

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

24/00201/TELE

CASE OFFICER

Ryan Killeen

DETERMINATION DATE 21.04.2024 **EXT OF TIME**

Address: Land Adjacent To Unit 6 Middleton Central Industrial Estate, Oldham Road, Middleton, M24 1QJ

Proposal: The installation of 25.0m Swann Lattice Tower supporting 6no. antennas, 30no. ericsson radio systems (ERS), 2no. transmission dishes and 2no. GPS modules together with 6no. equipment cabinets on a concrete foundation, 1no. meter cabinet and ancillary development thereto including 1.8m high palisade fencing and a 1 metre high gate (Resubmission of 23/00601/FUL)

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	Y
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	Y

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N/A	Contrary to national policy?	N/A
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N/A	Contrary to previous decision?	N/A
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N/A	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N/A

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	Y

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N/A
-----	--	-----

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RG

DATE: 19 April 2024

SITE

The application relates to a small area of land set to the west of Unit 6 of Middleton Central Industrial Estate which itself is located to the south of the designated Middleton Town Centre, being bound by Oldham Road to the North, from which vehicular access is taken, and Manchester New Road to the west. Wince Brook runs along the southern boundary of the industrial estate with the channel set well below the level of the site. Despite this the site falls wholly within Flood Zone 3. Further south, the topography climbs above the site with residential dwellings on Mill Fold Lane backing onto the river. To the east of the site are the 6-storey vacant London House office building, and the Grade II Listed Warwick Mill which is a 5-storey brick cotton spinning mill constructed in the early C20.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks prior approval for the installation of a 25m lattice tower to accommodate a number of radios, transmission dishes and GPS modules together with 6no. equipment cabinets to be sited at the base of the structure. The site is to be enclosed to all sides with a 1.8m palisade fence.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY & LEGISLATION

The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (As Amended).

Part 16, Class A:

Development by or on behalf of an electronic communications code operator for the purpose of the operator's electronic communications network in, on, over or under land controlled by that operator or in accordance with the electronic communications code, consisting of—

- (a) the installation, alteration or replacement of any electronic communications apparatus,
- (b) the use of land in an emergency for a period not exceeding 18 months to station and operate moveable electronic communications apparatus required for the replacement of unserviceable electronic communications apparatus, including the provision of moveable structures on the land for the purposes of that use, or
- (c) development ancillary to radio equipment housing.

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan

Places for Everyone is a joint development plan for 9 boroughs within Greater Manchester over the period up to 2037, and follows the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF), which was dropped following the decision of Stockport Council to drop out of GMSF in December 2020.

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024.

The relevant Policies in the plan are:

JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P2	Heritage
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO3	Improving design, image and quality of place
P1	Improving image
P2	Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
P3	Improving design of new development
G8	Managing water resources and flood risk
DM1	General development requirements

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1	Defined Urban Area
--------------	---------------------------

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

23/00601/TELE	The installation of a 22.5-metre-high Lattice Tower supporting 12no Antennas on a headframe; 2no GPS Modules; 4no 300mm Transmission Dishes; 36no. Ericsson Radio Systems ERS; together with 6no. equipment cabinets, 1no. meter cabinet and ancillary development thereto including 1.8m high palisade fencing and a 1 metre high gate – Refused:
---------------	--

1. By virtue of its height, siting and appearance, the proposed 22.5 metre high Lattice Tower would constitute a significantly incongruous and dominant feature within the industrial park, amplified by the siting of additional unsightly equipment cabins in a prominent, unshielded location. The proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the street scene and visual amenity generally. On this basis the application is contrary to Policies P1, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

18/01257/TELE	Prior approval for the installation of a 20 metre high phase 5 Monopole and associated works – Refused:
---------------	---

1. The proposed Phase 5 Monopole, by virtue of its height, siting and appearance, would result in a significantly incongruous and dominant feature of the street scene in a prominent gateway to the town centre and major through route. The development would therefore result in unacceptable harm to the street scene and visual amenity generally and be contrary to policies P1, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways And Engineering

The site is removed from the highway and unlikely to have any noticed impact upon traffic or safety.

We have no further highways comment on this application.

Env Health - Noise/Odours

This section has no objections to the proposals

Conservation And Design

Summary:

The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. This harm needs to be balanced against public benefits. A heritage statement should have been submitted as part of the application.

Significance Assessment:

The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO 2015), under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A, Paragraph A.3(4) require a local planning authority to assess proposals for the installation of telecommunications equipment solely on the basis of their siting and appearance.

