

PDH4. Erection of Manufacturing Facility (Class 5), Ancillary Office (Class 4) and Associated Development at Earls Gate Park, Beancross Road Grangemouth for Piramal Pharma Solutions- P/20/0612/FUL

The Committee considered a report by the Director of Development Services on an application for national development seeking full planning permission for the erection of a manufacturing facility (class 5), ancillary office (class 4) and associated development at Earls Gate Park, Beancross Road, Grangemouth.

1. The Planning Officer (J Seidel) outlined the nature of the application and the consultations carried out. There had been no public representations submitted. Grangemouth Community Council had not objected to the proposal although it raised two issues in relation to the construction phase of the development. These were the need for clarification on the duration of the piling activities and the need for the provision of construction workers' parking.
2. The applicant's representative (K Thorne) was heard in relation to the application. He explained that the planning application, as submitted, was national development and sought full planning permission for the erection of a manufacturing facility (class 5), ancillary office (class 4) and associated development. There were currently five operating buildings and between 140 and 170 personnel. The company was involved in manufacturing biopharmaceutical drugs for the treatment of various cancers and other life limiting conditions. It specialised in manufacturing oncology fighting drugs such as lymphoma and in the coming years it hoped to develop into drugs treating head and brain cancers. Global clients had asked if the company could upscale its manufacturing capacity. This would not be possible at the present scale of operation and required a larger site. The company had looked at a range of site options but ideally the development and manufacture at the same location was the best option. There would be three phases of expansion over a 10 year period. It was estimated that the additional staff resource would total 70 and amount to 210 staff overall. Other local organisations and business would clearly benefit from the expansion of the site.

At this point it was proposed to show a video detailing the work to be undertaken on the site. Due however to technical difficulties, this could not be shown on screen. Members would receive copies of the video footage following the meeting. The video highlighted the 'Incopation' work with head and neck cancers. This detailed how treatment entered the cancer cells. It was a non toxic method and a key development in cancer therapy.

3. No consultee representatives present wished to be heard in respect of the application at this point.
4. Questions were then asked by Members of the Committee as follows:-

- Q(a) Clarification was sought on the response to the objection by the Health and Safety (HSE) on safety grounds.

Response by the applicant's representative (K Thorne):-

The HSE objection related to the number of people who would occupy the building. Once completed the total would be around 140.

- Q(b) Clarification was sought on the Council's response to the HSE concerns.

Response by the Planning Officer (J Seidel):-

There were multiple hazardous consultation zones relevant to the site. The number of staff and the number of stories on the building has triggered the objection. The applicant has tried to look at taking elements outwith the area and reducing staff but that hasn't proved possible. There would be a robust assessment of the health and safety objection and, clearly, material considerations associated with the application site in the report that will be provided to Planning Committee in due course. If the Planning committee was minded to grant the application at a future meeting, the matter would require to be referred to Scottish Ministers as with all applications where there was a Health and Safety Executive objection.

- Q(c) Clarification was sought on whether the drugs produced were cancer drugs.

Response by the applicant's representative (K Thorne):-

These oncology drugs were used as a last resort for the treatment of cancer. The value of these drugs was large. Generally other methods of dealing with cancer were used such as chemotherapy. Results had shown however that when used, they were very effective in the long term.

- Q(d) Clarification was sought on whether the majority of these drugs were exported.

Response by the applicant's representative (K Thorne):-

Yes they were primarily exported.

- Q(e) Clarification was sought on the location of hazardous products on the site and the safety implications.

Response by the applicant's representative (K Thorne):-

If you take the location of the present site in relation to the hazardous consultation zone which relates to the CalaChem production site, the new facility would be further away from the area where hazardous substances are stored. They would be moving around 60 people from the present building into the new building. So in some ways, although still within the Tier 1 zone, they would be moving people further away from the hazard. Although in Tier 1 zoning, staff would be kept away from the hazards and approaches and practices would be put in place to protect staff and members of the public.

- Q(f) Clarification was sought on whether each stage of development would be dependent on the success of the previous stage.

Response by the applicant's representative (K Thorne):-

It would most likely take around 10 years for the full facility to be built. This is dependent on market demand but the signs for success looked good. The facility would provide benefit for Grangemouth and for Europe.

- Q(g) Clarification was sought on the bio hazard and safety procedures in place.

Response by the applicant's representative (K Thorne):-

There are some toxic materials used but the quantities are literally grams. In terms of any release, the facilities are built so that all extracts, laboratory and manufacturing areas are filtered so that any substance that is released from the manufacturing process is filtered out before the air is taken out of the area. The manufacturing systems as a whole are sealed so that the risk is minimal and all hazardous extracts are filtered from manufacturing and lab areas before they go out of the area. Should any release take place, the spill would be instantly maintained and dealt with by using chemicals on site such as caustic soda which will eliminate a lot of the dangerous chemicals quickly. Mitigation methods are also in place to reduce impacts on the area.

- Q(h) Clarification was sought on the piling and construction parking arrangements as raised by the Community Council.

Response by the applicant's representative (K Thorne):-

Concrete driven piles would be used over an estimated 60 day period. They are the lowest acoustic form of piling. Noise levels would be measured at pre-determined points within the area to ensure that the noise levels are not exceeded. Will keep to a

rigid timeline. In addition, there was agreement that dialogue would take place with Grangemouth Community Council on the timescales and scheduling of piling work. The applicant was also happy to meet with the Community Council at any point. In relation to construction parking, there was a construction and contractor parking plan in place and it was envisaged that more space would be available as an overspill area. Discussions had taken place with the neighbouring company CalaChem to mitigate issues and ensure co-ordination. It had been agreed that the applicant would look to lease an area for parking from CalaChem. . Should this arrangement not be possible, another option was use of the development's potential car parking area 3, which could operate when the construction phase was underway.

Comments were invited from the Manager, Growth and Investment, Development Services (P Reid) who commented as follows:-

From an Economic Development point of view, the development very much accorded with the Council's growth and economic strategy for the area. Consultation had taken place with the Transport Planning Co-ordinator, Development Services and with the applicant. The importance of engagement and consultation with the Grangemouth Community Council in advance of commencement of the development had been stressed. The proposal could provide job opportunities in the area. It would be beneficial to work along with Forth Valley College, academia in the area and local businesses.

5. Section 38A of the Town and Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 together with Regulation 27 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013 give those persons who have submitted representations on relevant planning applications the right to be heard before a Committee of the Council before the application is determined. No formal representations had been submitted in respect of this application nor formal requests for access to deliberations. Deliberations would however be livestreamed.
6. Further information requested by Members of the Committee for the meeting of the Planning Committee included:-
 - (a) Occupancy levels of other buildings in the area.
 - (b) Information on the form and layout of the site including the other buildings within the site; and

- (c) Information on the duration of the piling activities and the provision of construction workers parking by the applicant.

7. Close of Meeting

The Convener concluded by thanking the parties for their attendance and advising that the matter would be determined by the Planning Committee on Thursday 16 June 2021.