



PLANNING COMMITTEE SOUTH - UPDATE SHEET

27 April 2021

Item 7 – DC/21/1079/VOC– Variation of Conditions 6, 7, 8 & 10 of DC/19/2666/FUL - Construction of 2 No. new buildings and use of land for vehicle and plant hire operator(s) comprising offices, workshops, associated parking, drainage infrastructure etc to allow for the hire, storage, sale, maintenance and servicing of vehicles, plant, machinery and equipment. - Variation to operating hours. Kesgrave Quarry, Main Road, Kesgrave, Suffolk

There have been no additional third party consultation responses, and no additional comments from statutory consultees.

Non statutory consultees

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Suffolk County – As Local Planning Authority for Minerals And Waste	29 March 2021	15 April 2021
<p>Summary of comments: Advise that they have no objection to the proposed variation of condition under DC/21/1079/VOC. In their view the variation to the working hours will not coincide with any waste operations onsite, and therefore, there will not be any cumulative impacts that will need to be considered.</p>		

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Ipswich Borough Council	29 March 2021	13 April 2021
<p>Summary of comments: Confirm they do not wish to make any comment on the application</p>		

LEGAL ADDRESS East Suffolk House, Station Road, Melton, Woodbridge IP12 1RT
DX: 41400 Woodbridge

POSTAL ADDRESS Riverside, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft NR33 0EQ
DX: 41220 Lowestoft

Item 8 – DC/21/1471/VOC - Variation of Conditions 4 and 22 of DC/15/4908/FUL- Erection of new headquarters building for vehicle hire operator comprising workshop, offices, associated parking, drainage infrastructure and landscaping to allow for the hire, storage, workshop and sales of vehicles and machinery (revised scheme to DC/15/2107/FUL and DC/14/4251/FUL) - Variation to operating hours. Kesgrave Quarry, Main Road, Kesgrave, Suffolk

- 4.9 Since the report was drafted, there have been 13 additional third party consultation responses raising objections to the application. The material planning considerations raised are as per those outlined in the published committee report, including those related to the impacts of noise and disturbance, and traffic from both the application site and the wider sinks pit site/operations. No additional material planning considerations have been raised in the additional representations.

Parish/Town Council

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Kesgrave Town Council	29 March 2021	13 April 2021
Support		

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Little Bealings Parish Council	29 March 2021	16 April 2021
<p>The Council has considered this application under established delegated authority. It objects to the application on the grounds that it breaches Local Plan Policy SCLP4.3 by proposing the intensification of an employment site, as productivity enhancement of the site would result in an unacceptable adverse effect on the living conditions of local residents in relation to noise, vibration and dust and, as proven by the existence of over 6,000 residents' complaints to the existing operations in the preceding five years; these adverse impacts have yet to be successfully mitigated. The Council is also of the view that an EIA should be required by ESC before the application is determined.</p>		

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Foxhall Parish Council	29 March 2021	12 April 2021
The Parish Council does not object to this application.		

Statutory consultees

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
SCC Flooding Authority	29 March 2021	13 April 2021

Summary of comments:

Advise that they have reviewed the submitted documents and have no comments to make, explaining that the proposed variation of conditions has no impact upon the approved surface water drainage strategy.

Non statutory consultees

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Suffolk Wildlife Trust	29 March 2021	16 April 2021

Summary of comments:

Make a Holding Objection. Consider that the extension to the operating hours may have an impact upon the Sinks Valley, Kesgrave Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI), and therefore Natural England should be consulted on any impacts. Concerned there may be negative impacts upon foraging and commuting bats, and therefore expect bat surveys to be undertaken so that impacts can be assessed. A lighting strategy should be designed in accordance with current guidelines. Without such a strategy there is insufficient information to ascertain whether bats are negatively affected by these proposals.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Ipswich Borough Council	29 March 2021	13 April 2021

Summary of comments:

Confirm they do not wish to make any comment on the application

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Suffolk County – As Local Planning Authority for Minerals And Waste	29 March 2021	15 April 2021

Summary of comments:

