with the small site itself constrained for any significant improvements with the addition of potential disruption to adjacent residents.

29. The Council's 'Highway Depots and Offices Strategy' (June 2006) and further statements of justification for the location of the current proposal site have been provided in support of the proposed development. These record that the applicant has investigated a number of alternative locations between Amesbury and Salisbury, but it is only the current proposal site at High Post which addresses the strategic requirements of such a facility. The site is in close proximity to the A345 at High Post junction and equidistant between Amesbury and Salisbury. It is therefore in a good strategic location to enable the County Council to perform its statutory responsibilities effectively and to ensure a continuation of the County's policy regarding access to centres of population with a locally identified service provision.
30. Officers consider that the need to strategically locate a vital facility for the Council to carry out its statutory duty of winter highway gritting from this site is a material consideration which can be given some weight, and which in this case justifies a departure from general countryside protection policy, especially given the semi-urbanised context of High Post and the environmental protection and enhancements that are integral to the proposed development.

Local Plan Policy

31. The proposed location for the salt depot is on agricultural land to the south of Amesbury. The land is within a designated SLA and regarded as countryside in the District Plan. Therefore, the principle of the use of the land for a salt depot is contrary to the proposals in the Development Plan. It will be necessary therefore, to refer the application to the Secretary of State if the Committee is minded to grant planning permission.
32. The application site is located at High Post, within an area subject to countryside protection policies in the District Local Plan, comprising Policy C2 and Policy C6 pertaining to SLAs. The area is not designated as an AONB. Policy C2 of the District Plan states that development in the countryside will be strictly limited and will not be permitted unless it would benefit the local economy or enhance the environment. Policy C6 states that within the SLA, proposals for development in the countryside will be considered, having particular regard to the high quality of the landscape. Where proposals which would not have an adverse effect on the quality on the landscape are acceptable, they will be subject to criteria relating to siting, scale and high standards of landscaping and design, using materials appropriate to the locality and that reflect the character of the area.
33. The site is located within a SLA, which although likely to be omitted from the emerging Local Development Documents (LDD's) is still policy at present. As detailed later in the report, the submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment acknowledges the importance of the SLA as a whole, but confirms that locally the development can achieve "best fit" without detriment to the wider landscape through the implementation of appropriate mitigation. This mitigation has been designed and incorporated within the submitted proposals. Officers consider that the level of assessment, design and mitigation proposed by the applicant is in accordance with Policy C6.
34. The proposal does not accord with Policy C2 as it is located within designated countryside. However, the Local Plan states that all development proposals in the countryside will need to satisfy the criteria listed in Policy G2 and it is particularly important that their impact on the environment is minimised. The criteria against which new development would be considered (listed in full at **Appendix 3**) include access issues, landscaping, biodiversity, pollution, loss of agricultural land, amenity and design. Many of these issues have been raised as concerns by the three objectors to the proposal. Officers consider that these issues have been addressed, as detailed in the following report, and that the proposal is in accordance with Policy G2.

35. The applicant has referred to Policy C3 in their submission. This relates to how small scale development required by public utilities undertakers will be permitted in the countryside on the basis that criteria can be met, including that it can be demonstrated that there is no alternative, more environmentally acceptable proposal site. Salisbury District Council has objected to the proposal, citing this policy and stating that the applicant has not considered more environmentally acceptable alternatives.
36. However, it should be noted that, in general terms, a statutory undertaker supplies some service to the public, such as gas, telecoms, electricity and water companies, and in return the person taking the benefit of the service pays a charge direct to the supplier, i.e. the statutory undertaker. This is distinct from the Council being the Local Highway Authority discharging its statutory duty to ensure safe passage over adopted highways - by gritting for example. This does not constitute an 'undertaking' and as such Policy C3 is not relevant.
37. In connection with Policy C3, SDC have requested that the applicant look at alternative more environmentally acceptable sites for the proposal. This has also been an issue raised by objectors. Notwithstanding the correct interpretation of Policy C3, the applicant has provided the rationale for locating the proposal at this site and outlined the optioneering process for other sites that was undertaken. This illustrates that the applicant considered alternative sites, but concluded that this scheme should be pursued. Whilst officers acknowledge objections made by SDC and local residents, the fact that there may be another site upon which the development could be yet more acceptable for planning purposes would not justify the refusal of permission on the application site. In addition, information submitted by the applicant has thoroughly assessed the environmental impacts of the development and has proposed mitigation which has been endorsed by statutory consultees as detailed in the following texts. Officers consider that this illustrates the current scheme is acceptable in policy terms.

