

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

19th November 2014

Item 6 (Pages 13-36) – CB/14/01818/FULL– Land adj. to The Guinea, Bedford Road, Moggerhanger

Corrections to report:

The report incorrectly cites the applicants as being: 'Berwick Homes/Charles Wells Ltd'. This should read 'Bewick Homes/Charles Wells Ltd'.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

The following letter addressed to Councillor Nigel Young and David Lamb was received on 11 November 2014 from Professor Richard Parish as Chairman of the Residents association Moggerhanger Action Together for Housing and Safety (MATHS):

11th November 2014

Dear Councillor Young and Mr. Lamb,

Planning Application CB/14/01818/FULL

Thank you again for your time when you met Chris Smith, Carolyn Lister, and myself, together with Cllr. Turner. We appreciated the fact that you were willing to engage in a dialogue with us.

We have now had an opportunity to seek legal opinion and also discuss the situation with a Planning Consultant, an expert who regularly advises the Planning Inspectorate. We have also taken soundings within the village as to our options should the DMC approve this application.

Firstly, let me deal with the matter of the water supply and drainage. We understood that you were intending to **consult further with Anglian Water** and we would be interested to learn the outcome of those discussions. We would be most grateful if you could advise us of the situation.

Given the very considerable evidence that we have from a variety of sources – official documents, customer complaints, recorded incidents, interviews with staff, etc – we were very surprised to see that the recommendation from officers is still to approve the planning application adjacent to The Guinea. As I think you know, we can point to numerous documents which refer to these problems, including citing

them as reasons or partial reasons for refusing planning applications in the past. Indeed, I believe Carolyn Lister has already forwarded some examples to you. Residents at the top end of St. John's Road and on Park Road are often unable to secure the necessary water pressure to operate their showers and other domestic equipment, while at the bottom end of Blunham Road residents on occasions experience sewage and waste water backwash into their properties. Neither situation can be viewed as acceptable in a civilised country such as the UK, to say nothing of the potential public health consequences.

A significant number of dwellings have been added to the village since these issues were first raised over ten years ago and a further 18 properties next to The Guinea will only exacerbate the situation further. There was a clear acceptance of the water supply and drainage issues when we met and, indeed, CBC representatives acknowledged the many complaints about these matters, hence our surprise at the recommendation from officers to approve.

You indicated that **you would ask your own engineers to investigate** the ongoing difficulties and we would be most grateful if you would advise us of the outcome of this exercise. As you know, we have clear evidence that the current infrastructure, both supply and drainage, is completely inadequate for the current size and population of the village, never mind further expansion.

You also indicated at the meeting that the A603 was not a material consideration in relation to this planning application. We have now identified further information, all from official documents (either Bedfordshire County Council or Central Bedfordshire Council), which add additional weight to our concerns about the A603 and the impact upon or effect of the proposed development next The Guinea.

By way of example, in reviewing various developments concerned with Waste and Mineral sites in Bedfordshire during 2011, comments were made about the A603 by the Highways Agency, the Highways Development Control Team, and Central Bedfordshire and Bedford Borough Strategic Transport Planning Teams. These were consolidated into a number of documents concerning local traffic flow and the impact this has on the residents of Moggerhanger. These points, all drawn from local official documents or internal Council memoranda, can be summarised as follows:

- Linking (the A421) to the A1 via the A603 “would involve poor quality rural roads and disbenefit to residential properties”.
- In relation to the proposed Mineral Site development at Willington Lock, the paper comments that “Access onto the A421 is the key issue The A603 is classified as a **secondary freight route** within the DFRN and so is **predominantly for access only**”.

(King, B. May 2011)

In a further memorandum dated 14th June 2011 from Bedford Borough Council to CBC, the following statement was made:

- “The A603 has already been the focus of concerns from residents of Willington and Moggerhanger in relation to its use by goods vehicles. The **A603 has secondary freight route status** and the preferred route would be to use the A1 and A421.”

