

## **Committee Report**

**Item No:** 7C

**Reference:** DC/21/05468

**Case Officer:** Bron Curtis

**Ward:** Bramford.

**Ward Member/s:** Cllr James Caston.

---

## **RECOMMENDATION – GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS**

---

### **Description of Development**

Full Planning Application - Construction and operation of a 100MW Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), and related infrastructure with associated access, landscaping and drainage.

### **Location**

Land To The South Of, Bullen Lane, Bramford, Suffolk IP8 4JD

**Expiry Date:** 13/05/2022

**Application Type:** FUL - Full Planning Application

**Development Type:** Major Small Scale - All Other

**Applicant:** Bramford Power Ltd

**Agent:** Mr Andy Moffat

**Parish:** Bramford

**Site Area:** 1.44ha

**Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit:** None

**Has a Committee Call In request been received from a Council Member (Appendix 1):** No

**Has the application been subject to Pre-Application Advice:** Yes. EIA Screening Reference DC/21/06376 – Not EIA

---

## **PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

---

The application is referred to committee for the following reason/s:

In accordance with the Mid Suffolk scheme of delegation as the proposal is for a renewable energy development as defined by government guidance.

---

## **PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY**

---

### **Summary of Policies**

GP01 - Design and layout of development

---

CLASSIFICATION: Official

T10 - Highway Considerations in Development  
CL02 - Development within special landscape areas  
HB14 - Ensuring archaeological remains are not destroyed  
H16 - Protecting existing residential amenity  
CS02 - Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages  
CS03 - Reduce Contributions to Climate Change

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPG-National Planning Policy Guidance

Other relevant documents:

- National Policy Statements: The policy context for the determination of NSIP scale proposals. This development is below the threshold for consideration as an NSIP but EN-1 and the revised draft EN-3 provide helpful context and an indication of the government's direction of travel in respect of renewable energy development.
- Energy Security Strategy 2022: Reinforces the net zero agenda and sets out a package of priorities, funding and policy objectives to move the country back to energy independence. This includes provision for onshore wind, solar and other technology including recognition of the need for network capacity and flexibility such as battery storage.
- Net Zero strategy 2021: A decarbonisation plan setting out the UK objective of achieving net-zero emissions by 2050. Part of the plan for "Building Back Better" after the covid pandemic.
- Energy white paper 2020: Builds on the Ten point plan for a green industrial revolution, addressing the transformation of our energy system, promoting high-skilled jobs and clean, resilient economic growth as we deliver net-zero emissions by 2050.
- United Kingdom Food Security Report 2021: Sets out an analysis of statistical data relating to food security.

### **Neighbourhood Plan Status**

This application site is not within a Neighbourhood Plan Area.

### **Consultations and Representations**

During the course of the application Consultation and Representations from third parties have been received. These are summarised below:

#### **A: Summary of Consultations**

#### **Town/Parish Council(s) (Appendix 3)**

Bramford Parish Council: Object

- Insufficient information on chemistry, fire risk and associated air and groundwater pollution.
- Refer to comments from CARE Suffolk campaign group

- Hazardous materials have not been declared. The application must be considered against the Hazardous Substances Regs.
- Loss of BMV.
- Traffic concerns
- Noise concerns

Burstall Parish Council: Object

- Cumulative impact must be considered
- BESS are not generators
- More appropriate options are available
- Loss of BMV
- Noise is unaccounted for
- Traffic must go via the Claydon interchange.
- Ecology concerns
- Not carbon friendly
- What happens if the site stops operating? Can the council secure removal of the development?
- Effects on population and human health
- Safety concerns

**National Consultees (Appendix 4)**

Natural England: No objection

Woodland Trust: Comments

- Concern regarding impact on Bullen Wood
- Woodland must be buffered by at least 15m
- It is not clear if the woodland would be buffered from any development
- Request clarification of buffer
- Permission should not be granted until the appropriate buffer is demonstrated.