Advise that they have no objection to the proposed variation of condition under DC/21/1471/VOC. In their view the variation to the working hours will not coincide with any waste operations onsite, and therefore, there will not be any cumulative impacts that will need to be considered.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
-----------	----------------	---------------------

Local Ward Member (Cllr Hedgley)		08 April 2021
<p>I am aware that the Sinks Pit Applications will come before the full committee in due course and I shall have the opportunity to speak then.</p> <p>However in the mean time I would like it recorded that my overriding concern is for the health and wellbeing of my constituents in Playford Road and Laundry Lane, plus others, though fewer, further afield.</p> <p>The noise and dust pollution has been recorded and well established and it is beholden on the person or persons causing any pollution to justify any non-compliance and it is not their right to increase such activities although it is their right to ask if they can. It is for the responsible agencies to enforce the law and I will be calling for them to do so at the full Planning Committee meeting when it takes place. It is not my argument to prevent anyone from carrying out their lawful business. The chance of continuing and indeed increasing employment does not give anyone the right to bypass the basic laws of health and care towards others. Surely the lessons of the past in other parts of the world, albeit of a greater magnitude, have taught us something.</p>		

Planning Considerations

- 6.32 The holding objection from Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT) in relation to potential impacts of external lighting upon the SSSI are noted. It is also interesting to note that Natural England, who are the Statutory Consultee in relation to impacts upon the SSSI has raised no objections (summary contained within published report), and that when SWT were consulted on the original application DC/15/4908/FUL, they did not respond to the consultation.
- 6.33 Condition 20 of the original Planning Permission DC/15/4908/FUL required the provision of external lighting in accordance with an approved external lighting scheme and only permits the installation of additional lighting if approval is given by the Local Planning Authority. This condition is proposed to be replicated on the decision notice for this current application, and therefore its requirements would remain.
- 6.34 The current scheme seeks to vary the hours of use/operations of the existing building and associate parking/turning areas, and does not seek to add additional external lighting units.
- 6.35 Therefore, contrary to the comments from Suffolk Wildlife Trust, the Local Planning Authority cannot seek to refuse consent on the lack of a lighting strategy, because one has already been approved.

Item 9 – DC/20/5019/FUL – Site a 'Mock-barn' Style Building for Use as a Nursery School and Day Care Facility [Use Class E(f)] for Provision of the Relocation of Badingham Playschool at land on land opposite the Village Hall, to the west of the B1116/Framlingham Road, Dennington, IP13 8AD.

4.3 An additional representation which objects to the proposal was received from the Old Rectory on 20 April 2021 on the following points:

- The pre-application advice is not publicly accessible.
- The impact on the setting of St Marys Church should be assessed.
- Dennington Consolidated Charities still own the site.
- Only a third of those supporting the application live in Dennington, “of these 18 people, six of these are connected with Dennington Consolidated Charities; trustees and close family members of a trustee for instance. A further three are connected to the Playschool; trustees for example”.
- The planning statement notes 29 children are “on roll” at the playschool. “12% (the proportion of children the "Site Selection Optioneering" document says come from Dennington) is a mere three children from Dennington”.
- Material finishes differ between what is within the supporting statement and required by the highways authority – the car park will be “covered in tarmac”.
- “The Badingham Playschool letter includes a photograph of the Cart Lodge Holiday Accommodation at Glebe Farm as an example of a nearby building that the new Playschool building will be similar to. This holiday accommodation is “not in the conservation area and the standard of design and quality of materials are not high enough for it to be built in one. In particular the pitch of the roof is too slight and the roof tiles not appropriate for a historic environment setting.”

In response to the above points, it is noted that those using the daycare/pre-school facilities may not all come from within the parish of Dennington and may travel from neighbouring parishes. Details of material finish and hard landscaping are sought by condition. The ownership of the site is not a material planning consideration. The proposal has been assessed in accordance with the adopted development framework with all representations taken into consideration.

Item 11 - DC/20/1036/FUL - Construction of retirement apartments for the elderly, a new public car park, access, landscaping and ancillary development. Land east and south of The Square, Martlesham Heath

4.1 One additional third-party consultation response supporting the application has been received. The comments raised are as per those outlined in the published committee report. No additional material planning considerations have been raised in the additional representations.

