

Delegated Report

Planning Ref: 23/00826/FUL
Applicant: Mr Simpson
Ward: Twycross Sheepy & Witherley



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Site: Countrywide Store, Watling Street Nr. Caldecote

Proposal: Extension of existing storage building

1. Recommendations

1.1. Grant planning permission subject to:

- Planning conditions outlined at the end of this report.

2. Planning Application Description

- 2.1. This application seeks full planning permission for the extension of an existing commercial building for storage (Use Class B8).
- 2.2. The extension would be sited to the rear of the existing building, and would occupy a larger footprint, height, and overall scale and massing than the existing building. The proposed dimensions are 36 metres in width x 36 metres in depth, with an eaves height of 6.65m and a ridge height of 8.54m, with a low pitched asymmetric roof design. Proposed external materials is a box profile with composite steel sheets to the walls and roof (Goosewing Grey finish).
- 2.3. The proposed building would provide approximately 1,300 square metres of storage floor space, including a mezzanine floor with additional space. Access to the building would be via a large roller shutter door and one pedestrian door.
- 2.4. The proposal includes the retention of external storage areas and on-site parking and manoeuvring for 13 vehicles. The existing access points would remain the same, with an in-only access from the southbound carriageway of the A5 Watling Street Trunk Road, and from Atherstone Road.
- 2.5. Amended plans and application details have been submitted during the course of the application and re-consultation has been undertaken.

3. Description of the Site and Surrounding Area

- 3.1. The application site measures approximately 0.23 hectares and is located in the countryside on the north side of the A5 Watling Street at its junction with A444.
- 3.2. The existing warehouse building is a rectangular structure constructed with grey metal profiled sheeting and a low brick plinth. It has a low pitched roof with an eaves height of approximately 5.5 metres and a ridge height of approximately 6.5 metres.
- 3.3. To the west there are open agricultural fields and to the north a detached two storey residential dwelling set within an extensive plot with agricultural fields beyond. To the east of the site there is a public house with agricultural fields beyond.
- 3.4. There are two accesses to the site, one directly from the south bound carriageway of the A5 Watling Street and one from the A444 Atherstone Road to the east.

4. Relevant Planning History

94/00454/FUL	Extension and alterations to farm sundries, storage and sales building	Refused	28.09.1994
95/00285/FUL	Extension and alterations to farm sundries storage and sales building	Refused	28.06.1995
96/00277/FUL	Extensions and alterations erection of screen fencing creation of storage compound and closure of existing access	Permitted	28.06.1996
96/00815/CONDIT	Variation of condition 10 of application 96/00277/FUL (retain A5 access)	Permitted	03.12.1996
99/00624/FUL	Demolition of dwelling, extension to existing depot and compound area	Permitted	19.07.2000
19/00447/FUL	Demolition of existing building and erection of replacement commercial building (Use Classes A1 retail and B8 storage)	Permitted	06.09.2019
21/00676/HOU	(Neighbouring Dwelling) Two storey front extension, two storey rear extension, two storey side extension, front door relocated, replacement of existing roof and raising overall building height. Building to be clad in render, brick and slate. Addition of triple garage	Permitted	12.08.2021

5. Publicity

- 5.1. The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents. A site notice was also posted within the vicinity of the site.
- 5.2. One objection to the proposal have been received from a neighbouring property raising the following issues and concerns:-
 - *National Highways' formal response to this application recommends that planning permission is not given for a specified period of time while its Annex A concerns about direct access from A5 and other issues are addressed or clarified. Conflicts with HBBC planning policies DM17 points (d) + (e).*
 - *Often there is a queue into the facility and this raises serious traffic concerns.*
 - *There have been several personal injury vehicle incidents specifically outside or next to the proposed entry-exit points.*
 - *The facility currently opens 24/7 and should be time limited as next door to a domestic property.*
 - *Size of the building: according to plans the total site would be 3 times the current one with maximum vertical height being proposed as 8.54m = 28ft vertical height. This would seem disproportionately dominant in size to the immediately adjacent residential dwelling (Red Gate House) and the Red Gate with only the narrowed A444 between the properties. Conflicts with HBBC planning policies DM4(b) and DM10 (a); (c); (e) and (f)*