The application site is within the vicinity of Warwick Mill, a grade II listed mill dating from the early 20th century. Warwick Mill was one of a number of mills built as part of the last great mill building boom in the Lancashire textile industry after 1900. The mills built at this time were significantly larger in floor area than their predecessors, with large floor plates and an increased number of spindles. Warwick Mill is a surviving good example of this phase of mill development. It retains many features of interest including the engine house, virtually intact rope race and a triple brick-arch fireproof system.

Warwick Mill is a landmark feature in Middleton Town Centre and dominates the townscape as a result of its height, proportions and architecture. It is listed at grade II for its special architectural and historic interest.

The proposal is for the installation of a 25m high lattice tower. It would be located to the southwest of the listed building, within Middleton Central Industrial Estate and adjacent to the Oldham Road roundabout. The supporting information does not appear to reference the listed building and no heritage statement has been provided.

As a result of its height and form, the new mast would be a dominant feature in the townscape and would be highly visible from public viewpoints. This would include public views towards and including Warwick Mill. Its height and scale would result in it competing for dominance with Warwick Mill within the townscape.

The development as a result of its height, scale and location would detract from the setting of the listed building. As a result it would harm the special

interest of the grade II listed Warwick Mill, contrary to Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. As a result of inappropriate development within its setting, it would result in less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset.

Environment Agency

No comments received to date.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties, a site notice was posted in the vicinity of the site and a press advert was issued in the local newspaper. 12 Letters of objection were received and a petition with 31 signatures objecting to the proposal were received.

The matters raised in the letters relate to the following matters:

The siting of the mast is inappropriate and other places should be considered.

The appearance of the mast would constitute a significantly incongruous and dominant feature within the industrial park, the impact of which would be exacerbated by the siting of additional equipment cabins in a large and fortified compound.

The mast would be visible from the town centre and would be an unsightly landmark

The siting of the proposed development would be to the detriment of the existing recycling area serving the site and would result in the loss of car parking as well as restricting the existing lorry turning area, which would be to the detriment of the proper operation of the estate and moreover, to pedestrian and vehicular safety.

The mast would have prejudicial impacts on occupiers being able to deliver to their premises and would be to the detriment of continuing the operation of their business

Impacts to outlook from nearby residential properties, and a subsequent overbearing impact to rear garden areas.

Officer response: The above points are considered within the assessment below

Impacts to local wildlife

Officer response: The developer is bound by a statutory duty under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) to ensure that the development would not impact protected species.

Concerns over health risks from radiation

Officer response: The developer has provided a demonstration that the development will conform with the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines.

Impacts to property value

Officer response: This does not form a material planning consideration.

ANALYSIS

Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) states that development consisting of the installation, alteration or replacement of electronic communications apparatus (other than on a building) is not permitted by Class A(a) if –

- (a) in the case of the installation of electronic communications apparatus (other than a mast), the apparatus, excluding any antenna, would exceed a height of 15 metres above ground level;
- (b) in the case of the alteration or replacement of electronic communications apparatus (other than a mast) that is already installed, the apparatus, excluding any antenna, would when altered or replaced exceed the height of the existing apparatus or a height of 15 metres above ground level, whichever is the greater;
- (c) in the case of the installation of a mast, the mast, excluding any antenna, would exceed a height of—
 - (i) 30 metres above ground level on unprotected land; or
 - (ii) 25 metres above ground level on article 2(3) land or land which is on a highway; or
- (d) in the case of the alteration or replacement of a mast, the height of the mast, excluding any antenna, would when altered or replaced exceed the greater of the height of the existing mast or a height of—
 - (i) 30 metres above ground level on unprotected land; or
 - (ii) 25 metres above ground level on article 2(3) land or land which is on a highway;

Or

- (e) in the case of the alteration or replacement of a mast—
 - (i) the mast is on any land which is, or is within, a site of special scientific interest; and
 - (ii) the mast would, when altered or replaced, exceed the original width of the mast by more than one third.

A.4 sets out that “development ancillary to radio equipment housing” means the construction installation, alteration or replacement of structures, equipment or means of access which are ancillary to and reasonably required for the purposes of the radio equipment housing, and except on any land which is, or is within, a site of special scientific interest includes—

- (a) security equipment;
- (b) perimeter walls and fences; and
- (c) handrails, steps and ramps;

The erection of a lattice tower up to 25m in height away from the highway to support electronic communications transmission apparatus with associated cabinets and perimeter fence would be development permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A.