5.1 Martlesham Parish Council have provided a response to the planning committee report – received 25 April 2021. The content of the letter is shown below.



Martlesham Parish Council

Parish Room
Felixstowe Road
Martlesham
Woodbridge
Suffolk IP12 4PB

Clerk: Mrs Susan Robertson
Telephone: 01473 612632
Email: clerk@martleshamcouncil.org.uk
Website: <http://martlesham.onesuffolk.net>

25 April 2021

East Suffolk Council
Riduna House
Station Road
Melton
Woodbridge IP12 1RT
F.A.O Rachel Lambert, Case Officer

Our ref: 21-115-DC20-1036-FUL

Dear Rachel

Planning Application DC/20/1036/FUL - Land east and south of The Square, Martlesham Heath Planning Committee South Meeting on 27 April 2021

With reference to your Committee Report for planning application DC/20/1036/FUL, we write with our observations on the Conditions. As per the ESC on-line instructions and our discussion regarding conditions on 13 April 2021, this supporting information is being submitted to the Planning Team more than 24 hours before the meeting for circulation to the Committee please. Please make this letter available to the Planning Committee Members prior to their meeting on Tuesday 27 April 2021.

1. Martlesham Parish Council - Remaining areas of concern

The Parish Council has continued to object to this planning application due to unresolved issues. The Parish Council's position is that it supports and welcomes the scheme in principle and its new residents, but with two caveats:

- The reduction in overall car park capacity compounded by increased overflow demand generated by the new development. Please see references below to conditions 32 and 33. The council feels that this is so fundamental that planning permission should be refused until the overall village centre car park capacity issues are satisfactorily resolved. This is not a problem which can be subsequently retrofitted. See reference to Conditions 32 and 33 below referring to car park management plans.
- The new runway car park's southern boundary landscaping and access proposal appears to fail to address the landscaping requirements set out in Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan Policy MAR3. Access arrangements onto the Green, which has historically been used for village events, have also not been taken into account, nor the need to prevent unauthorised vehicular access. See para 2 below.

Please note that Martlesham Parish Council's comments included in the Committee Report are the first set submitted in April 2020. The Parish Council has subsequently made further positive submissions/suggestions relating to our preferred requirements especially with respect to the runway car park, (including photos of Village Day events and satellite images illustrating usage patterns). No feedback has been received and all iterations of the car

park plan have failed to address one or more of our requirements. This is all the more disappointing in view of the proposal that it be handed over to the Parish Council on completion.

We also proposed a new desire route footpath across the NE corner of the Green which would give easier access from the east side of the Green to the footpath up the west side of the car park to the Village Square, but were told that it could not be S106 funded. We recommend that this be revisited - it has merit in terms of usability and public acceptance of the scheme.

2. Design of the new public car park

The Parish Council is unhappy with the statement in para 9.48 of the Committee Report referring to the Parish Council not supporting the concept of the car park as an informal plaza. The officer's report is the first time we have seen a narrative description of the planners' vision for this space. It has not been described in any of the previously published documents. The design and access statement has not been updated since first published in March 2020 and had only one short paragraph about the car park.

Our objection to the various revised layouts for the car park has not been driven by loss of car parking spaces in this space as suggested in the report; that is a separate issue affecting the whole of the village centre.

Our concerns with this car park have been and still are:

- Vehicular access arrangements from the car park to the Green for village events on the Green,
- compliance with MAR3 in the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan (development should protect and enhance the Village Green setting),
- user safety given the car park is next to an area where children and young people gather,
- preventing unauthorised vehicle access onto the green.

The move towards unfettered public access area emerged after SCC referred to the Mistley Quay ruling in their response dated 23 February 2021. We believe this is a misapplication of that ruling. The case there was that the Quay already had Town and Village Green status, which the port operator wanted to have removed. This runway does not have TVG status.

Had there been an opportunity for two-way dialogue between the Parish council, ESC, McCarthy & Stone and SCC Highways which we requested several times this sort of confusion could have been avoided. A joint site visit would be the ideal approach.

On the plus side we welcome the imaginative ideas for treatment of the actual surfacing of the car park reflecting its former runway use which are shown in the freehand sketch plan entitled parking layout posted on 9 April 2021.