Landscape Impact and Countryside protection

38. The planning application documents include a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) in accordance with the guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement 7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas). The assessment identifies that the site is located in the High Chalk Plain Landscape Type – 3B Salisbury Plain East Landscape Character Area. The local landscape character exhibits key characteristics typical of the High Chalk Plain, e.g. large landscape, open scale, strong sense of remoteness. The submitted report notes that the urbanisation of the High Post Junction has 'served to erode the character and relationship to the surrounding landscapes of the area', stating that the local landscape character is considered to be 'of good quality and of medium sensitivity to change'.
39. The LVIA concludes that the proposed scheme would not fundamentally conflict with the baseline landscape pattern, due to its relationship and proximity to the urbanised form around High Post cross roads. The document states that the relationship between the existing landscape pattern and the proposed scheme would remain similar in character terms to that currently experienced with Mahle Filter Systems. The LVIA states that the mitigation proposals in the form of planting around the northern and southern boundaries of the proposed site would aid integration. Visual screening of both the taller structures and low level vehicle movements within the site and would, in the long-term, merge and reinforce planting currently establishing on the boundary of the Mahle Filter Systems, appearing as a logical extension to the existing planting framework.

40. A key component missing from the original submission was an integrated landscape plan that illustrated all proposed soft landscaping works that were to be provided for the implementation of ecological and landscape mitigation. The County Landscape Officer initially objected to the application on this basis but then worked with the applicant to formulate an effective strategy to mitigate for any potential landscape impact. The strategy (detailed on Drawing 591/007RevJ) includes:
- Hedgerow planting and a 5 metre wide linear belt to the south of the site which would provide low level screening from the footpaths of vehicular movements and provide wildlife corridor linkages. It would also provide a robust visual screen to the site that is in keeping with the local landscape character.
 - Urban features such as the security fence are proposed behind the tree/shrub planting.
 - Details of planting, i.e. species, size, density and long-term maintenance are included on the integrated landscape plan.
 - Initial proposals for bunding, which were removed due to their appearance being deemed to be out of character to the wider landscape.
41. Salisbury District Council, Durnford Parish Council and a number of local residents have objected to the application, commenting that the proposal will have a negative visual impact on the countryside. Officers consider that although the area is considered to be in open countryside, there are many land uses which conflict with this, including the adjacent firework factory, the urbanised forms of the High Post Hotel and Mahle behind its bund which looks alien in the landscape. The findings of the LVIA support this stance and it is worthy of note, that the detailed landscape mitigation may serve to integrate the Mahle bund into the landscape more successfully. In light of the detailed design of the proposal and its accompanying mitigation strategy, officers consider that the application is in accordance with Policies G2 and C6 as the proposal would not have an adverse visual impact on the countryside or the SLA designation.
42. Concerns have also been raised by local residents relating to the loss of agricultural land. The site is not of a significant size and was assessed by the applicant and found to be classified as Grade 3C land which is not deemed to be the best and most versatile. It is therefore not safeguarded.

Highway considerations

43. The proposed salt depot would be accessed via a minor C class road leading approximately 100 metres to the east to the High Post crossroads with the A345. Objections have been received from local residents who are concerned that the proposal would result in an increase in large vehicles travelling west of the site through the Woodford Valley.
44. The site would be used for Winter and Emergency Service operation, which would consist of the storage of salt and spreaders (gritters) together with their necessary support; fuel, wash-down and mess facilities. The main operating period is November to March and this involves vehicles being loaded, moving onto the network, unloading, vehicle washing and re-fuelling. The site is proposed to accommodate the occasional discharge from gully emptiers but no general highway maintenance functions. There would be seven HGVs based at the site which would operate in the winter (November-March). The proposed vehicle movements associated with the site include fuel deliveries, salt deliveries and staff trips. During severe frosty weather gritter lorry trips will peak at 12 movements per day (6 out, 6 in). These will normally be between 18.00 hours and 07.00 hours. In severe snow these trips would increase in line with demand.

45. The LHA was consulted on the proposal and requested a number of amendments with regard to access and site layout. Following the submission of revised drawings the LHA had no objection to the proposal subject to conditions being attached to any permission granted relating to access construction and surface water. The Highways Agency had no comments to make on the application.
46. Officers are aware of the concerns expressed by the Parish Council and local objectors with regard to increased HGV movements resulting from this proposal. However, the number of HGV movements proposed are insignificant and operational management of the site would be undertaken by contractors on behalf of WCC. The LHA are satisfied that drivers are required to use pre-determined routes in order to gain access to gritting runs but, of course, some gritting would be required on these 'C' class roads themselves.