The application is therefore for a determination whether the prior approval of the Council will be required as to the siting and appearance of the installation, as required under paragraph A.3 of the Order.

Siting and appearance

The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (GPDO 2015), under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A, Paragraph A.3(4) require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its siting and appearance, taking into account any representations received.

There is no requirement to have regard to the development plan as there would be for any development requiring planning permission. Nevertheless, Policies P1, P2, P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy are material considerations as they relate to issues of siting, appearance and heritage. In addition, Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the recently adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) are relevant given their aspirations to achieve high quality places and to conserve, sustain and enhance heritage assets and their settings. PfE Policy JP-C2 emphasises the ambition for Greater Manchester to become a digitally connected city region, however does explicitly set out that this should not come at the expense of townscape quality. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is also a material consideration, and this includes a section on supporting high quality communications. Paragraph 139 of the Framework is explicit in that development which is not well-designed should be refused.

The application site lies immediately south of the boundary of the designated Middleton Town Centre, as set out under saved UDP Policy G/S/1. Manchester New Road is the predominant access route into the town centre from the south, accommodating traffic from the M60 J20 and Manchester city centre beyond and as such is a well-trafficked route. Oldham Road to the north of the site is a continuation of the main vehicular route through Middleton town centre connecting all parts of the wider Middleton township and the significance of all these routes is set out in Spatial Strategy Key Diagram (Figure 6 of the adopted Core Strategy) with them displayed as strategic corridors which act as a key gateway. The more recently adopted Middleton Town Centre Masterplan (2022) (*the Masterplan* hereafter) also notes that Manchester New Road/Oldham Road roundabout as a town centre gateway, and seeks to enhance the quality of the pedestrian arrival into the town centre at this location through well-designed interventions.

The proposed lattice tower would be a substantial structure which would appear cluttered due to the number of antennae attached and would appear as a highly conspicuous feature which would rise well above the height of buildings within the trade park, the ridge of the dwellings to the rear and surrounding street furniture and vegetation which would only serve to highlight the disparate scale and dominance of the tower.

It is noted that the levels rise towards the south, however the tower would still rise well above the ridge of these dwellings, which is calculated to be at 15m above ground level of the site and would only further accentuate the significant height of the proposed equipment in relation to surrounding features.

Trees to the southern bank of Wince Brook would assist in partially screening the lower parts of the tower when viewed from Manchester New Road, however the upper, more visually distracting part of the tower would undoubtedly be easily viewed at this gateway to the town centre. Similarly, whilst it is acknowledged that the

enclosed compound and lower quarter of the tower would be screened by buildings within the trade park, the tower would remain a highly dominant structure which can be readily viewed from the well-trafficked adjacent roundabout and Oldham Road.

Whilst street furniture is plentiful within the vicinity of the site, by reason of its excessive scale and bulky lattice structure, the tower would fail to integrate with its surroundings in any meaningful way and would remain a highly conspicuous and visually harmful feature.

Similarly, the inclusion of a 2.4m high palisade fence around the perimeter of the base of the tower, would introduce a hostile and uninviting feature which would harm the character and appearance of the area.

In turning to the impact on nearby heritage assets, the Grade II Listed Warwick Mill lies 120m east of the site which is arguably the most imposing and dominant building in Middleton's townscape due to its height and scale. The Mill was built to a five storey design by George Stott of Joseph Stott and Sons and commenced in December 1907. The mill is brick built, with 20x 14 bays with an internal cast iron frame. The mill includes a Water tower on the north-eastern corner.

Warwick Mill is considered to be a fine example of an early 20th century cotton spinning mill and is likely built to a standard design. The area around the site had already been established as a centre for the textile industry at the time of its construction.

The majority of the original mill complex remains, including the original railings along Oldham Road. The elements that have been lost include the boiler house and chimney, which both appear to have been demolished during the latter half of the 20th century.

In light of the scale and height of the mast, the overall height of which would be comparable to the five-storey main section of Warwick Mill, it is considered that the mast would be an unsightly and intrusive feature which would compete with Warwick Mill within the townscape to which the Council's Conservation Officer has also raised concerns of the development's impact on the setting of Warwick Mill, concluding that the development would give rise to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset.

The intervening space between Warwick Mill and the application site is predominantly occupied by London House and its associated curtilage, and this space has an open character with views through south towards the vegetation along Wince Brook, owing to the scale of buildings and the separation between them, which would only further serve to highlight the mast as an incongruous and competing feature within the townscape.

