

# Appendix 1: Submission by Knights 22.10.2021

## Contents

Pages 1-2 Letter from Knights

Pages 3-18 Copy of Structural Report (application ref: 19/2624M)

Pages 19-20 Copy of response from Building Control Officer (application ref 19/2624M)

Pages 21-24 Copy of Environment Agency response (application ref 08/0791P)

Pages 25-29 Copy of Environment Agency response (application ref 19/2624M)

**Ingersley Vale Mill - Comments by Knights plc on Behalf of H. Cumberbirch**

**Date:** 22 October 2021

- 1.1 Knights have raised the issue relating to the deliverability of the Ingersley Vale Mill site which was first granted planning permission on 30 December 2009 for the conversion of the mill for 24 apartments and the construction of 42 additional units (24 apartments and 18 townhouses). Cheshire East Council have prepared a separate note on the planning status of the site.
- 1.2 In the event that the Inspector agrees that a technical start to development has been made, there are parts of the development, namely the conversion of the mill itself, that are no longer deliverable. Our opinion on this is as follows:
- (a) Both the developer, and the Council's structural engineer agreed when considering application reference 19/2624M that the existing building is no longer structurally sound and is on the verge of collapse. This position is confirmed in the planning statement by Emery Planning (enclosure 4 of the Council's Homework Item 3), as well as the structural engineers report submitted on behalf of the applicant (attachment 1 to this note) and the consultation response from the Council's structural engineer (attachment 2 to this note).
  - (b) Since the submission of the structural engineers report dated April 2019, there has been further collapse to the northern elevation as identified by the red outline on photo 1 below, which confirms the views of the structural engineers acting for both parties.



**Photo 1 (image taken on 10 March 2021)**

- (c) The building now requires new structural elements and substantial rebuilding and the condition of the building is likely to have deteriorated further in the 6 months since photo 1 above was taken. The collapse of the structure to other elevations of the building, is now to such a level that this level of development would go beyond the scope and description of the existing permission which permits “conversion”, given that all walls around the structure were intact at the time that the original planning application was determined. Knights assume that the s.73 application submitted in 2019 was withdrawn on the basis that the rebuilding proposed would be beyond the scope of a s.73 application.
- (d) The Environment Agency objected to the original scheme (attachment 3) and the 2019 application that was submitted under s.73 of the Town and Country Planning Act (attachment 4) on the grounds that the site is located within Flood Zone 3. Any new application for the site would need to follow the sequential approach to flood risk as set out in the NPPF and be accompanied by a detailed flood risk assessment, associated flood modelling and associated technical work.
- (e) As a minimum therefore, 24 units cannot be delivered on this site, even if the remainder of the development was lawfully commenced by virtue of demolition.
- (f) The site has otherwise been “on the books” for over 10 years with no active development having taken place on this site during that period other than demolition and two years have passed since an attempt to vary the existing planning permission was made with no further applications being made since.
- (g) The above comments re-inforce the submissions made by Knights that alternative deliverable sites are required in Bollington to meet local market and affordable housing needs.

**Knights plc**  
**October 2021**

# **BMC**

**BELL MUNRO CONSULTING LTD.**

**STRUCTURAL INSPECTION OF  
INGERSLEY CLOUGH MILL  
INGERSLEY VALE  
BOLLINGTON  
APRIL 2019**

Bell Munro Consulting Ltd.  
Consulting Civil and Structural Engineers  
Turing House  
5 Archway  
Manchester  
M15 5RL  
Tel: 0161 2098032  
Fax: 0161 2098033  
E-Mail: [consulting@bellmunro.co.uk](mailto:consulting@bellmunro.co.uk)  
Ref: J6037.B

## **CONTENTS**

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Findings

3.0 Discussion

4.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

5.0 Disclaimer

Appendix

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.01 At the request of Mr. K. Hollingworth the building known as Ingersley Clough Mill, Ingersley Vale, Bollington, Cheshire was visited by Bell Munro Consulting on the afternoon of 15<sup>th</sup> April 2019.
- 1.02 The purpose of the visit was to undertake a structural inspection of the building and to report on our findings.
- 1.03 We were commissioned to give recommendations regarding any structural works required in connection with re-development of the property.
- 1.04 It was dry and sunny at the time of the inspection and the temperature was approximately 10° C.

