

FIRST SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
29th March 2022

Agenda Item 8

Application Ref. 21/01131/REM

Land West of Pit Head Close, Lymedale Business Park

Since the publication of the main agenda report the further consultation comments of the **Landscape Development Section (LDS)**, the **Highways Authority (HA)**, **Waste Management Section (WMS)** and the **Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)** have been received.

The LDS advises that updated arboricultural information is still required because of additional trees that have been removed on the site and this needs to be properly considered. Trees around the brook and impacts of land stability and fly tipping around the brook should also be considered in greater detail.

LDS also advises that additional landscaping to soften the visual impact of the development is welcomed but concerns about the visual impact of the larger structure and car parking areas still remain. They would also like the proposed 2.4m spike topped galvanised palisade fencing to be replaced with a green coloured welded mesh panel fencing, which would also help soften the appearance of the proposed development.

The **HA** advises that they are satisfied with the cycle parking arrangements and access gate details.

The **WMS** identifies that the site plans show no arrangements for the storage of refuse and recyclable materials generated onsite. The size of store required will be dependent up the precise nature of the operations undertaken. For ease of access and proper use by staff onsite, such storage should be within or close to the building where it is generated. For safe servicing, the store should not require a long reverse to reach it, or involve driving through an area of parked vehicles.

The **LLFA** have advised that they still require some additional clarification points to demonstrate an acceptable drainage strategy. They recommend that planning permission is not granted until this has been resolved.

Officer response

The LDS in their original consultation response requested and updated tree survey, tree retentions and removals plan and an updated Arboricultural Implications Assessment.

The applicant set out previously that they did not consider that additional tree information was necessary because the original tree survey is less than two years old and the extent of tree removal has not changed significantly. The applicant also advised that 100 trees will be planted across the site at a ratio of 5:1 which will adequately address tree loss.

The request by LDS for a different boundary fence can be secured by recommended condition 4 of the main agenda report. However, the additional requests by LDS in terms of the works around the brook, cycle path and for additional planting are not accepted. The access works have been approved as part of the outline planning permission and these secured a number of significant improvements to the brook and the landscaping proposals also include positive improvements to these areas (only those that are in the applicants ownership).

As set out in the main agenda report, your officers are content that the proposed landscape masterplan for the site will soften the appearance of the development to an acceptable level. A revised boundary fence can be secured by recommended condition 4 of the main agenda report also.

Whilst the WMS identify that the site plans do not show arrangements for the storage of refuse and recyclable materials generated onsite, the application is supported by a Waste Storage & Collection Strategy. The submitted site plans also show a bin store on the north elevation of the building which is close to the vehicle access point off Pit Head Close. These matters are therefore considered acceptable and can be secured by a condition, which the main agenda report recommends.

The applicant has still not resolved the matters raised by the LLFA and it cannot be concluded that the proposed development has demonstrated an acceptable drainage strategy. However, the applicant is making a conscious effort to resolve these outstanding technical matters and your officers are content that these matters will be resolved in due course. In light of this it is considered that subject to an amended recommendation as set out below, that deferral of a decision is not justified.

The Head of Planning be given the delegated authority to determine the application subject to the Lead Local Flood Authority not raising any significant objections that cannot be overcome through the imposition of conditions following their consideration of additional information submitted in response to their latest comments, PERMIT the application subject to conditions set out in the main agenda report.