Whilst vacant, Warwick Mill and London House are the subject of a planning application for the conversion of the Mill and redevelopment of the London House site for residential apartments (ref. 23/00795/FUL). Whilst the application is still to be determined, the redevelopment of the Warwick Mill & London House site is identified as a regeneration priority within the Masterplan, and is also identified as a site for residential development within the Council's SHLAA and as such it is considered that the site has a reasonable prospect of coming forward as a significant development within the Middleton Town Centre Masterplan area.

Given the proximity of the proposed mast to the London House site, it is considered that any prejudicial impact must be considered. From the plans submitted under

planning application ref. 23/00795/FUL, the proposed mast would be sited c.55m from the side elevation of any new tower.

The incongruity of the proposed mast may present challenges in respect of the marketability of new residential development where units facing west would be presented with an entirely unshielded view of the mast at reasonably close proximity. The Council is aware that the development is running with a significant conservation deficit, and thus any impact to the viability of the proposal through reduced values could have implications on the deliverability of the most significant scheme within the Masterplan Area. The siting therefore has a potentially significant prejudicial impact on regeneration priorities within the local townscape.

Furthermore, it is also noted that the site immediately south of Wince Brook is consented for three dwellings under planning permission 22/00345/FUL, which is considered to hold a reasonable prospect of coming forward and as such is considered as a committed development for the purpose of this assessment. The approved dwellings include rear, north facing windows to habitable rooms at both ground floor and lower-ground floor level and external garden areas which would have predominantly unobstructed views of the mast at short range (c.16m). Given the proximity of the mast to the garden areas and habitable room windows, it is considered that the mast would comprise a dominant and wholly incongruous feature which would overwhelm the outlook from all three dwellings, but in particular unit B as shown on the approved site plan. The first floor windows of these units would also have an unrestricted outlook onto the palisade fence compound at the base of the tower.

In a similar manner, dwellings on Mill Fold Road and Silk Mill way which include rear facing windows to habitable rooms and rear private garden areas would also be subject to an undue impact to their outlook as a result of the mast.

Overall it is considered that the proposals comprise a wholly inappropriate form of development at a highly prominent gateway at an edge of town-centre location which would cause a significant degree of harm to the character and appearance of the area, forming an obtrusive feature in views from the rear facing habitable room windows and rear garden areas from dwellings on Mill Fold Road and Silk Mill Road, in addition having an unacceptable impact on future development to the rear of dwellings on Mill Fold Road and the redevelopment of London House contrary to Policy P1 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The development would also give rise to less than substantial harm to the significance of Warwick Mill through the addition of an incongruous feature to the designated asset's setting and the visual competition within the townscape which it would create contrary to Policy P2 of the adopted Core Strategy, PfE Policy JP-P2 and the NPPF. In accordance with paragraph 206 of the framework, any harm to the setting of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 208 states that less than substantial harm caused by a development should be weighed against the public benefit.

The applicant has not provided any specific documentation assessing the significance of the Grade II listed status of Warwick Mill and the application does not fulfil the requirements of paragraph 200 of the Framework. Supporting documentation does however provide details of the public benefits which would be derived from the proposed upgrade to the mast in the provision of 5G. Both the Framework and PfE Policy JP-C2 are clear of the weight which should be afforded to the delivery of high-quality communications, however, in order to attract full weight, it

must be concluded that the proposed siting is the most sequentially preferable and that the same, or similar benefits could not be achieved elsewhere.

The site specific supporting information sets out the proposed development as necessary for business development and meeting specific technical and operational requirements. Within the site specific supporting information, the site is considered sequentially preferable within the context of paragraph 119 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk

The site falls wholly within Flood Zone 3 and the development would comprise 'Essential Infrastructure' (given the reference made in NPPF para.118) as per the flood risk vulnerability classification contained within Annex 3 of the NPPF. The site is at low risk of surface water flooding at between 0.1% and 1% annually.



Fig. 1 Flood Zone Map showing the site edged in red. Source: <https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/>

Paragraph 165 of the NPPF seeks to direct development away from areas at the highest risk of flooding, with the NPPF also requiring all development located within Flood Zones 2 & 3 to be supported by a site specific flood risk assessment.

Within Flood Zone 3, NPPG sets out that essential infrastructure should be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe in times of flood. NPPF para 173 establishes a number of matters which are required to be demonstrated in order for development to be acceptable (in addition to demonstrating the sequential and exceptions test, as applicable).