## 2.0 Findings

- 2.01 This section of the report should be read in conjunction with the photographs in the appendix.
- 2.02 The building was found to be of solid rubble filled wall construction and originally three stories in height. The majority of the roof and floors were not present and the East gable had mostly collapsed. A wheel house and associated aqueduct were exhibited at the West side of the building. A date stone shows 1809 but it is understood this refers to the central section of the building only and the majority of the building was constructed after this date.
- 2.03 A structural inspection of the South elevation was undertaken and significant movement of the stone wall structure to the main wall to the elevation was evident. Lateral movement and bowing was noted together with significant vertical displacement of the stone structure and failed stone lintels. Movement of the rubble fill to the wall was suspected together with significant weathering of the exposed wall head. Brick infill panels had been installed in several low level openings at some point in the past. The section of the South elevation at the West side of the elevation spanned over a watercourse and appeared to be supported by a stone arch structure. Significant movement of the stone wall structure above the arch was evident.
- 2.04 A central outrigger of five stories in height was exhibited together with a more modern outrigger at the East side of the main outrigger. Sections of the roof structure and finishes to the outriggers did remain but were damaged beyond repair and in an unstable condition. Self – seeded trees were noted to be growing at the head of the outriggers and weathering of the head of the outrigger walls was evident. Lateral movement of the structure to the smaller outrigger was noted. The outriggers appeared to be constructed using loadbearing brickwork clad in stone.
- 2.05 At the West side of the South elevation a water wheel building was present which consisted of a stone rectangular building with a more modern loadbearing brickwork outrigger. The stone section exhibited signs of local deterioration and movement of the stonework but appeared relatively stable. This section of the building exhibited a parapet and damage to the coping stones and parapet was noted in several areas. The roof structure to the outrigger was damaged beyond repair although the main structural walls to the outrigger did not appear to be in poor condition. An aqueduct structure spanned from the adjoining site to the wheel house at high level and temporary propping of the aqueduct had been installed at some point in the relatively recent past.
- 2.06 The North elevation was of a similar form to the South elevation and exhibited a significant lateral movement at the East side of the elevation. Further signs of local movement of the stone structure and weathering of the exposed head of the wall were noted throughout the elevation. The remains of what are thought to be steel roof trusses from a previous adjoining building were noted

built into the stonework structure at first floor level.

- 2.07 The majority of the East gable wall had collapsed and only a small section of the gable wall adjacent to the South elevation remained. This section of wall exhibited signs of significant structural movement within the stone structure.
- 2.08 An internal inspection of the main building was undertaken and it was clear the roof and suspended floors had collapsed at some point in the relatively distant past. A grillage of steel support beams were noted at first floor level and the beams were found to be deformed significantly at the East side of the building. The internal faces of the walls which remained and the heads of the walls appeared very heavily weathered and signs of local and global instabilities were noted throughout. Brick arches were exhibited internally over the heads of a number of the window openings and loss of mortar and movement of the brick arch structures was evident. Fire damaged sections of timber were noted built into the internal faces of the North and South elevation walls.



### 3.0 Discussion

- 3.01 The majority of the building was in a very poor state of repair and close to collapse in several areas. The main section of the structure consists of the North and South elevation walls and what remains of the East gable. Significant lateral movement of the North and South elevation walls has taken place and it is thought this has initially been due to the collapse of the East gable but more recently due to the lack of restraint to the walls and weathering causing damage to the wall structure via the head of the walls and existing damaged sections. Due to the construction of the stone walls it is likely the internal fill material has migrated downwards following ingress of rainwater to the structure of the wall via the head of the wall and existing fractures in the wall. Fractured stone lintels were exhibited resulting in the movement of the stonework structure above. Repair of these walls would be extremely difficult and unlikely to succeed due to the extent of movement and damage noted to date. It is thought any attempt to repair these walls so they would be suitable for re-development would result in local collapse of the walls. We would recommend the walls to the North and South elevations together with the remains of the East gable are taken down and re-built as part of any re-development. Given the poor condition of the sections of wall which remain it is recommended the taking down and re-building works take place as soon as possible to enable the works to progress in a controlled manner. Further deterioration of the wall structure would reduce the possibility of controlled demolition and the prospect of salvaging the stone and features.
- 3.02 The wheel house section of the building appeared relatively stable and it is thought this could be safely retained and re-used as part of the development. It is likely the roof structure will need replacing and local stone repairs to the parapet and upper sections of the wall will be required. The retaining wall at the base of the East side of the wheel house adjacent to the watercourse will need to be closely inspected following making safe of the West side of the South elevation as the retaining wall may need some strengthening works or remedial works to ensure the long term stability of the East wall to the wheel house. A detailed assessment of the aqueduct will be required when safe access can be provided and it is likely substantial remedial works will be required in order to make good the aqueduct structure and maintain the structural stability of the aqueduct in the future.