If the Committee agrees the recommendations and Conditions of the Planning Officer's Committee report, we observe and request the following:

3. The s106 agreement must include the transfer of the former runway to the community and the open space area to the east of the site (an Area Protected from Development in the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan) via Martlesham Parish Council or Martlesham Heath Householders Limited to secure them in perpetuity for the benefit of the community. This is discussed at paragraphs 9.41 & 9.82 of the Committee Report. To asset lock the runway for future community use, the transfer and matters covered in paragraph 9.82 must be enshrined in the s106 Agreement. The s106 Agreement should be made a Condition of the planning consent and any Heads of Term should be made legally binding.

Further, we concur with the asset lock 'in perpetuity'; we recommend this should solely refer to the broader community use aspect.

4. Martlesham Parish Council must be proactively involved in concluding Conditions 23, 26, 32 and 33. Due to the proposed asset transfer, and the impact of the Village Centre on the day-to-day activity of the community, local businesses and services as well as special village occasions, the community, represented by the Parish Council, must be involved, more than just as a normal arm's length consultee.

- Condition 23 Strategy for the former runway – it is important that the local community living with the design decisions, has a say in the design aspects which impact Community Life far beyond the construction phase. These include the usage and ongoing safety of the runway car park. The Parish Council is the advocate for the community. The applicant must be able to demonstrate that they have worked with the community. This condition must be amended to reflect that.
- Condition 26 The Heritage Strategy – again, this planning condition acknowledges the need to involve the community. The Parish Council should be a named participant.
- Conditions 32 and 33 – Management of the private and the three public car parks cannot be disassociated from each other (the public car parks will be used as overflow for the new apartments). The Parish Council should be a named participant in the production of the Car Park Management Plans, along with the owners of The Square and the other two public car parks. The commercial viability of The Square and its health-related services may be significantly impacted by the reduction in the number of spaces and increased demand from visitors and employees at the new development. We wish in principle to take ownership of the runway car park, but it must come with enforcement rights, powers to manage the car park and its users, power to manage temporary closures for village events.

5. The ESC proposed Planning Conditions are defective in the following respects:

- Condition 2 – The latest site plan (PO9 dated 6.4.2021) does not indicate any vehicular access points or vehicular routes to the Green for community events. This was included in previous iterations of the site plan albeit in an unacceptable location. The access point we have consistently requested is along the eastern side of the Green well away from where people gather on Village Day. This version of the plan does not show how unauthorised access to the Green will be prevented.
- Condition 23 - Strategy for the former runway –The Parish Council welcomes and appreciates the Heritage design elements shown in the latest sketch plan. The Parish Council should be named consultants to the Strategy.
- Condition 23 –The 'Design Heritage and Landscape Strategy' - should be retitled 'The Design, Usage, Heritage and Landscape Strategy'.
- Condition 23 –A funding Strategy for the ongoing maintenance of the former runway is required prior to commencement of development.
- Condition 26 - To add clarity and for consistency with other the Conditions, and to ensure the Condition is complied with in good time, "Prior to use" must be replaced with "Prior to commencement of development".
- Condition 32 - Car Parking- this condition does not go far enough. Residents, as the property owners, will also book outside contractors and services for their flats. The Condition must clarify that any references to contractor/trade/service bookings includes services commissioned for both residents and developer. Enforcement provisions must be prescribed within the Condition.
- Condition 34 – parking amenities – infrastructure provision should be made for electric point installation in the public as well as private car park as shown on some iterations of the site plans. The Parish Council also suggested that additional ducting be put in place to allow further EV charge points to be added with minimal upheaval as EV penetration rises.

- Condition 37 – A requisite element of the Construction Management Plan must be proposals to handle displaced car parking during the construction phase. Accessibility to the surgery and shops for residents unable to walk any distance MUST be maintained. Informative 13 applies equally to the construction phase as the post construction phase. During construction access for doctors and ambulances to the yard behind the surgery must be maintained during their opening hours.