**County Council Responses (Appendix 5)**

Archaeology: Comments

- Site lies within an area of archaeological potential.
- No ground for refusal.
- Conditions recommended

Active Travel Officer: No comments

Fire and Rescue: *Additional comments on further information submitted:*

- Subject to engagement with the fire service to develop an emergency response plan, the measures proposed meet expectations to enable the fire service to respond to an incident.

Flood and water:

*Additional comments on further information submitted:*

- Recommend approval subject to conditions

Highways: Comments

- Conditions to secure access works, visibility splays, surface materials and HGV deliveries management plan.
- Construction management plan recommended.

Minerals and Waste: No comments

Rights of Way: Comments

- Accept proposal
- Identify typographical errors in submission documents
- General advice regarding development and rights of way

### **Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 6)**

Arboricultural officer: Comments

- No objection subject to being carried out in accordance with arboricultural report

Ecology:

*Further comments on additional information:*

- *Sufficient information to determine*
- *No objection subject to mitigation*

Environmental health – Land contamination: No objection

Environmental health – Air quality: No objection

Environmental health – Noise / Odour / Light: No objection, conditions recommended

Environmental health – Sustainability: No conditions recommended

Landscape:

*Additional comments on further information submitted:*

- Satisfied the baseline is accurate and the scheme and mitigation have been considered.
- There would be noticeable change to the character of the landscape.
- Proposed mitigation will sufficiently screen the development such that residual effects will be localised.
- No objection.
- Conditions recommended.

Public realm: No comment

### **B: Representations**

At the time of writing this report at least 24 letters/emails/online comments have been received, including additional or reiterated comments received during re-consultation. It is the officer opinion that this represents 22 objections, 0 support and 0 general comment. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Comments are summarised below:-

- Concern regarding safety, especially fire risk and associated potential pollution of air and groundwaters as well as adequacy of submitted information Non safety.
- Cumulative impact with other development
- Landscape and visual impact
- Noise impact especially in cumulation with other development

- Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land
- Impact on amenity of rights of way users
- Impacts on wildlife
- Should be EIA due to likely significant effects
- Traffic impact of construction vehicles on rural road network and suitability of access and turning
- Brownfield sites should be considered in preference to greenfield
- There is already sufficient capacity in the grid
- Not green or carbon friendly
- Impacts on health and wellbeing
- No justification - the substation that was built in the 1960's without battery storage
- Food security concerns
- Does not meet the needs of the community
- Risk of anti-social behaviour
- Contrary to local plan
- Failure to consider alternative sites
- Archaeology impact
- No evidence of grid connection agreement

(Note: All individual representations are counted and considered. Repeated and/or additional communication from a single individual will be counted as one representation.)

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

<b>REF:</b> DC/21/06376	Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion Request for Construction and operation of a 100MW Battery Energy Storage System, and related infrastructure with associated access, landscaping and drainage. (DC/21/05468)	<b>DECISION:</b> EAN 15.12.2021
-------------------------	---	------------------------------------

### **Other decisions relevant to the consideration of this application include:**

<b>REF:</b> DC/19/03008	Full Planning Application - Installation and operation of a 49.9 MW Battery Storage Facility, with associated infrastructure including inverters, transformers, switchgear, spares container, fencing, CCTV Cameras and access road.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 23.09.2019
-------------------------	--	------------------------------------

<b>REF:</b> DC/21/06919	Application for a Non Material Amendment relating to DC/19/03008 - Amend description of development to remove reference to the mega watt output of the battery.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 26.01.2022
-------------------------	---	------------------------------------

<b>REF:</b> DC/21/00060 and DC/20/05895	ENSO solar farm	<b>DECISION:</b> PCO
---	-----------------	----------------------

<b>REF:</b> DC/22/00683 and DC/22/01243	Greybarn solar farm	<b>DECISION:</b> PCO
---	---------------------	----------------------

<b>REF:</b> DC/19/01601	Anesco BESS	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD
-------------------------	-------------	----------------------

REF: DC/21/04711

EDF solar farm

DECISION: PCO

REF: DC/19/00046

Gas powered standby electricity generation facility

DECISION: GTD

**\*This list includes some of the key developments within the immediate vicinity of the site that are relevant material considerations in the assessment of the application. It is not exhaustive insofar as considerations of cumulative impacts.**