## **4.0 Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 4.01 It is recommended due to the unstable state of the wall structures and the impracticalities of undertaking a safe repair that the North and South walls and what remains of the East gable to the main building are taken down and rebuilt. Given the poor condition of the remaining sections of these walls it is recommended the taking down and rebuilding works are undertaken as soon as possible. Further deterioration of the walls would reduce the possibility of the works being undertaken in a controlled manner and therefore the possibility of salvaging the stone and features.
- 4.02 It is likely the wheelhouse structure could be safely repaired although a detailed assessment of the retaining structure adjacent to the watercourse will be required as this may require strengthening or repair works.

## 5.0 Disclaimer

- 5.01 This report is confined to the terms referred to in section 1.0 of this report and no responsibility can be accepted in respect of defects in inaccessible or un-inspected parts of the property.
- 5.02 This report is in our opinion based upon a visual inspection of conditions as they exist at this moment in time and is confined to the terms of our brief, as laid down in section 1.0 of this report.
- 5.03 We have not inspected woodwork or other parts of the structure which are covered, unexposed or inaccessible and we are therefore unable to report that any such part of the property is free from defect.
- 5.04 We did not test any drains, water, electrical or gas services, nor did we open – up or break – out any of the building structure which is not highlighted in the report.
- 5.05 We did not have any consultation with British Coal, the Waste Management Authority or indeed any other statutory undertaker.
- 5.06 This report is solely for the use of the addressee and no responsibility can be accepted to any third party for the whole of it or any part of the content.

Report Prepared By:



.....  
Christopher J. Munro B.Eng.(Hons.), C.Eng., M.I.Struct.E.

## Appendix A



A.1 South Elevation of Building



A.2 Fractured Lintel and Unstable Stonework





A.3 Internal Structure of Central Outrigger to South Elevation



A.4 Masonry Arch Supporting West Side of South Elevation





A.5 West Side of South Elevation showing Unstable Stonework



A.6 Wheel House at West Side of South Elevation





A.7 West Elevation of Wheel House Showing Aqueduct



A.8 Local Damage to Parapet of Wheel House





A.9 North Elevation of Building



A.10 Damage to Head of North Elevation Wall





A.11 Remains of East Gable



A.12 Damaged First Floor Steel Support Beams





A.13 Movement and Damage to North Elevation Wall



A.14 Fire Damaged Timber Built Into South Elevation Wall

## **Internal Consultee Reply Form**

Consultation on Planning Reference Number **19/2624M**

Proposal: **Variation of conditions 3, 5, 6, 11 & 41 on approval 08/0791P for demolition of all buildings except the mill, conversion of mill to 24 apartments and erection of 24 apartments and 18 townhouses with associated landscaping and car parking**

Location: **INGERSLEY VALE WORKS, INGERSLEY VALE, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5BP**

Views of Structural Engineer for  
CivcanceLtd in response to consultation dated 17-Jun-2019.

The building was last inspected by me in 2008 when it could be seen that the mill had been severely damaged following a fire in 1999 when it lost not only its roof but also all internal floors.

At that time the structural stone external skeleton of the building was still intact and it was proposed as noted in the structural report that was submitted at this time, to re-introduce new floors and roof elements. The introduction of these would then provide full structural integrity of the building and extend its life span thus the engineers observations and conclusions were accepted.

Following my recent site visit of the 20<sup>th</sup> June 2019 when once again I undertook a limited visual appraisal of the structural external skeleton of the mill and having read the new structural engineers report by Bell Munro Consulting dated April 2019 as well as assessing the photographic evidence provided in this report, I would in general concur with its findings and therefore its observations and conclusions are accepted.

It can clearly be seen that since 2008 that no remedial works have been undertaken to the mill and the structure has deteriorated significantly since then due to many years of exposure to inclement weather/high winds. This can be seen especially at the far east end of the building where most of this gable elevation has collapsed thus causing quite significant movement to the adjacent south and north elevations.