(Macleaod, M. June 2011)

The above paper makes reference to an even earlier memorandum from the Bedfordshire County Council Planning and Transport Group (author Morbey, C, August 2006), which, in considering potential mineral site developments, makes the following observations:

- “..the A603 at points can be quite narrow and dangerous.”
- “Further consideration needs to be given to the amount of traffic using the A603 as this route can be narrow in some points and would **create safety implications for local communities and existing traffic.**”
- “..vehicles travelling to or from the site (Octagon Farm South) towards the A1 would need to travel along the A603 and pass through the residential developments of Willington and **Moggerhanger leaving safety implications...**”
- Among the most telling, the document (in relation to Land North of Bedford Road and East of Willington) states “.....traffic management, **noise and safety implications this would have on local residents** and the safety implications of the increased number of vehicles using the A603.”
- Referring to the proposed development at Cople, the paper comments “traffic passing through this route would pass through Willington and **Moggerhanger creating negative noise, safety and traffic effects for local residents.**”

Our argument in making these points is that the traffic not only causes an increasing problem for existing residents, but will have a similar impact on the residents of any new properties build adjacent to the A603. Moreover, the increased volume of traffic using the Blunham Road/A603 junction as a result of any development next to The Guinea will merely exacerbate these problems. Any increase in traffic movements on to or from the A603 will merely create additional pressure on what is widely acknowledged as already being a grossly overstretched road. As you know, the Local Authority has a duty to assess the safety implications of any planning proposal and ensure that public safety and welfare are protected.

We now have a mountain of documents referring to the systematic failure to address the infrastructure problems in Moggerhanger, both traffic and water. The traffic issues relating to the A603 are further emphasised in the recent *Central Bedfordshire Local Transport Plan* covering Sandy, Biggleswade and the surrounding area. This clearly states that the A603 is designated a “**Secondary Freight Route**” for “**access and deliveries**” (p 35 of the Local Area Transport Plan, 2013).

In addition to the noise, safety and environmental issues highlighted in so many local publications and papers, I would strongly wish to emphasise the health implications as well. The local authority has a legal responsibility to promote and protect the health of its communities as a result of the Health and Social Care Act, which came into effect in April 2013.

The conclusions reached in so many local policy documents are meaningless unless applied to planning decisions such as the development adjacent to The Guinea.

You kindly indicated that you would **check the powers available to the Local Authority** regarding traffic restrictions on the A603 and we would be interested to know the outcome of such deliberations.

In making our argument to reject this application, please also refer to the previous papers and documents we have submitted. Throughout, we have made the case for refusing this application by reference to previous CBC and Mid Bedfordshire decisions, your own criteria, and independent evidence.

I mentioned at the start of this letter that we have sought legal and planning advice in order to understand the options available to us. In the spirit of openness, I should say that we have been advised that there would be little merit at this stage in attempting to challenge the LDF itself, as this has now been through the process of sign-off and approval. This confirms your view, Councillor Young, and I feel that we should acknowledge that this is the case.

Nevertheless, we have been told that this would not in any way inhibit us from using all the evidence, CBC criteria, and expert opinion submitted during the process of preparing the LDF, and that we would be able to call upon all such submissions as part of a legal challenge in the event that this application is approved by the DMC. To reiterate, we have been informed that all such evidence would be admissible, should The Guinea application be approved, even if such advice, evidence and criteria were ignored in approving the LDF itself. In other words, the criteria highlighted by CBC in various planning documents, together with the expert opinion and evidence submitted during the LDF planning process, remain valid and relevant to this specific application.

Should the DMC approve this planning application, we have been advised that we cannot appeal to the Inspector. Such an appeal is only open to the applicant and, as such, we do not have the same rights as the developer. This has led us to consider other options. The first of these is Judicial Review, and this remains open to us as an option. We have even considered how we would fund such action. However, the advice we have received is that the most appropriate course of action would be to submit a complaint to the Ombudsman for Maladministration. We have been advised that the Ombudsman enjoys similar powers to the High Court and that we would have a strong case, based on the evidence already available. The grounds for such a submission to the Ombudsman broadly would be:

- A failure to consistently apply policy and criteria;
- A failure to respond appropriately to the concerns and complaints of residents
- Inadequate or inappropriate consultation in relation to the criteria used to inform a policy (the LDF) used subsequently to justify approval of The Guinea Planning Application
- A failure to follow the Authority's own procedures and guidance

We have been further advised that the Ombudsman has the necessary powers to investigate how the Local Authority reached its decision and why any relevant evidence was dismissed or rejected.