## **PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION**

---

### **1. The Site and Surroundings**

- 1.1. The application site is an area of Grade 2 classified agricultural land, forming part of a larger arable parcel, located adjacent to the Bullen Lane. The site is in the countryside close to the village of Bramford and is in flood zone 1.
- 1.2. To the north the site is adjoined by the Bullen Lane highway (and bridleway). To the south lies a small stand of woodland known as Bullen Wood, a County Wildlife Site, and further agricultural land. To the west lies a further area of agricultural land which occupies the space between the application site and the National Grid substation and which benefits from planning permission DC/19/03008 for a 49.9MW BESS that has yet to be commenced. To the east the site is bordered by agricultural land and a small compound containing a telecoms mast and associated buildings.
- 1.3. There is a mature hedge along the boundary of the site with Bullen Lane which screens public views. The local public rights of way network crosses the agricultural land in close proximity to the site from which there are open views across the site.

### **2. The Proposal**

2.1. The application seeks a temporary (40 year) permission, to reflect the expected lifetime of the equipment to be installed, for the proposed development of a battery energy storage system (BESS), after which the site would be reinstated and returned to the existing agricultural use. The development comprises the following elements:

- 28 battery racks / skids
- 13 inverter units and transformers
- Switchgear and control room building
- Storage room building
- Switchroom and metering cabinet
- Access from Bullen Lane
- 2.4-2.5m metal boundary fencing and access gates
- Drainage scheme including attenuation basin
- Landscaping

The proposed batteries would use Lithium-ion. In raising concerns about the safety of battery storage Bramford Parish Council and some members of the community state that the application should be considered against the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015. It should be noted that neither Cadmium or Lithium are listed as named hazardous substances and the planning process and decision making should not duplicate the function of other regulatory bodies. Safety is a material consideration in the assessment of this application discussed below.

### **3. The Principle Of Development**

3.1. BESS installations enable energy generated from renewable sources, like solar and wind, to be stored outside of the national and local transmission and distribution network and then released onto the grid when customers need power most, ensuring a continual supply of energy outside the constraints of the intermittent nature of solar and wind generation. BESS are an integral part of the transition to net zero and ensuring security of supply.

3.2. In response to Burstall PC's comments that BESS is not energy generation development: The government's position is that battery storage is a necessary and associated element of increased renewable energy generation. Battery storage allows renewable energy to be used when the sun is not shining or the wind is not blowing. In this sense, if solar panels and wind turbines are considered primary generation, battery storage facilities can be considered secondary generation.

3.3. In considering this planning application, section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan comprises the saved policies of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan and Core Strategy. These policies and documents will be replaced by the emerging Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan once it is adopted. The JLP is therefore also a material consideration, albeit of limited weight.

3.4. The NPPF must also be taken into account as a material consideration in planning decisions. The NPPF provides the framework against which LPAs draw up Local Plans and determine planning applications. It encourages LPAs to promote renewable energy development and identify appropriate sites for it. It says that - in meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change - the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future. It goes on to identify ways in which Local Plans should help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat.

3.5 At the time of writing there are no national or local policies that specifically deal with BESS development. This proposal is therefore considered against the general principles of renewable energy policy as BESS is considered to be infrastructure associated with renewable energy, and those policies that deal with individual impact topics.

3.6 Policies CS1 and CS2 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy 2008 set out the types of development that are likely to be considered appropriate inside defined settlements (CS1) and within the countryside comprising the rest of the district (CS2) These policies state development within the countryside, as in the case of this site, is restricted to certain types of development, including for renewable energy.

### **4. Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land**

4.1 The application site is Grade 2 classified agricultural land and is therefore considered to be Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land for the purposes of planning policy.

4.2 Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states that “...*decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:*

- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);*
- b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland...”*

4.3 Policy CL11 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan states that the council “...*will encourage the conservation of agricultural land. Particular protection will be afforded to the best and most versatile agricultural land...”*

4.4 There are a number of factors specific to this application to consider in the assessment of impact on BMV land. The application seeks permission for a limited period of 40 years after which the site will be reinstated and returned to agricultural use, this reinstatement can be secured by condition. The area of land, at 1.44ha is relatively small as a parcel of agricultural land and the functional operation of the site is constrained to a degree by its position between the road, Bullen Wood and adjacent permitted development.