- *The applicant wants to put in a 7m hedge between the site and their domestic neighbours which is in breach of the Anti-social Behaviour Act 2003 and the High Hedges (Appeals) (England) Regulations 2005*
- *Max height and ridges of facility: 8.54m = 28ft vertical height (two giraffes) and is disproportionate in size to immediately adjacent residential dwelling (Red Gate House) and the Red Gate.*
- *Bat box and swift box for biodiversity - raises issues of limited lighting on side facing A5 (Bat Conservation Trust), possibly affecting safety of access/egress on to a major arterial route despite being able to insert such conditions into any planning permission. Conflicts with HBBC planning policies DM7c, Notes 13.51 to 13.54 and DM7(F).*
- *There is little economic benefit as the application states 4 extra jobs – however this is unlikely as the facility is fully automated and therefore there will be no extra jobs generated. Conflicts with HBBC planning policies DM4, DM18 and DM20.*
- *Ecology – application is classed as in the countryside and therefore conflicts with HBBC planning policies DM4 – countryside.*
- *Overdevelopment of the site.*

6. Consultation

6.1. No objection has been received from:-

Environmental Health (Drainage) – No comment
HBBC Waste

6.2. No objection subject to conditions has been received from:-

Leicestershire County Council (Highways)
National Highways
LCC Ecology
Environmental Health (Pollution)

6.3. Witherley Parish Council – Neutral:

1. **National Highways formal response** [DOC 1]: *recommends that planning permission is not given for a specified period of time. Annex A – access from A5 practical difficulties, even with low numbers of vehicles as indicated in additional traffic assessments. Other reasons are also given.*
2. **3/7 Personal Injury vehicle incidents** - *slight (LCC [DOC 4]) are specifically outside or immediately adjacent to the proposed A5 access-egress point. IMPORTANT because LCC defers to NH formal response ie planning permission withheld for specified period.*
3. **Size of the building as proposed is major concern:**
 - (1) *According to plans [DOC 2], the 'extension' = 2x original building according to length and width measurements. It is effectively new build with the original building being an appendage to the proposed construction. Specifically, 1370m² versus 710m². Thus the total site would be 3x the current one.*
 - (2) *Max height and ridges: 8.54m = 28ft vertical height (two giraffes) and is disproportionate in size to immediately adjacent residential dwelling (Red Gate House) and the Red Gate. Only the narrowed A444 without pavements comes between the properties.*
 - (3) *Visual impact: T42 and T44 footpaths nearest are acknowledged as suffering visual impact. However the planning application claims that no other visual impacts are significant. I question this – a 28ft structure will stick out like a sore thumb for views over the sloping land from the public foot path Church Lane FD to Kennel Lane*

4. **Ecological report [DOC 3]:** Biodiversity site <1 Ha so the application does not have to meet formal biodiversity imposed criteria until 24 April 2024. However:
 - (1) proposed natural species on side facing A5 [Amended plan DOC 5] – feasibility to be ascertained since rootballs may be damaged by pressures of frequently passing vehicles up to 44 tonnes and NH itself questions the application regarding suitability of vegetation lining the A5 here.
 - (2) bat box and swift box for biodiversity raise issues of limited lighting on side facing A5 (Bat Conservation Trust), possibly affecting safety of access/egress on a major arterial route despite being able to insert such conditions into any planning permission
 - (3) NH recommendation (para 1) may go beyond April 24 so amendments would then be needed to meet biodiversity requirements.
5. **Frequency of trip generation [LCC DOC 4, citing applicant evidence]:** Mon 17 – Sun 30 April 2023. Note:
 - (1) Period immediately after school holidays – significance for figures as per lower activity?
 - (2) Is more complete data for a much longer period of operation available from any premises access records, noting that entry is by key code?
6. **Economics:** a triple size structure creates only 4 additional jobs. This seems to be a disproportionately low figure if arguing direct economic benefit. Regarding indirect economic benefit, the planning application asserts that many local jobs are dependent upon Extra Storage. However, the activities described in the application are straightforward storage and withdrawal, typical of businesses using any of the various storage companies also conveniently located close to the A5 and other arterial routes. These businesses may choose to use Extra Storage but they are not dependent for their very existence on this one particular company and this specific location.
7. **QUERY:** There does not seem to be established demand in the application for tripling the size of the building when considering the number of current customers using the facility according to the applicant's own traffic analysis? Noting the low numbers of vehicle movements cited and the description by the applicant of client transport as 'cars and light vans' ie very modest physical volumes for storage, is such an immense proposed structure justified?
8. **QUERY** re Planning application [DOC 9]: materials and design clearly specified but explicit documented confirmation that the materials comply with all low carbon requirements of NPPF (paras 104 and 110) is not obvious?
9. **QUERY** re 7m high hedging on the north side – will this reduce the direct light during afternoons entering the windows on the east side of Red Gate House?