Ecological Impact

47. An extended Phase 1 habitat survey of the application site was carried out and a report submitted. The report identified the presence of brown hare and grey partridge which are UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) target species. They should, therefore, be given consideration within the proposal in terms of not only preventing adverse impact on either the habitats present or the species they support, but also seeking opportunities to enhance the potential of the habitat to support these species. Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (PPS9) refers to the obligation to protect and enhance wildlife habitats.
48. The County Ecologist requested further information be submitted relating to breeding birds, possible impacts on species/habitats on the site and in the immediate surrounding area during the construction and operational phases and any mitigation necessary and enhancement proposals in line with the BAP. A number of documents were subsequently submitted, including an Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA). The EclA concluded that it did not predict significant effects to Valued Ecological Receptors as a result of the construction or operation of the proposed salt depot at High Post. Furthermore, negative effects on other ecological receptors are considered to be minimal, with a range of biodiversity gains delivered through the development and management of the site.
49. Following the submission of the further information, the County Ecologist agrees that there is unlikely to be any risk of impact on European Protected Species either within or close to the application site. Any risk of disturbance to nesting birds can be avoided by carrying out works to hedgerows at a time of year when these species are least likely to be present. The proposed mitigation and enhancement put forward by the applicant is also considered appropriate to the site and should serve to ensure that there are no adverse effects on the local ecology in the immediate surrounding area or in the wider countryside as a result of either the construction or operation of the proposal. Both a Construction Environmental Management Framework and an Operational Environmental Management Framework have been submitted to guide the proposal. The compliance with these documents would be conditioned. This approach is consistent with the aims of PPS9 and the Wiltshire BAP and is in accordance with Policy G2 of the SDLP. The Wiltshire Wildlife Trust does not object to the proposals.

Hydrology

50. The proposed development is situated on the Chalk Formation, a major aquifer as defined in the Environment Agency's (EA) Policy and Practice for the Protection of Groundwater (EA's PPG). The site also lies within Source Protection Zone 1 of the catchment to several boreholes in the area. Source Protection Zones are defined in the EA's PPG and delineate areas around major abstractions in which enhanced groundwater protection measures are required. In planning policy terms the area is designated within the SDLP as a Groundwater Protection Zone under Policy G8.
51. Local objectors outlined concerns that the proposal would pollute surrounding land uses. The EA requested that more information be submitted relating to the reed bed systems and the site drainage to be constructed at the proposed depot. The further information submitted included the operation manual (containing descriptions, design criteria, plant species, maintenance, general and emergency operations), drawings of ecological treatment system proposals and examples of 'Living Water' ecological systems that have been tested out on the treatment of gully tanker effluent, oil terminals and sewage and contaminated surface water. The discharge of waste effluents (including liquor from gully emptying) would be dealt with on site by a reed bed filtration system. Rainwater would be harvested for re-use by the washdown facility. Currently gully waste is deemed to be hazardous in its concentrated form, but when dried it is not so. Therefore, the material would be dewatered, with the liquor being processed on site and the dry goods being disposed of to landfill.
52. The EA was satisfied with the further information but requested that a number of informatives relating to chemical storage and surface water treatment be attached to any permission granted. This approach is in accordance with Policy G8 and G2 of the SDLP and is consistent with the aims of PPS 23: Planning and Pollution Control.

Archaeology

53. The application site is located within a designated Area of Archaeological Significance. Consequently, the applicant submitted an Archaeological desk-based assessment to support the planning application. It was found that remnants of field systems have been identified from aerial photographs in the area of the proposal. These field systems are likely to date from the prehistoric period, as there are a number of other features of this date to the east of the A345, including a Bronze Age barrow and two Iron Age enclosures. A further Iron Age settlement has been found to the north-west on the Pains Wessex site.
54. The County Archaeologist considers that there is the potential to find further archaeological features in the proposal site and requests that the applicant secures the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation. This can be secured by condition and would be in accordance with the aims of SDLP Policies CN21 – CN23 and G2 and Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology.

Lighting

55. The proposed salt depot would need to operate at night in the winter months when weather conditions demand. Consequently, details of the external lighting were submitted with the application. The proposal involves the installation of nine hooded floodlights on 7 metre high poles paired around the site and a number of smaller scale internal lighting systems. The external lighting plots confirm that light spillage from the site would be kept to a minimum, with levels measuring 20 lux at its most intense and reducing to 1 lux within approximately 10 metres outside the edge of the site. This suggests that, together with the low operational usage of the site (as detailed in the planning documentation) there would be minimal detrimental impact on the nearest sensitive land uses. The relatively low impact of the lighting proposals illustrated through the submitted lux plots is consistent with the aims of Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control (2004) and in accordance with Policy G2 of the SDLP.