4.5 Should Members be minded to grant permission for this development there would be a temporary loss of BMV. However, the loss would be time limited, reversible and would affect a relatively small area of land without unduly hindering the ongoing agricultural use and operation of the surrounding land.

4.6 Overall, therefore, the impact on BMV is not considered to be such as to warrant refusal of this application.

## **5. Traffic and highway safety**

5.1 The proposed development includes the construction of a new shared access serving the site and the adjacent permitted BESS development from Bullen Lane, leading to hard surfaced access ways and areas for the parking and turning of vehicles.

5.2 It is proposed that construction traffic will access the site from Bullen Lane travelling south along the B1113 from the A14 Claydon interchange. The construction period is anticipated to be 9 months during which between 5 to 15 vehicle movements a day are expected.

5.3 Once construction is completed the facility would be unmanned and would be operated and monitored remotely. Maintenance visits 1-2 times a month by small van are expected.

5.4 The SCC highways officer has raised no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions to secure the access works and a construction management plan.

5.5 On the basis of the comments from SCC highways, subject to the conditions recommended below there is not considered to be any unacceptable traffic highway safety impacts that would warrant refusal of the application.

## **6. Landscape and visual impact**

6.1 The application site lies in the countryside, in a relatively isolated location. The visual context of the area comprises a unique mix of enclosed agricultural land within a gently undulating landscape, some interspersed commercial and domestic buildings and a significant visual background of existing and



permitted energy infrastructure development such as the adjacent permitted BESS, the National Grid substation, the EA1 and EA3 compounds and a number of overhead lines. However, there are immediate public views across the site available from Bullen Lane and the rights of way network.

6.2 The proposed development includes the reinforcement of existing planted screening and the provision of additional landscaping to mitigate the visual impact of the development.

6.3 The application documents include an LVIA and other information to demonstrate the impacts and effect of the proposed mitigation.

6.4 The MSDC Landscape officer advises that, whilst there will be a noticeable change in the character of the landscape as a result of the development, the submitted information is considered to be sufficient to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures such that residual impacts would be localised and, as such, there is no objection to the proposal on landscape and visual impact grounds.

6.5 The application seeks a time limited permission for 40 year, after which the development will be removed and the site reinstated to agricultural use. Conditions are recommended to agree an appropriate reinstatement scheme, retaining the plated buffer to the county wildlife site and highway boundary planting as appropriate.

6.6 The proposed mitigation planting can be secured by condition as recommended below. As such, and on the basis of the advice from the landscape officer, there is not considered to be any unacceptable landscape or visual impact arising from the development such as would warrant refusal of the application.

## **7. Ecology**

7.1 The application site is an area of agricultural land, currently with arable crop, located adjacent to the Bullen Wood county wildlife site. There are records of protected flora and fauna species in the surrounding area such that the proposed development has the potential to have an impact on ecology unless appropriate designed and mitigated.

7.2 Following initial concerns raised by your ecology adviser the layout of the proposal has been amended and further information has been provided.

7.3 The amended scheme provides an enlarged non-arable buffer to the woodland together with proposed landscaping that will increase the planted habitat along the boundary with the woodland, offering enhanced protection from the arable use and the construction and operation of the development. Further information and assessment have been submitted, together with a statement of further activities and mitigation to be carried out should planning permission be granted. This includes reasonable biodiversity net gain in accordance with the requirement of the NPPF.

7.4 Your ecology adviser is satisfied that the details provided are sufficient to enable the authority to determine the application and to discharge the statutory duty in respect of protected species. They have also confirmed that the proposed mitigation measures are acceptable.

7.5 Conditions are recommended to secure the details of the ecological assessment, further survey for Dormouse, wildlife sensitive lighting and management plans, as recommended below.