7. Policy

- 7.1. Core Strategy (2009)
 - No relevant policies
- 7.2. Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (SADMP) DPD (2016)
 - Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 - Policy DM4: Safeguarding the Countryside and Settlement Separation
 - Policy DM7: Preventing Pollution and Flooding
 - Policy DM10: Development and Design
 - Policy DM17: Highways and Transportation
 - Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards
 - Policy DM20: Provision of Employment Sites
- 7.3. National Planning Policies and Guidance
 - National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023)
 - Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

8. Appraisal

8.1. Key Issues

- Assessment against strategic planning policies
- Design and impact upon the character of the surrounding countryside
- Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity
- Impact upon highway safety
- Surface water drainage

Assessment against strategic planning policies

- 8.2. Paragraph 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023) states that planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise and that the NPPF is a material consideration in determining applications.
- 8.3. The development plan in this instance consists of the adopted Core Strategy (2009) and the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (SADMP) Development Plan Document (2016).
- 8.4. By virtue of the location of the site in the countryside and the nature of the development proposed, there are no policies within the adopted Core Strategy that are directly relevant to the proposal.
- 8.5. Policy DM4 of the adopted SADMP states that to protect its intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character, the countryside will first and foremost be safeguarded from unsustainable development. The policy goes on to list a number of categories of development that would be considered sustainable in the countryside. These include proposals for the change of use, re-use or extension of existing buildings which lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting and proposals that contribute significantly to economic growth, job creation and/or diversification of rural businesses, and where, amongst other matters, the proposal does not have a significant adverse effect on the open character or appearance of the surrounding landscape/countryside.
- 8.6. The NPPF in paragraph 88 states that planning decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through the conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings and the retention and development of accessible local services such as shops. Paragraph 89 recognises that in rural areas sites may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements and in locations not well served by public transport. In such circumstances development should be sensitive to its surroundings and should not adversely affect local roads. The use of previously developed land is encouraged.
- 8.7. The application site is a previously developed brownfield site that is currently operating with storage and retail uses, and Policies DM4 and DM20 of the adopted SADMP and the NPPF generally support the extension of existing rural buildings and the provision of employment sites on previously developed land. The proposal is for the extension of the existing building which would further expand and diversify an existing rural self-storage business with associated job creation. Both the use of previously developed land and the expansion and diversification of rural businesses are supported by the NPPF.
- 8.8. By virtue of the scale and existing use of the site, the proposal is considered to have limited conflict with adopted strategic planning policies and the overarching principles of the NPPF (2023).

Design and impact upon the character of the surrounding countryside

- 8.9. Policy DM4 of the adopted SADMP requires that development in the countryside does not have a significant adverse effect on the open character or appearance of the surrounding landscape. Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP seeks to ensure that development complements or enhances the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, mass, design and materials.
- 8.10. The application site lies in the countryside but is not isolated from other development. There is a detached extended dwelling to the north, a public house and car park to the east and the A5 Watling Street and other residential development to the south.
- 8.11. Witherley Parish Council raises concerns in respect of the scale and appearance of the proposed extension, which they consider to be disproportionate to the neighbouring house and pub.
- 8.12. The existing site contains a commercial storage building (19/00447/FUL) which lies adjacent to Red Gate House, set slightly further back from Atherstone Road than the dwelling. The proposed extension would lie to the rear of the existing building. It is acknowledged that the proposed design is both taller and wider than the existing building. However, the siting of the extension to the rear of the dwelling means that it would be less prominent when viewed in the context of Red Gate House and the Red Gate Inn. Additionally, NPPF paragraph 124 (d) states that planning decisions should make effective use of land, promoting the development of under-utilised land which this site is considered to be.
- 8.13. Furthermore, the proposed extension would be constructed to modern building standards and would be fit for the intended self-storage and retail purposes. The proposal would provide a similar overall site layout and the proposed replacement building would occupy a similar overall position and orientation within the site to the existing building, although it would be moved away from the northern boundary with Redgate House by 4 metres.
- 8.14. Following advice from the LPA, the applicant has also implemented boundary planting to screen the proposed development from views via the A5 and from neighbouring Red Gate House, which will help to alleviate the visual impacts from the proposed development.
- 8.15. Additionally, the applicant has submitted a landscape and visual impact assessment which concludes that the proposed development will result in limited impacts at a localised level. The scale and form of the proposed development is likely to result in impacts which are limited to the site area and its immediate context only. In the wider landscape, potential views of the proposals are limited and generally screened by topography, the existing built form and existing vegetation.
- 8.16. Therefore, notwithstanding the proposed increases in width and height when compared to the existing building, along with the concerns of the Parish Council, it is considered that the proposal would not over-dominate the site or result in any significant adverse impact on the character or appearance of the surrounding countryside.
- 8.17. By virtue of the proposed layout, scale, design and appearance, and given the context of the site in close proximity to existing built form, the proposal would not result in any significant adverse impacts on the character or appearance of the surrounding countryside. The proposal would therefore be in general accordance with Policies DM4 and DM10 of the adopted SADMP in terms of design and visual appearance.

Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

- 8.18. Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP requires that development would not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy or amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings.
- 8.19. Objections have been received on the grounds that the proposed building would have an adverse overbearing and overshadowing impact on the neighbouring residential property.
- 8.20. The existing warehouse building abuts the northern boundary of the site with a residential property known as Redgate House. The existing building extends along the boundary for a length of approximately 42 metres and therefore currently results in a degree of overshadowing and visual impact on the adjacent residential property and its garden, as it extends approximately 17m beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling.
- 8.21. The proposed extension would be slightly taller than the existing building and would extend a further 36m to the rear, however the building would be extending further towards the rear of the neighbouring amenity area and would be viewed and experienced in the context of the existing building. Furthermore, the proposed planting would partially screen the extension, softening its visual appearance from the neighbouring property.
- 8.22. Redgate House is subject to an extant planning permission for significant extensions and alterations that are currently being undertaken. The permission includes front, side and rear extensions. The dwelling is to be re-orientated so that the front elevation is facing north, and the rear elevation would face the boundary with the application site. The elevation facing the application site contains a number of small windows which serve a hallway/utility area on the ground floor, and bathrooms on the first floor and will therefore be obscurely glazed. No new openings are proposed on the north elevation facing the boundary with Redgate House.
- 8.23. Notwithstanding the increases in the eaves and ridge heights of the proposed extensions, and the objections received, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any significant or unacceptable additional adverse overbearing or overshadowing impacts on the neighbouring property over and above the existing situation. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP in terms of impacts on residential amenity.

Impact upon highway safety

- 8.24. Policy DM17 of the adopted SADMP supports development that would not have any significant adverse impacts on highway safety and the residual cumulative impacts on the transport network would not be severe. Policy DM18 requires new development to provide an appropriate level of parking provision.
- 8.25. Objections have been received on the grounds of highway safety, referring to the National Highways objection (which has now been resolved), trip generation figures, and historical personal injury collisions in the area.
- 8.26. The other existing accesses to the site from the A5 and A444 Atherstone Road have been assessed by the Local Highway Authority and National Highways who consider that the accesses have been proven to be adequate to serve the site. The Local Highway Authority is satisfied that, notwithstanding the proposed increase in operational floor space, the proposed development would not generate the volume of trips in the peak hours that would have a severe impact on the local highway network. In addition, the proposal seeks to maintain the existing levels of parking provision (14 spaces) for the site as shown on the submitted proposed block plan which are also satisfactory.

- 8.27. The proposed scheme would utilise existing accesses to the site and would not result in any significant adverse impacts on highway safety. The scheme would retain the existing on-site parking provision. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the adopted SADMP.

Drainage

- 8.28. Policy DM7 of the adopted SADMP seeks to prevent development from resulting in adverse impacts on flooding by ensuring that development does not create or exacerbate flooding by being located away from areas of flood risk unless adequate mitigation is provided in accordance with National Policy.
- 8.29. The site represents an existing hard surfaced area with an existing surface and foul water drainage system that is to be utilised by the extension. The proposal does not include the provision of any significant additional areas of hard surfacing compared to what is already in place, covering the majority of the site. Environmental Health (Drainage) made no comments. By virtue of the existing situation, the proposed development would have no significant adverse impact on any nearby watercourses.
- 8.30. It is considered that the proposal has a satisfactory drainage system and would not result in the creation or exacerbation of flooding. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with Policy DM7 of the adopted SADMP.