It is with a sense of considerable sadness that we have reached the conclusion that such action would be necessary in the event of a decision to approve the application. We have only ever wanted to work in collaboration with CBC to ensure the sustainable and appropriate development of our village. Unfortunately, we feel that

we have been pushed to such a decision as a result of pressure from the developers, indicating that they would appeal to the Inspector, if the decision goes against them. In the event that the DMC rejects the application, resulting in a subsequent appeal by the developers to the Inspector, I reiterate again that we would immediately file a Section 6 application, thereby enabling us in effect to provide CBC with its defence to the appeal and to emphasise the democratic justification for such a decision.

Given all the evidence and the strong views of residents, we are dismayed at the decision by officers to once again recommend approval of this application. We recognise, of course, that Elected Members have the final say. Should the DMC approve the application, it is with regret that I must inform you that we are completely resolved to file a complaint with the Ombudsman and that we have more than enough villagers prepared to support such action. It is with genuine regret that I must bring this to your attention, but we are confident that we have sufficient, indeed considerable, evidence to make our case.

We feel that our village has suffered considerably in recent years from unsustainable development and that the infrastructure issues remain unresolved despite being a matter of record for many years. As the local body elected to represent the interests of our community, we respectfully ask you to reflect the overwhelming views of Moggerhanger residents and reject this application.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Richard Parish, CBE,
Chair, Moggerhanger Action Together for Housing and Safety (MATHS)

cc Paul Petrie, Chair Moggerhanger and Chalton Parish Council
Cllr, Tricia Turner, MBE
MATHS Group

Additional Comments

The following response has been received from Anglia Water:

14/11/2014

Dear Amy,

further to our telephone conversation this afternoon and to clarify the position relating to the foul network capacity to serve this development site I can confirm there is capacity to accommodate the foul flows.

To explain the Amber rating that we advised some time ago in response to the site allocation consultation; at this stage the assessment is at a high level to provide the Council with an indication of possible constraints and the ease at which the sites can be served. Amber means that there is no significant constraint and there may be a need for upgrades but this will require further assessment to confirm. At planning application stage we carried out that

further assessment and are satisfied that there is capacity within the existing network without the need for upgrades.

I trust this satisfies the concerns raised,

Regards

Sue Bull
Planning Liaison Manager

The following response has been received from Council Officer Steve Thomas, a Senior Engineer in Flood Risk Management:

04/11/14

I can't really comment on why there was a contradiction in AW's responses. There are two elements to the foul sewerage system – the pipework and the treatment works – but AW's latest response says there is capacity in both - so not sure where the original comment came from.

I would think AW development control do a simple calculation based on pipe size, gradient and number of connected properties to determine capacity. They probably don't take into account any maintenance problems which can affect any system at any time – which is understandable.

The existing system may well have problems – perhaps prone to blockages or ingress of surface water during heavy rain - but I expect AW will say that they monitor all their catchments and carry out improvement works based on priorities across the whole of their region. So, Moggerhanger may well need improving but may not be a priority compared with other catchments in the area.

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

The following standard informative is recommended and should have been included following the recommended conditions under the heading *Notes to Applicant* (p.35):

4. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

Item 7 (Pages 37 – 52) – CB/14/03426/FULL – Land adjacent to 17 Wavendon Road, Salford

Revised suggested resolution

A further consultation period was entered into, to ensure that the development was advertised in the newspaper, the consultation period does not expire until 5th December it is suggested that the resolution, if members were minded to grant planning permission could be to “grant planning permission subject to no new issues being raised as part of the consultation process.”

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Responses received to 2nd consultation (development without the basement)

Additional Individual letters:

2 further letters of Objection received from 8 and 10 Wavendon Road:

Both neighbours wish to reiterate the opposition to the development, with the basement removed, on the grounds of overdevelopment, and matters raised during the original consultation.

1 letter received from the Incumbent Rector of St Mary The Virgin, Salford:

Stated concern for the “continually changing application” and the difficulty in understanding the development.

Expressed concern that the dwelling would constitute overdevelopment of the plot and wish to support comments made by English Heritage.