7.6 It is also relevant to note that as the proposal is for a time limited permission of 40 years, officers recommend conditions to ensure the removal of the development and reinstatement of the site to agricultural use. This reinstatement scheme will require a further assessment of biodiversity and the

retention of the planted buffer with Bullen Wood as well as other planted landscaping as may be appropriate.

7.7 On the basis of the consultee advice received and subject to the conditions recommended below the proposal is not considered to have unacceptable impacts on ecology that warrant refusal of the application.

## **8. Flood Risk and Drainage**

8.1 The application site lies in flood zone 1 and there is no record of surface water incidents.

8.2 The proposed development will replace some of the undeveloped agricultural land with areas of hard surfacing for the access, roadways and siting of battery equipment, etc. This will affect the drainage capacity of the site and so the proposal includes the construction of a SuDS attenuation basin.

8.3 The SCC Floods officer advises that the proposal is acceptable subject to condition. On the basis of this advice there are not considered to be any unacceptable flood risk or drainage impacts that warrant refusal of this application.

## **9. Noise and residential amenity**

9.1 The site is relatively isolated from residential properties, the nearest being Bullen Hall Farm, approximately 460m to the north. There are dispersed dwellings on Bullen Lane and within the wider surrounding area with the main built settlements of Bramford located approximately 1.8km to the east and Burstall approximately 1.3km to the west.

9.2 The site is sufficiently distanced from residential properties such that there will not be any impact on privacy, overshadowing or overlooking arising from the development.

9.3 There will be increased traffic movements along Bullen Lane during the period of construction, however, once the development is operational it will be unmanned so there will minimal disturbance impact from vehicle movements, all of which will be on the public highway.

9.4 The proposed development includes electrical / mechanical equipment that will produce noise when operational which has the potential to be heard at nearby residential properties, affecting the level of amenity enjoyed by occupants. The application documents include a noise assessment which concludes that the daytime operation of the development would be within the level of the existing background noise and whilst there is a minor exceedance of night time background level experienced outside the nearest dwelling, when adjusted for indoor noise level with a partially open window the noise impact is acceptable.

9.5 Concerns have been raised regarding the cumulative impact of noise having regard to the cumulative impact of other developments in the locality. Officers requested that cumulative noise impacts be considered in order to take account of operational facilities nearby, including the National Grid and EA1 substations and permitted but as yet unbuilt developments including the adjacent BESS and the EA3 converter station. The application has submitted a cumulative noise assessment addendum document which confirm that when considering the predicted noise level of the proposed development with the cumulative noise level from the other schemes in the area, the overall noise level of 37dB LA,r indicates that the proposed development would not increase the cumulative noise level experienced at Bullen Hall Farm. The report goes on to explain that main contribution to the predicted noise levels at Bullen Hall Farm would come from the EA3 and Greybarn schemes.

9.6 Your environmental protection officer has considered the information submitted and has not offered any further comments on the information provided other than to recommend a condition to require noise measurements to be undertaken and submitted for approval.

9.7 On the basis of the information submitted and the comments of your environmental protection officer it is concluded that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable impact in respect of noise and residential amenity such as would warrant refusal of the application.

## **10. Health and safety including fire risk**

10.1 Battery storage installations are usually unmanned and operated remotely as is the case with the proposed development. This feature of operation together with reports of fire incidents at BESS sites in the UK and elsewhere has resulted in an understandable concern for this relatively new technology. Concerns raised include risk of fire and potential air and groundwater pollution associated with such an incident.

10.2 BESS are a relatively new technology and developments for such installations have only been dealt with fairly recently. As such, although there is ongoing discussion and comment at government level, there is limited specific policy relating to BESS development proposals. Therefore, in assessing the health and safety impacts of the proposal it is considered appropriate to follow the precedent of decision making on similar recent applications by other local authorities and the Secretary of State. As such it is necessary to consider whether there is sufficient information provided to demonstrate that risks associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of the development proposal can be appropriately and safely managed and mitigated.

10.3 It should be noted that the equipment must be installed in accordance with existing electrical installation regulations and standards.

10.4 The applicant has submitted a fire safety statement which explains that their choice of equipment has been driven in part by its safety features.