Yours sincerely

S C Robertson

Susan Robertson
Clerk

Cc Philip Ridley, Head of Planning and Coastal Management

Ward member Cllr Blundell requests that a site visit is conducted in view of the importance to the local community.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Anglian Water	08 April 2021	14 April 2021
Summary of comments: No objection (informatives noted).		

9.49 Without a good estimate of the current parking demand in the village centre it is difficult to objectively ascertain as to whether the proposed overall provision is adequate. The applicant does not appear to have supplied such an estimate beyond two days of car parking surveys. However, with a combination of separate suitable management plans for the private and public car parks, and possible Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) control of parking on the adjacent public highway, it is possible that the car parking arrangements could prove successful - better management of the car parks use could offset the decrease in number of spaces. To prove successful the management of the private car parking spaces within the site's security railings may need to be unallocated, and the 'private' spaces currently proposed may need to be a kind of hybrid public/private car parking area.

11.1 The following conditions have been revised to reflect agreed changes with the applicant and to incorporate comments raised by Martlesham Parish Council (see above letter).

Condition 23

No development shall take place above damp proof course level until a Design, Usage, Heritage and Landscape Strategy for the former runway area has been submitted to and agreed by the local planning authority, in consultation with Martlesham Parish Council. The strategy shall include 'detailed design elements' (layout; quantity of car parking spaces; surface materials; landscaping,

lighting; cycle parking; street furniture and signage; and appearance of all car parking features); and an ongoing funding strategy. It shall also address all pertinent matters associated with the overall vision and character of the area and its setting; the design approach to the public realm; measures to reflect and enhance the historic importance; and the principles of car park/public space hierarchy to address, movement and permeability. The approved scheme shall be carried out and made available in its entirety prior to first occupation and shall be retained thereafter and used for no other purpose. All work must be carried out using the approved materials and in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the development will not harm the historic character of the non-designated heritage asset, to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interest of visual amenity, and to allow for a safely designed layout for the benefit of public use.

Condition 26

Prior to the use of the former runway car park, a Public Heritage Scheme shall be submitted to and agreed by the local planning authority, in consultation with Martlesham Parish Council. It shall set out a strategy of engagement and delivery of a heritage installation on the site. It shall include details of how the management body and community will influence the delivery of the installation and how, if possible, other on site and adjacent organisations could contribute to that delivery. This may include Martlesham Aviation Society and other occupiers of Martlesham Heath. The heritage installation shall be agreed and delivered within a timeframe set out in that document.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed heritage installation makes the appropriate provision of community led involvement whilst ensuring the feature suitably represents the historical importance of the non-designated heritage asset.

Condition 33

No part of the development shall be commenced until the initial Public Car Park Management Plan (PCPMP) and timescales for later ongoing reviews of the PCPMP, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: A Public Car Park Management Plan is to be employed to help ensure that the public spaces are used to their maximum effectiveness and reduce the likelihood that motorist visitors to the Village Centre services and amenities, might choose to, or need to, park elsewhere locally outside of the public car parks. A pre-commencement condition is required to ensure any changes to layout, identified during the preparation of the PCPMP, would not require expensive remedial action making such layout changes unviable.

Condition 37

Before the development hereby permitted is commenced a Construction Management Plan shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the approved construction statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction of the development. The Construction Management Plan shall include the following matters:

- parking and turning for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- provision of public car parking during construction
- loading and unloading of plant and materials
- piling technique
- storage of plant and materials

- provision and use of wheel washing facilities
- programme of site and all associated works such as utilities including details of traffic
- management necessary to undertake these works
- site working and delivery times
- a communications plan to inform local residents of the program of works
- provision of boundary hoarding and lighting
- details of proposed means of dust suppression
- details of measures to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction
- haul routes for construction traffic on the highway network and
- monitoring and review mechanisms.
- details of deliveries times to the site during construction phase.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety to avoid the hazard caused by mud on the highway, to ensure minimal adverse impact on the public highway during the construction phase, and to reduce the potential impacts of noise pollution and additional vehicular movements in this area during the construction phase of the development.

Informatives

The following informatives have been added to reflect the comments received by Anglian Water.