Conclusion and Reasons for Granting Planning Permission

56. The proposed development would provide a purpose-built facility for delivering highway maintenance and winter salting functions of the LHA. Whilst the proposed development is a departure from countryside protection policies, the site provides a strategic location to enable the County Council to effectively perform its statutory responsibilities with regard to winter gritting. It is considered that together with the strategic importance of the site and the level of assessment, design and mitigation proposed the development is in accordance with SDLP Policies C6 and G2 and that a departure from SDLP Policy C2 is justified.
57. The proposal has been carefully considered for potentially damaging effects on the environment and amenity. It is considered that the development is acceptable subject to the safeguards and mitigation measures contained in the suggested conditions.
58. In light of the detailed design of the proposal and its accompanying mitigation strategy, the application is considered to be in accordance with Policies G2 and C6, as the proposal would not have an adverse visual impact on the countryside or the SLA designation.
59. The development can be appropriately controlled by good site management and adherence to detailed treatment design, and conditions can be imposed to protect the hydrology of the site and surrounding area.
60. Subject to appropriate mitigation in respect of archaeological matters it is considered that there are no conflicts with planning policy.
61. Subject to appropriate mitigation in respect of ecological matters it is considered that there are no conflicts with planning policy.
62. Subject to appropriate conditions and safeguards in respect of highway matters it is considered that there are no conflicts with planning policy.

Recommendation

63. That the application be referred to the Secretary of State informing her that the Committee is minded to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out below.

64. That should the Secretary of State direct that she does not wish to call-in the planning application for her determination, permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

General

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within three years from the date of the permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Unless required by conditions attached to this permission, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Drawing Numbers:

103/RevA – Proposed Floor Plans - Gritters
104/RevB – Proposed Floor Plans - Salt Store
105/RevA – Proposed Elevations - Gritters
106/RevB – Proposed Elevations – Salt Store

102/RevK – Site Layout Plan
107/RevC – Survey/Site Layout
109/RevA – Site Sections
591/001/RevJ – Layout for Treatment System
591/007/RevJ – Integrated Landscape Strategy

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted details and for the avoidance of doubt.

3. No development shall take place until samples of materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Development shall be in accordance with approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

Access and highway matters

4. Provision shall be made within the site for the disposal or surface water so as to prevent its discharge onto the highway details of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

5. Prior to the development being brought into use the access road shall be properly constructed to Highway Authority specification in accordance with full details which shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

Ecology

6. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted High Post Salt Depot Ecological Impact Assessment (dated June 2008), Ecological Mitigation, Habitat Creation and Landscaping plus Ecological Treatment Systems for the Salt Store at Amesbury document (dated June 2008).

Reason: In the interests of wildlife conservation.

7. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Construction Environmental Management Framework (dated June 2008) and the Operational Environmental Management Framework dated June 2008).

Reason: In the interests of wildlife conservation, environmental protection and enhancement.

8. The clearance of vegetation from the application site shall only occur between the end of August and the beginning of March or following a search for active bird nests within the site by an appropriately qualified person that confirms no nests are present.

Reason: In the interests of wildlife conservation.

Landscape

9. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted integrated landscape plan illustrated on Drawing Number 591/007/RevJ and the accompanying habitat creation and landscaping document dated June 2008 and the timings herein.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and wildlife conservation.

Water Environment

10. Any facilities for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls, details of which shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval. The volume of the bunded compound should be at least equivalent to the capacity of the tank plus 10%. If there is multiple tankage, the compound should be at least equivalent to the capacity of the largest tank, or the combined capacity of interconnected tanks, plus 10%; or 25% of the total volume which could be stored at any one time, whichever is the greater. All filling points, vents, gauges and sight glasses must be located within the bund. The drainage system of the bund shall be sealed with no discharge to any watercourse and/or underground strata. Associated pipework should be located above ground where possible and protected from accidental damage. All filling points and tank overflow pipe outlets should be detailed to discharge downwards into the bund.

Reason: To prevent pollution to the water environment.

11. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the lining of the contaminated water reservoirs (following guidance stated in the Environment Authority's letter to the applicant and County Planning Authority dated the 25th April 2008) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

Lighting

12. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the specifications detailed on Drawing Number 60284(63)001.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the impact of the proposal on the countryside.

Archaeology

13. No development shall take place within the area of the application until the applicant or their agents or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Development shall be carried in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To enable sites of archaeological interest to be adequately investigated and recorded.

GEORGE BATTEN

Director of Environmental Services

Report Author
MARI WEBSTER
Principal Planning Officer

The following unpublished documents have been relied on in the preparation of this Report:

Consultation replies and correspondence