10.5 The battery cabinets are designed with a 1 hour wall, thereby capable of containing any fire without breach for 1 hour. The equipment is fitted with both heat and smoke sensors to enable fire detection and initiate shut down and fire suppression systems.

10.6 Officers have sought advice from the SCC Fire service who would be respond to any incident of fire at the site. They advise that they are satisfied with the information submitted provided the developer works with the fire service to prepare a risk reduction strategy to include the prevention of pollution to ground water and air.

10.7 On the basis of this advice and subject to a condition to secure a risk reduction strategy there is not considered to be any health and safety impact that warrants refusal of the application.

## **11. Heritage Issues**

11.1 There are no heritage assets within the site itself and the site does not lie within a designated area.

11.2 SCC Archaeology advise that the site lies within an area of archaeological potential and recommend conditions to secure appropriate investigation and recording of below ground assets.

11.3 The nearest designated asset is Grade II listed Bullen Hall Farmhouse approximately 460m to the north. Having regard to the distance between the site and the listed building and the presence of

intermediate vegetation and modern buildings the development is not considered to have any impact on the setting or significance of this building.

11.4 Subject to the conditions as recommended by the SCC Archaeology officer the proposed development is not considered to have any unacceptable impact in respect of heritage issues.

## **12. Other matters**

12.1 Other matters raised in comments received from the local community are responded to as follows:

12.2 The proposal should be EIA development: Officers have screened the development in accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017 and the associated government guidance and have determined that the development is not EIA. It should be made clear that the EIA status of the development proposed makes no difference to the assessment of all material planning considerations in the determination of the application.

12.3 Officers can confirm that the applicant has provided evidence of a grid connection agreement.

12.4 The site may incur permitted development rights as statutory undertaker and could undertake further development.

12.5 Officers can confirm that Bramford Power Ltd, as operator of the site, is not a statutory undertaker and therefore they do not have any permitted development rights. It is also considered unlikely that National Grid would acquire the site such as to confer their permitted development rights onto the site due to the necessary separation of National Grid's various operations in accordance with competition rules, etc.

## **13. Parish Council Comments**

The matters raised by the Parish Councils have been addressed in the above report.

---

## **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION**

---

### **14. Planning Balance and Conclusion**

14.1. The proposed development will contribute to the wider objectives of enabling a move to more renewable energy generation and more consistent supply of power to the grid, a key element of the government's net zero, decarbonisation agenda.

14.2 The installation is proposed for a limited period, thereby reducing the 'loss' on agricultural land and the permanence of other impacts.

14.3 There are not considered to be any unacceptable landscape, flood risk or drainage, ecology, heritage or residential amenity impacts that cannot be adequately mitigated such as would warrant refusal of the application.

14.4 A number of concerns have been raised regarding the health and safety of the proposal which has been explored at length with colleagues at the Suffolk County Council fire service. Based on their advice, the proposal is not considered to pose an unacceptable risk to health and safety.

14.5 The impacts of the development are either not unacceptable or can be mitigated to make them acceptable. The renewable energy and energy security benefits of the proposal are considered to weigh in favour of the proposal and, on balance, having regard to the assessment set out above, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:**

- Standard time limit
- Temp PP 40 years plus removal and reinstatement if operation ceases for a period of 6 months or at the end of the 40 year life. Reinstatement scheme to be agreed including biodiversity review, mitigation and details of retained landscape planting
- Approved Plans (Plans submitted that form this application)
- Access improvement works
- Access surface material details
- Archaeology
- Carry out in accordance with arboricultural report
- Carry out in accordance with ecological assessment
- CEMP
- Construction management plan including deliveries, vehicle routing and working hours
- Dormouse survey
- Fire safety strategy
- Landscape planting and management scheme
- LEMP
- No burning of waste on site
- Noise assessment
- Visibility splays
- Wildlife sensitive lighting scheme to incorporate light pollution prevention design
- Carry out in accordance with surface water drainage strategy
- Submission of surface water drainage verification report

**And the following informative notes as summarised and those as may be deemed necessary:**

- Pro active working statement
- SCC Highways notes