Concern raised at use of area adjacent to the application site (blue line), the concern is that this area will also be built on/used for garden.

English Heritage

Responded to the revised consultation stating that they had “no further comments”.

Additional Comments

Response to Rectors Concerns:

The Rectory of St Marys Church expressed concern at the use of the land adjacent to the application site. It is considered that this is not garden land, and does not form part of this application. Should the applicant wish to use this area of ground for “a garden” then a further planning application would be required to change the use. It is outside the application site, and therefore is not being considered as part of this development.

Additional/Amended Conditions

No additional or amended conditions.

Item 8 (Pages 53-72) – CB/14/03075/FULL – Land at The Gateway (former BTR site) London Road, Dunstable, Beds LU6 3DX

Corrections to report:

1. Site Location, paragraph 3. Page 56.

Replace with:

“The site is located within an area predominantly made up of residential properties. The northern area of the former BTR site is currently being developed for 64 dwellings. To the west is a residential area which includes a recently constructed apartment building (Brockwell Place), which reaches **three** storeys in height. To the east of the site lies a recently constructed hotel (Holiday Inn), which reaches approximately **four** storeys in height.”

2. Section 3, paragraph 5. Page 66.

Remove “seven” and replace with “four”

Additional consultation responses:

1. Dunstable Town Council.

Dunstable Town Council has responded to the revised design of the Care Home, simply stating “no objection”.

2. Environment Agency.

“The Environment Agency have identified that they consider that that surface water can be managed appropriately. They have stated that planning permission could be granted, subject to conditions. These conditions would relate to the agreement of a surface water drainage scheme, completion of the works identified in the remediation strategy and regarding the consideration of contamination risks.”

3. Neighbours.

An additional response has been received from No.10 Brockwell Place, who previously commented on the application. This response has raised no further material considerations.

Amended and Additional conditions:

As a result of the late comments received from the Environment Agency and a further response from Highways the following conditions are recommended:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 **No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces, including the external brick walls, rendered walls and tiled roof, of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To control the appearance of the building in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan and Policy 43 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.

- 3 **No development shall take place until details of wheel-cleaning facilities at all site exits have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development shall take place until the approved facilities have been installed and made operational and the Site Developer shall ensure that these are used by all vehicles exiting the site until the development has been substantially completed or until the roadworks necessary to provide adequate and clean access to and from the public highway have been completed (apart from final surfacing).**

Reason: In the interests of the amenity and to prevent the deposit of mud or other extraneous material on the highway during the construction period in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and Policy 43 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.

- 4 **No development shall commence until details of substantial protective fencing for trees on the north western boundary of the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The fencing shall be erected on a scaffolding framework, constructed with uprights and cross members, being well braced to resist impact, with the vertical poles driven firmly into the ground. The approved fencing shall remain in position for the entire duration of development shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made.**

Reason: To protect the trees so enclosed in accordance with Section 8 of BS 5837 of 2012 or as may be subsequently amended in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and Policies 43 and 59 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.

- 5 **No development shall take place until a landscaping scheme to include all hard and soft landscaping and a scheme for landscape maintenance for a period of five years following the implementation of the landscaping scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing**

by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented by the end of the full planting season immediately following the completion and/or first use of any separate part of the development (a full planting season means the period from October to March). The trees, shrubs and grass shall subsequently be maintained in accordance with the approved landscape maintenance scheme and any which die or are destroyed during this period shall be replaced during the next planting season.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable standard of landscaping in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and Policies 43 and 58 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.

- 6 No development shall take place until details of the method of disposal of foul water drainage has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including any land drainage system. Thereafter no part of the development shall be occupied or brought into use until the approved drainage scheme has been implemented.

Reason: To ensure that adequate foul and surface water drainage is provided and that existing and future land drainage needs are protected in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and Policies 43 and 44 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.