Continued on next page:-

The report recommends that the remaining section of the east elevation along with the south and north elevations up to the west wheel house structure (which is to be retained) should be immediately demolished in a controlled manner while it is feasible to do so in order to reclaim as much of the stonework and building features as possible.

This again I would generally agree with, although it may be possible to only demolish part of the bottom sections of the south and north elevations where infill of openings in the past has given more stability to this lower areas. However this may prove difficult due to health and safety of the work force undertaking the demolition and full demolition may be the only option.

Based on the above comments I would also point out that if the mill building is left exposed to ongoing inclement weather this will undoubtedly cause further deterioration to the structure and may cause collapse of other sections of the building to the point where full demolition is inevitable with no reclamation possible.

<b>From:</b>	Heron, Sylvia
<b>Sent:</b>	23/06/2008 16:44:38
<b>To:</b>	planning
<b>CC:</b>	
<b>Subject:</b>	08/08791p

A hard copy of the above letter will be sent in the post.

Many Thanks  
Sylvia

Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else.

We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it.

We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

If we have sent you information and you wish to use it please read our terms and conditions which you can get by calling us on 08708 506 506. Find out more about the Environment Agency at [www.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk)

**World Environment Day 2008 - Time for a new routine.** Take part in our campaign by telling us what one thing you will do to stand up to climate change. Visit our website to tell us and find out more: [www.environment-agency.gov.uk/wed](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/wed)

Macclesfield Borough Council  
Development Control  
PO Box 40  
Macclesfield  
Cheshire  
SK10 1DP

**Our ref:** SO/2008/103471/01-L01  
**Your ref:** 08/0791p  
**Date:** 23 June 2008

Dear Sir/Madam

**DEMOLITION OF ALL BUILDINGS EXCEPT THE MILL. CONVERSION OF MILL TO 24NO. APARTMENTS AND ERECTION OF 24NO. APARTMENTS AND 18NO. TOWNHOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND CAR PARKING INGERSLEY VALE WORKS, INGERSLEY VALE, BOLLINGOTN, MACCLESFIELD**

Thank you, for referring the above application to the Environment Agency for comments.

The proposed development is contrary to NE9 River Corridors Policy in Macclesfield's UDP.

We OBJECT to the proposed development on the following grounds.

The site lies within flood zone 3 of the River Dean and therefore a flood risk assessment should have accompanied the application. The applicant has however only submitted a copy of the Agency's flood map as the flood risk assessment and this is inadequate for the purpose.

In order that we can assess the risk of flooding a satisfactory flood risk assessment in accordance with Appendix C of "PPS 25 Development and Flood Risk: A Practice Guide " should be submitted to and agreed prior to approval.

In addition to the requirements of the above the FRA should consider the following:

1. Provide a hydraulic model of the river and culvert through the site from the weir immediately downstream to the footbridge upstream of the site applying the Q100 plus 20% climate change flow. A copy of the hydraulic model on disc should be provided with the FRA.

2. Demonstrate whether the site is within Flood Zone 3a or 3b.

Environment Agency  
Appleton House, 430 Birchwood Boulevard, Birchwood, Warrington, Cheshire, WA3 7WD.  
Customer services line: 08708 506 506  
Email: [enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk)  
[www.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk)

Cont/d..

3. Provide a survey of the River Dean culvert through the site to determine its structural condition and capacity and locate any pipe crossings that might create blockages and which will have to be removed.

It is not advisable to build over the line of the culvert, or directly adjacent to it, as this would lead to structural problems in the future. Any development that involves culverting or construction above culverts is not considered good practice, as it will prejudice future access to the watercourse, and will also result in a loss of open watercourse, which will be unacceptable in ecological terms

4. Previous studies of this site have indicated that the leat from Waulkmill Farm to Ingersley Mill leaks onto the adjacent field.

We understand that the inlet to the leat was sealed some years ago. A topographical survey and study of the structural stability of the leat should be carried out and proposals for its reinstatement provided. We would point out that the wall on the right hand side of Photograph 2 supporting the leat has several major cracks and could be at risk of failure.

5. Give particular attention to the risk of flooding from overland flow for example flow along the road from Waulkmill Farm to Ingersley Vale Mill and water overflowing from the river upstream of the site and passing behind plots C and D.