9. Equality Implications

- 9.1. Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:-
- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 9.2. Officers have taken this into account and given due regard to this statutory duty, and the matters specified in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in the determination of this application.
- 9.3. There are no known equality implications arising directly from this development.
- 9.4. The decision has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including General Data Protection Regulations (2018) and The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

10. Conclusion

- 10.1. Notwithstanding that the application site lies outside any settlement boundary and is therefore in the countryside, it is a previously developed brownfield site that is used for the same purpose as this proposal. The site is not isolated but sits adjacent to a public house and residential property. The proposed scheme would match the existing building with a modern fit for purpose and more visually acceptable building, albeit with an increased scale and massing to the existing.

- 10.2. The submitted plans demonstrate that the proposal would not over-dominate the site or result in any significant adverse impact on the character or appearance of the surrounding countryside when compared to the scale of existing development on the site. The impact of the increase in scale and height of the proposed building on the residential amenity of the adjacent Redgate House would be mitigated by the movement of the building further away from the boundary and additional planting, such that it would not result in any significant additional adverse overbearing or overshadowing impacts in the context of the existing situation.
- 10.3. The proposal is considered to be in general accordance with Policies DM1, DM4, DM7, DM10, DM17, DM18 of the adopted SADMP and the overarching principles of the NPPF which support the re-use of previously developed land and the expansion of rural businesses and is therefore recommended for approval.

11. Recommendation

11.1. Grant planning permission subject to:

- Planning conditions outlined at the end of this report.

11.2. Conditions and Reasons

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted application details, as follows:

- Site Location Plan,
- Proposed Site Plan - received by the local planning authority on 22 September 2023
- Proposed Floor Plan and Elevations received by the local planning authority on 3 October 2023.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

3. Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development shall commence on site until such time as the existing and proposed ground levels of the site, and proposed finished floor levels have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development has a satisfactory appearance and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

4. No development shall commence on the site until such time as a construction traffic management plan, including as a minimum details of wheel cleansing facilities, vehicle parking facilities, and a timetable for their provision, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Highway Authority for the A5 Trunk Road). Construction

of the development shall then be carried out in accordance with the agreed Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Reason: To mitigate any adverse impact from the development on the A5 Trunk Road in accordance with DfT Circular 01/2022, and to reduce the possibility of deleterious material (mud, stones etc.) being deposited in the highway and becoming a hazard for road users, to ensure that construction traffic does not use unsatisfactory roads and lead to on-street parking problems in the area to accord with Policy DM17 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016).

5. Prior to first use of the proposal hereby permitted, the schedule of hard and soft landscaping works, including boundary treatments, for the site shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved landscaping scheme (Andrew Large Surveyors – Proposed Site Plan, received 22 September 2023). The approved landscaping scheme shall be carried out in the first planting season following the first use of the site and shall be maintained for a period of five years from the date of planting. During this period any trees or shrubs which die or are damaged, removed, or seriously diseased shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of a similar size and species to those originally planted at which time shall be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development has a satisfactory external appearance in accordance with Policies DM4 and DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

6. If during development, contamination is found to be present at the site, no further development shall take place until a scheme for the investigation of all potential land contamination is submitted in writing to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which shall include details of how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with. Any remediation works so approved shall be carried out prior to the site first being occupied and verification of any works shall be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised in accordance with Policy DM7 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

7. The materials to be used on the external elevations of the proposed extension shall be in accordance with the details submitted in the application form received by the local planning authority on 24 August 2023.

Reason: To ensure that the development has a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policies DM4 and DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

8. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until such time as the parking and turning facilities have been implemented in accordance with the approved Proposed Site Plan - received by the local planning authority on 22 September 2023. Thereafter the on-site parking and turning provision shall be permanently so maintained at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that adequate off-street parking provision is made to reduce the possibility of the proposed development leading to on-street parking problems locally (and to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward direction) in the interests of highway safety and in accordance with Policy DM17 and 18 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016).

9. Notwithstanding the approved plans, no new windows or openings shall be created on the northern elevation (adjacent to the boundary shared with neighbouring Red Gate House) of the building hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure the development maintains a satisfactory relationship in terms of neighbouring amenity, in accordance with Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

11.3. **Notes to Applicant**

1. The approved development may require Building Regulations Approval, for further information please contact the Building Control team via e-mail at buildingcontrol@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk or call 01455 238141.
2. Application forms to discharge conditions and further information can be found on the planning portal website www.planningportal.gov.uk
3. In relation to condition 7 advice from Environmental Health should be sought via esadmin@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk to ensure that any investigation of land contamination is in accordance with their policy.