- 7 No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Infiltration systems shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality. The scheme shall be implemented as approved. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

The scheme shall include finalised details of the following:

- Full calculations detailing the existing surface water runoff rates for the QBAR, Q30 and Q100 storm events;
- Full storm event simulation results with appropriate inputs and parameters demonstrating the surface water runoff rates for the QBAR, Q30, Q100 and Q100 plus climate change storm events, of the critical storm season and duration;
- Full results of proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events, inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements, together with an assessment of the system performance;
- Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions, and pipe reference numbers;

- **Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures, including dimensions, design and water levels, gradients and – where a vortex flow control is used – the manufacturer’s design flow curve;**
- **Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance or failure, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants, or to adjacent or downstream sites;**
- **Full details of the maintenance and/or adoption of the system inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements.**

Reason: To ensure that surface water drainage is provided and that existing and future land drainage needs are protected in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and Policies 43 and 44 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.

- 8 Prior to the occupation of the development a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy (ref LC321-85A/NJW dated 12 September 2011) and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.
The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a “long-term monitoring and maintenance plan”) for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan. The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.
Reasons: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and Policy 43 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.
- 9 Prior to the occupation of the development all on site vehicular areas shall be surfaced in a manner to the Local Planning Authority’s approval so as to ensure satisfactory parking of vehicles outside highway limits. Arrangements shall be made for surface water from the site to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge into the highway.
Reason: To avoid the carriage of mud or other extraneous material or surface water from the site so as to safeguard the interest of highway safety and reduce the risk of flooding and to minimise inconvenience to users of the premises and ensure acceptable parking of vehicles outside highway limits in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and Policy 43 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.
- 10 The development shall not be brought into use until details of a turning space for vehicles within the curtilage of the site have been submitted to and

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved turning space has been constructed.

Reason: To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn outside of the highway limits thereby avoiding the reversing of vehicles on to the highway in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and Policy 43 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.

- 11 The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until a scheme for the parking of cycles on the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented before the development is brought into use and thereafter retained for this purpose.

Reason: To ensure the provision of cycle parking to meet the needs of occupiers of the proposed development in the interests of encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and Policy 43 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.

- 12 The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until a scheme for noise attenuation measures has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The noise attenuation measures will ensure that internal noise levels from external road traffic noise sources shall not exceed 35 dB LAeq, 07:00 - 23:00 in any habitable room or 30 dB LAeq 23:00-07:00 and 45 dB LAmax 23:00-07:00 inside any bedroom, and that noise levels from external inside any bedroom, and that noise levels from external inside any bedroom, and that noise levels from external road traffic noise sources shall not exceed 55 dB LAeq, (1hr) in outdoor amenity areas. Any works which form part of the scheme approved by the Local Planning Authority shall be completed and the effectiveness of the scheme shall be demonstrated through validation noise monitoring, with the results reported to the Local Planning Authority in writing, before any permitted dwelling is occupied, unless an alternative period is approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reasons: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents in accordance with Policy BE8 of South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and Policy 43 of the emerging Central Bedfordshire Development Strategy.

- 13 Noise resulting from the use of the plant, machinery or equipment on the site shall not exceed a level of 5 dBA below the existing background level (or 10 dBA below if there is a tonal quality) when measured in accordance with BS 4142:1997, at a point one metre external to the nearest noise sensitive building.

Reason: To ensure that the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers is not prejudiced by excessive noise in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and Policies 43 and 44 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.

- 14 If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reasons: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and Policy 43 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.

- 15 This approval relates only to the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers LU6 3DX-A-01, LU6 3DX-A-02A, LU6 3DX-A-03, LU6 3DX-A-04A and LU6 3DX-A-05A.

Reason: To identify the approved plans and to avoid doubt.

Amended and Additional informatives:

As a result of the late comments received from the Environment Agency the following informatives are recommended:

- 1 Please note that the unnumbered drawings submitted in connection with this application have been given unique numbers by the Local Planning Authority. The numbers can be sourced by examining the plans on the View a Planning Application pages of the Council's website www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk.
- 2 The Environment Agency have no objection to the use of soakaways on this site following our review of a site investigation report in October 2012 in relation to planning permission CB/09/06991.
- 3 Condition 13d of CB/09/06991/OUT (contamination verification report) has not been discharged and is therefore relevant to this application and will need to be discharged following completion of the development.
- 4 Contamination can still be missed by an investigation and this condition gives the Local Planning Authority the ability to require a new, or amendments to an existing, remediation strategy to address any previously unexpected contamination