The application is not supported by flood risk assessment in any form, however does include a brief alternative site selection assessment which is considered further in this report. That assessment does not however consider flood risk impacts when considering the site selection. In the absence of an exceptions test or any FRA however, the application cannot demonstrate that it would be appropriately flood resilient, or would not increase flood risk elsewhere. In the absence of these necessary assessments, the development fails to accord with the requirements of the NPPF, Policy JP-S4 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and Policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.

Other Matters – Site Selection

The application sets out the need for an expansion of infrastructure as necessary for business development and meeting specific technical and operational requirements.

No information has been provided on the extent of the coverage of the current network. An understanding of the broader network context is helpful to properly appreciate how a proposed mast fits into the network and to then be able to assess what alternatives have been investigated.

The application includes a Site Specific Supplementary Information, which details the site selection process providing details of alternative sites considered for development. No details have been provided in respect of the cell search area, or of the cell centre and other existing sites in the surrounding area, which would be useful in demonstrating the suitability of the site. Seven alternative sites have been submitted as considerations in this assessment, with reasons relating to planning or physical constraints which discount the sites for development.

No further information has been provided to conclude that the seven sites in this assessment, plus the application site, are the only viable sites to fulfil the needs of the operator within this undefined area.

The robustness of this assessment raises a significant degree of doubt where it is considered that several other sites (such as atop Middleton Shopping Centre) which are likely to be sequentially preferable over the application site (subject to appropriate details), are discounted on the basis that the installation would “*be of more impact to the area than the application site,*” and does not elaborate or assess to any extent, why this view is taken.

Given the concerns relating to flood risk, a sequential assessment is a significant component in establishing the suitability of the siting of the proposals, and the current test fails to provide a convincing area over which the test should be applied, and does not take account of the flood risk at any alternative sites.

Under Appeal ref. APP/P4225/W/20/3259908, the Inspector stated that the evidence provided in a directly comparable assessment was “*less than compelling,*” and that the applicant had failed to “*robustly demonstrate that a satisfactory level of coverage could not be achieved in another location where a [mast] would not have such an adverse visual impact.*” As this application demonstrates similar shortcomings in its assessment of alternative sites, it would not be possible to definitively conclude that there are no more suitable sites reasonably available that would result in a lesser degree of visual harm, harm to the amenity of nearby occupiers and harm to the significance of heritage assets. Taken as a whole, would fail to comply with the requirements of paragraphs 119 to 121 of the NPPF. Prior approval for the siting and appearance is therefore refused.

Conclusion

Within the context of paragraph 208 of the Framework, whilst it is acknowledged that the proposals would result in social and economic benefits through the improvements to local communications networks, it is not considered that the application suitably demonstrates that it would not be possible to achieve the desired coverage at a site which would be less harmful to the significance of designated heritage assets, and taken as a whole, would fail to comply with the requirements of paragraphs 119 to 121 of the NPPF. Prior approval for the siting and appearance is therefore required and the application is refused.

RECOMMENDATION

1. The site sits adjacent to the Grade II listed Warwick Mill, designated for its special architectural and historic interest which forms a dominant feature within the townscape. The proposed 25 metre high lattice tower by reason of its significant scale, siting and appearance, would fail to sit sympathetically with, and respond positively to, Warwick Mill and its setting. The proposal would fail to safeguard the significance of Warwick Mill and would result in less than substantial harm to its significance. By reason of its siting and scale, the proposed lattice tower would also give rise to an unacceptable impact to the character and appearance of the area and would comprise a wholly inappropriate addition to the townscape generally and would undermine the aspirations of the adopted Middleton Town Centre Masterplan at this gateway location. In addition, the proposals would set a dominant and incongruous feature in a prominent location relative to the outlook of dwellings on Mill Fold Road and Silk Mill Road in addition to giving rise to unacceptable impacts on the outlook of future residential development at London House and to the rear of dwellings on Mill Fold Road. In the absence of a comprehensive assessment of alternative sites for the proposed development it is not possible to definitively conclude that there are no more suitable sites reasonably available that would result in a lesser degree of visual harm, and the public benefits of the proposal are not considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm identified. The application also fails to demonstrate that the site would be sequentially preferable in respect of flood risk, and in the absence of an exceptions test or site specific Flood Risk Assessment, that the development is appropriately flood resilient and would not lead to an increased risk of flooding elsewhere. On this basis the application is contrary to Policies P1, P2, P3, G8 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policies JP-S4, JP-P1, JP-P2 and JP-C2 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Notes for Applicant:

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans:

- 100 – Rev A – Location Plan and Existing Site Plan
- 201 – Rev C – Proposed Site Plan
- 301 – Rev C – Proposed Elevations