6. Consider safe egress and access from the buildings. There is a low spot in the road adjacent to the mill building which might flood during heavy rainfall and prevent access for emergency vehicles.

7. The weir on the River Dean immediately downstream of the site is in poor structural condition and water is flowing through the face of the weir rather than over the crest. A study of the structural stability of the weir and risk of failure should be incorporated within the FRA. Failure of the weir during flood conditions could impact on the stability of some of the adjacent proposed properties.

We understand that the weir is not in the ownership and that remedial works would have to be subject to a Section 106 agreement.

We have a hydraulic model of the River Dean. The developer should contact Katie McAlinden on 01925 543345 to obtain a quote for providing the model if they so wish.

Consideration should be given to the opening of all stretches of watercourse within the boundaries of this development. This would be of considerable positive benefit to wildlife along the River Dean corridor.



It is further considered that potential for further enhancement of the aquatic habitat should be considered. Opportunities for the removal of impassable weirs should be identified.

There is also considerable scope for enhancement of the aquatic habitat at this location which may add economic value to the development and increase recreational opportunities.

Once revised details have been submitted that addresses the above concerns we will be please to comment further.

If the Council is minded to approve the application as submitted, then, in accordance with paragraph 26 of PPS 25, we should be notified in order that further representations may be considered.

Yours faithfully

**Ms SYLVIA HERON**  
**Planning Liaison Officer**

Direct dial 01925 543362

Direct fax 01925 852260

Direct e-mail [Hérons.Birchwood1.NW@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Hérons.Birchwood1.NW@environment-agency.gov.uk)

Cheshire East (Development  
Management)  
PO Box 606 Earle Street  
CREWE  
CW1 9HP

**Our ref:** SO/2012/110813/02-L01  
**Your ref:** 19/2624M  
**Date:** 23 July 2019

**FAO: Paul Wakefield**

Dear Sir

**VARIATION OF CONDITIONS 3, 5, 6, 11 & 41 ON APPROVAL 08/0791P FOR  
DEMOLITION OF ALL BUILDINGS EXCEPT THE MILL, CONVERSION OF MILL  
TO 24 APARTMENTS AND ERECTION OF 24 APARTMENTS AND 18  
TOWNHOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND CAR PARKING**

**INGERSLEY VALE WORKS, INGERSLEY VALE, BOLLINGTON, SK10 5BP**

Thank you for consulting the Agency on the variation of condition application. This referral was received in office on the 17<sup>th</sup> June 2019.

**Environment Agency Position**

We object to the application 19/2624M as submitted, specifically the variation of condition 41 (approved plans), as insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the following issues have been adequately addressed:

The potential flood risk associated with the proposed development, the impact of climate change and subsequent safety of its occupant.

The impact of the proposed development on nature conservation, ecology, physical habitats and Water Framework Directive (WFD) requirements.

Please see outlined below a further explanation of our rationale for this position and reasoning for our objection.

**Reason for objection [1] - Flood risk**

The application site lies within Flood Zone 3, which is land defined by the planning practice guidance as having a high probability of flooding. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paragraph 163, footnote 50) states that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must be submitted when development is proposed in such a location. An FRA is vital to making informed planning decisions and in its absence, the flood risks posed by the development are unknown. This alone justifies the refusal of planning permission.

When the initial planning application for the proposal was submitted in 2008, no FRA was submitted and the Environment Agency consequently objected in line with the since updated NPPF. Despite this, application 08/0791P was subsequently

Environment Agency  
Richard Fairclough House Knutsford Road, Warrington, WA4 1HT.  
Customer services line: 03708 506 506  
[www.gov.uk/environment-agency](http://www.gov.uk/environment-agency)

1Cont/d..



*“Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable) it can be demonstrated that: a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location; b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient; c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate; d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.”*

Guidance on how to prepare a flood risk assessment can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-for-planning-applications>

## **Reason for objection [2] - Impact on natural environment**

This development will take place on and close to a culverted and canalised section of the River Dean. It will therefore require a flood risk activity permit (FRAP) under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016. We are unlikely to grant a permit for this proposal, as submitted.

In determining the FRAP for this development, we will consider how the development affects water biodiversity and the wetland environment, in line with the relevant European and domestic law.

