

[REDACTED]

From: Mark Bassett [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 April 2021 18:30
To: Polly Harris-Gorf
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: H02-0095-21 Land to the South of James Road North of A16, Crowland
Attachments: We sent you safe versions of your files; CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-02D_Block Plan A1.pdf; CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-03B_Existing Site Layout Plan A1.pdf; CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-04E_Proposed Site Layout Plan 1-400 A1.pdf; CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-05C_Proposed Site Layout Plan - HGV Only 1-200 A1 (1).pdf; CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-06E_Proposed Site Layout Plan - PFS Only 1-200 A1.pdf; CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-07C_Proposed Site Elevations A1.pdf; CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-08D_Proposed Building Plans A1.pdf; CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-09C_Proposed Building Elevations A1.pdf; CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-10C_Proposed Site Finishes Layout Plan A1.pdf; CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-11C_Swept Path Analysis Plan A1.pdf; CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-15B_Sections A-A B- B and C-C A1.pdf; Planning Amendment Form 1-4-21.pdf

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

This message originated from outside your organization

Dear Polly,

I write in response to the Parish Council's comments and to provide some amended and additional drawings.

I attach a completed Planning Amendment form and the amended plans, which comprise the following:

- CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-02D_Block Plan A1
- CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-03B_Existing Site Layout Plan A1
- CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-04E_Proposed Site Layout Plan 1-400 A1
- CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-05C_Proposed Site Layout Plan - HGV Only 1-200 A1
- CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-06E_Proposed Site Layout Plan - PFS Only 1-200 A1
- CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-07C_Proposed Site Elevations A1
- CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-08D_Proposed Building Plans A1
- CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-09C_Proposed Building Elevations A1
- CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-10C_Proposed Site Finishes Layout Plan A1
- CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-11C_Swept Path Analysis Plan A1
- CROWLA - WPS-PPL-005-P-15B Sections A-A B- B and C-C A1

The changes to the scheme are minor.

1. We have denoted on the layout the lorry parking bays designated for refrigerated lorries. These comprise the 20 spaces to the south east of the lorry park, closest to the A16 and furthest from residential properties. I confirm that we would be happy for a condition on this matter.
2. Landscaping on the James Road elevation. To demonstrate the extent of the landscaping on the James Road frontage we have provided some section drawings. These help emphasise the potential depth of the planting areas and also visually explain the distance to residential dwellings. A detailed landscaping scheme would be a suitable condition but we are satisfied that both amenity and the impact on the character of the area can be safeguarded through appropriate planting.
3. We have included a minor variation to the internal road layout, so that it is easier for users of the site to navigate where they need to go following their entrance from the A16.

4. In response to comments from Crowland Caravans we have adjusted the kerbs in and out of the drive thru lane and have removed the canopy above the payment window. We have also added tracking for a caravan through the forecourt. In addition, in respect of caravan/motorhome parking, we are aware of a scheme at Sutterton whereby such vehicles are able to park in the HGV park for free for a limited time period. Our client is happy to provide a similar service on this site.

Parish Council Comments

Firstly, we note that the Parish Council does not object to the scheme and identifies the benefits of the proposal to residents of Crowland as a sustainable facility. We also see that the Parish Council welcome the welfare facilities for HGV drivers, and confirm that currently overnight lorry parking in inappropriate locations is a concern.

We note the request to have an additional exit onto the A16 for HGV north bound traffic. The access/egress arrangements of the site has been subject to detailed discussion with the Highway Authority and we understand that the submitted proposal represents the safest arrangement for access/egress and that an additional exit on to the A16 would not be supported.

In respect of the acoustic fence, this is not considered to be the appropriate mitigation solution as the distance of lorry movements from the fence would reduce its effectiveness. You will note from above that our proposal to limit the areas where vehicles containing chiller units can park, directs these furthest away from residential properties. Relocating the staff parking to the James Road side is not likely to have any meaningful impact, nor would a reduction in lorry parking spaces, as vehicles would still need to travel through the area to reach the parking spaces. In response, we would point to the Noise Assessment which concludes an acceptable amenity impact.

Matter such as lighting, litter bin provision etc could be secured by condition and our client is contacting the Parish Council to discuss all on-site management issues and of course will be willing to explain our position on the above matters to the Parish Council as required.

Kind Regards

Mark Bassett
Principal Manager



FRFFT

Freeths LLP
Cumberland Court, 80 Mount Street
Nottingham NG1 6HH