- Notification of intention to connect to the public sewer under S106 of the Water Industry Act Approval and consent will be required by Anglian Water, under the Water Industry Act 1991. Contact Development Services Team 0345 606 6087.
- Protection of existing assets - A public sewer is shown on record plans within the land identified for the proposed development. It appears that development proposals will affect existing public sewers. It is recommended that the applicant contacts Anglian Water Development Services Team for further advice on this matter. Building over existing public sewers will not be permitted (without agreement) from Anglian Water.
- Building near to a public sewer - No building will be permitted within the statutory easement width of 3 metres from the pipeline without agreement from Anglian Water. Please contact Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087.
- The developer should note that the site drainage details submitted have not been approved for the purposes of adoption. If the developer wishes to have the sewers included in a sewer adoption agreement with Anglian Water (under Sections 104 of the Water Industry Act 1991), they should contact our Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087 at the earliest opportunity. Sewers intended for adoption should be designed and constructed in accordance with Sewers for Adoption guide for developers, as supplemented by Anglian Water's requirements.

Heads of Terms

Draft Heads of Terms were submitted by the applicant on 21 April 2021 – these are shown below.

Section 106 Agreement - planning application reference DC/20/1036/FUL
Heads of Terms

1. Site Address

Land East and West of the Square, Martlesham Heath, Martlesham, Suffolk

2. Proposed Development

Construction of retirement apartments for the elderly, a new public car park, access, landscaping and ancillary development.

3. Financial S106 contributions

Requirement	Proposed sum	Phasing/Trigger
Public Art / Heritage Designation Plaque	The sum of £[TBC] to be applied towards public art / heritage plaque at the retained runway section	Prior to 50% Occupation
Habitat Mitigation	The sum of £321.22 per dwelling to mitigate in-combination recreational disturbance impacts on habitat sites (European designated sites)	Prior to 50% Occupation
Section 106 Monitoring Fee	The sum of £412 payable to the County Council	Prior to Commencement of Development

4. Highways obligations

Requirement	Proposed obligation	Phasing/Trigger
Bond (returnable)	Provision of a returnable bond in the sum of £15,000 to monitor local parking issues, and progress any necessary TRO to prevent adjacent on-street parking (including on Eagle Way) to address any harm from any localised on-street parking that might potentially arise as a result of the development. Bond to be in place for period of 5 years from the date of first Occupation.	Bond to be provided prior to first Occupation
Accessible Community Parking	To secure the provision of the former runway site as an area of 'accessible community parking' for business needs and vitality of the local centre.	To be provided prior to first Occupation
Cycle Track	Provision of frontage cycle track linking USRN38680534 (Cycle Track: Eagle Way to Valiant Road) and USRN38606516 (Cycle track Eagle Way to Gloster Road) to be delivered via Section 278 Agreement.	Section 278 Agreement (including adoption provisions under Section 38) to be entered into prior to first Occupation
Footway / Cycle Crossing	Provision of raised table footway/cycleway crossing where cycle and footpath routes cross Eagle Way to be delivered via Section 278 Agreement.	Section 278 Agreement (including adoption provisions under Section 38) to be entered into prior to first Occupation

5. Transfer obligations

Requirement	Proposed obligation	Phasing/Trigger
Car Park Transfer	Transfer of new car park area to the Parish Council	Transfer to be offered in writing to Parish Council prior to first Occupation
Public Open Space transfer	Transfer of public open space to the Parish Council	Transfer to be offered in writing to Parish Council prior to first Occupation

Community Infrastructure Levy

As wider pedestrian improvements have been requested by the Parish Council these may fall within works which the Parish Council could deliver through the Neighbourhood CIL it would receive from this development. The calculation below has therefore been provided as a guide and Neighbourhood CIL (not District CIL) is a benefit of development.

The site falls within the Mid Zone which is £90/sqm (currently £115.71sqm for permissions granted in 2021).

The calculation will therefore be if permission is granted in 2021: 3399sqm x £90 x 333/259 = **£393,312.86**

Martlesham have a Neighbourhood Plan at this time and therefore if the permission is approved and the development commenced the Parish Council would receive 25% of the CIL receipts (uncapped). Based on the calculation above they would receive approx. **£98,328.21** once receipts have been received from the developer.