We will also assess its compliance with the River Basin Management Plan (RBMP). The RBMP states that the water environment should be protected and enhanced to prevent deterioration and promote the recovery of water bodies. We therefore seek the removal of existing culverts wherever possible and positive riparian development design with key green infrastructure asset(s) provided.

The proposed development may prevent the restoration of a heavily modified waterbody and a substantial loss of watercourse habitat. This is owing to the significant amounts culverted watercourse remaining and unclear development proposals in the River Dean (WFD Ref: GB112069060650), riparian corridor and river channel to achieve the stated development layout on Drwg.004 (UAD, 2008).

Further to above, there is a significant risk that the development may:

prevent achievement of good ecological potential;

potentially impact on nature conservation interests, including fish and other wildlife - no up to date provision of ecological survey and assessment of overall riparian site provided; and

represent a significant environmental/pollution risk to waterbody and ecological receptor based on indicative scheme proposals L033\_Drwg 004 (the age and identified poor condition of building, infrastructure associated with 19th century mill, utilities within the river channel and the unclear construction methodology on/ near the culvert and river itself).

3Cont/d..

3  
3

Cont/d..

This objection is supported by paragraphs 170 and 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which recognise that the planning system should conserve and enhance the environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or as a last resort compensated for, planning permission should be refused. Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged.

## **Overcoming our objection [2] - Impact on natural environment**

It may be possible to overcome our objection by setting back the development at least eight metres from the centre-line of the open channel watercourse. This should maximise the amount of waterbody that can be opened up ('skylighted'); minimise the numbers of crossings as part of scheme design; remove redundant infrastructure from within the river channel; and clearly detailing new retaining structures within the riparian corridor. Where feasible these should be based on more environmentally sensitive bio-engineering techniques (<http://www.hrwallingford.com/news/supporting-green-river-engineering>). In conjunction with:

detailed drawings of the location and construction of the proposed development (including timing of works, methods and materials to be used);

detailed cross sections every 50m, pre and post development through riparian corridor;

details of how the River Dean waterbody is to be protected during construction works; and

details of appropriate mitigation/compensation for the loss of riparian habitat used by the development.

An ecological survey is required prior to the development of detailed plans, to enable an assessment of the level of risk posed by the development. The design, construction, mitigation and compensation measures should be based on a survey which is carried out at an appropriate time of year by a suitably experienced and qualified surveyor using recognised survey methodology.

The planning statement submitted states that some ecological assessment has been undertaken (BSG Ecology May 2019), but as yet, it is unclear how the results of said surveys and outputs of these have informed current riparian scheme proposals.

### **Note to Applicant / Agent**

Should you wish the Environment Agency to review any technical documents or want further advice to address the environmental issues raised, we can do this as part of our Charged for Planning Advice service.

Further engagement will provide you with the opportunity to discuss and gain our views on potential options to overcome 4  
4Cont/d.. 4

Cont/d..

our objection, before formally submitting further information as part of your planning application. It should also result in a better quality and more environmentally sensitive development.

As part of our Charged for Planning Advice service we will provide a dedicated project manager to act as a single point of contact to help resolve any problems. We currently charge £100 per hour, plus VAT. We will provide you with an estimated cost for any further discussions or review of documents. The terms and conditions of our service are available [here](#).

If you would like more information on our Charged for Planning Advice service, including a cost estimate, please do not hesitate to contact me.

### **Note to LPA**

Please forward a copy of this letter to the applicant/agent and re-consult us on the submission of any further relevant documentation submitted in support of this application. Should you wish to discuss this application further, then please do not hesitate to contact me.

We acknowledge that this variation of condition application specifically relates to a planning application 08/0791P, already approved. Therefore, the developer can rightfully implement 08/0791P and any relating existing approvals should they desire.

Regardless of the decision made on the current application, we wish to continue working closely with the council and developer so that all parties can reach an agreeable position on the use of the site. We consider that an improved scheme can be delivered if we commit to work together going forward. It would also be in the developer's best interest to deliver a development that is sustainable and that will align with the requirements of any relating environmental permit(s).

Yours faithfully

**Mr Andy Davies**  
**Sustainable Places Advisor**

Direct dial 02077140640  
Direct e-mail [andy.davies1@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:andy.davies1@environment-agency.gov.uk)

5Cont/d..  
Cont/d..