

Public Document Pack



Democratic Services
White Cliffs Business Park
Dover
Kent CT16 3PJ

Telephone: (01304) 821199
Fax: (01304) 872452
DX: 6312
Minicom: (01304) 820115
Website: www.dover.gov.uk
e-mail: democraticservices@dover.gov.uk

19 June 2017

Dear Councillor

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** on Thursday 22 June 2017 at 6.00 pm, the following report that was unavailable when the agenda was printed.

4 **MINUTES** (Pages 2-13)

To confirm the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 25 May 2017.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be "Nicky", written over a horizontal line.

Chief Executive

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 25 May 2017 at 6.02 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor F J W Scales

Councillors: B W Butcher
J S Back
T A Bond
M D Conolly
B Gardner
P J Hawkins
D P Murphy
G Rapley
P M Wallace

Officers: Team Leader (Development Management)
Principal Planner
Senior Planner
Planning Officer
Planning Officer
Senior Heritage Officer
Planning Consultant
Planning Delivery Manager
Locum Planning Solicitor
Democratic Support Officer

The following persons were also present and spoke in connection with the applications indicated:

<u>Application No</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>
DOV/17/00039	Ms Michele Parry	-----
DOV/16/01254 & DOV/16/01255	Councillor M Eddy	Councillor A Friend
DOV/17/00226	-----	Mr John Wratten
DOV/17/00267	Mr David Stewart	Ms Eloise Marshall
DOV/16/01460	Ms Liz Waller	Mr David Emms
DOV/16/01479	Mrs Barbara Ledger	Ms Claudine Nutley
DOV/16/00626	Ms Jeanne Taylor	Councillor S Le Chevalier
DOV/16/01026	Mr Mark Quinn	-----

1 APOLOGIES

It was noted that apologies for absence had been received from Councillors T J Bartlett and D G Cronk.

2 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4, Councillors M D Conolly and P M Hawkins had been appointed as substitute members for Councillors Bartlett and Cronk respectively.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor T A Bond declared an Other Significant Interest in respect of Agenda Item 7 (Application Nos DOV/16/01254 and DOV/16/01255 – Deal Town Hall, High Street, Deal) by reason that he was a Deal Town Councillor.

4 MINUTES

Subject to the addition of Councillor G Rapley and the correction of Minute 164 to read '2,000 one-way traffic movements in a 24-hour period', the Minutes of the meeting held on 20 April 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5 ITEMS DEFERRED

The Chairman advised that the two items listed (Application No DOV/16/00530 (Site adjacent to 5 Friends Close, Deal) and Application No DOV/16/01328 (Land rear of Archers Court Road, Whitfield) remained deferred.

6 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT

The Chairman announced that Agenda Items 9 (Application No DOV/17/00093 – 28 Union Road, Deal) and 15 (Application No DOV/16/0450 – Land adjacent to Fernfield Lane, Hawkinge) had been withdrawn from the agenda and would not be considered at the meeting.

7 APPLICATION NO DOV/17/00039 - FIVEWAYS, THE CROSS, EASTRY

The Committee viewed photographs of the application site which lay within the Conservation Area. The Planning Officer advised that the application sought a change of use from a hairdresser's to a café on the ground floor. Members were referred to paragraphs 3.1 to 3.9 of the report which set out the key issues. The proposal supported the economic objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and approval was therefore recommended.

Councillor B W Butcher welcomed the idea of a new café in Eastry. Concerns had been raised about parking, but spaces were available near the church and at the pub which had now closed. In response to the Chairman, the Team Leader (Development Management) clarified that a condition on hours of operation could be attached to reflect the hours proposed in the application. This would restrict opening from 8.00am to 6.00pm, with closure on Sundays and Bank Holidays. An application to vary these would be required should the applicant wish to change them at a later stage.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/17/00039 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Timescale of commencement of development;
- (ii) List of approved plans;
- (iii) Details of mechanical ventilation to kitchen area;
- (iv) Hours of opening: 08.00am to 6.00pm, Monday to Saturday. Closed Sundays and Bank Holidays.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with

the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

8 APPLICATION NOS DOV/16/01254 AND DOV/16/01255 - DEAL TOWN HALL, HIGH STREET, DEAL

Members were shown drawings and photographs of the application site. The Planning Officer advised Members that the applications sought planning permission and listed building consent for the installation of gates and railings in the undercroft area of Deal Town Hall, a Grade II-listed building. There had previously been railings of a different height and design in a similar position. Officers considered that the proposed installations would not be visually intrusive in the street scene and, furthermore, would cause no harm to the listed building or Conservation Area.

In response to Councillor B Gardner, the Senior Heritage Officer clarified that the gates would be affixed by drilling four holes into the ceiling of the undercroft and one into the floor. The Chairman added that Deal Town Council had clearly sought to identify a method of installation which would have the least impact on the fabric of the building.

Councillor Gardner referred to the fact that other applications for the installation of gates and shutters in the High Street had been refused. However, he accepted that this proposal was necessary in order to tackle the problem of anti-social behaviour perpetrated by people sleeping in the undercroft. Councillor M D Conolly commented that the gates were an elegant solution to a problem that needed to be addressed.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application Nos DOV/16/01254 (Planning Permission) and DOV/16/01255 (Listed Building Consent) be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) 3-year commencement;
- (ii) Built in accordance with the approved drawings and details;
- (iii) Railings and gates to be installed in accordance with approved details.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary conditions in respect of the Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent in line with the issues set out in the recommendations and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

(Councillor T A Bond withdrew from the Chamber during consideration of this item.)

9 APPLICATION NO DOV/17/00226 - 7 CHESTNUT CLOSE, WHITFIELD

Members were shown a map, drawings and photographs of the application site. The Planning Officer advised that the application sought planning permission for a single storey side extension to a detached bungalow and the demolition of the existing garage. Planning permission was required as the ridge height of the extension would be half a metre higher than allowed under permitted development legislation.

In response to Councillor T A Bond, the Planning Officer clarified that the 50% rule relating to the percentage of a site that could be developed related to new development only and did not include the existing house. In response to the Chairman, it was clarified that the applicant intended to extend the boundary fence by half a metre in order to mitigate overlooking into 8 Chestnut Close.

Councillor Conolly questioned the applicant's assertion that the house would never be occupied by drivers since it was not certain that the property would always be used for the same purpose. The Planning Officer advised that the formation of two new bedrooms would allow a maximum of four people to live at the property, according to information received from the applicant. The Team Leader confirmed that the dwelling was not a registered care home, but legislation permitted up to six people to live together as a family household. The property therefore remained a C3 dwelling-house.

Councillor P M Wallace raised concerns that the house could potentially be occupied by as many as nine people which worried him in respect of parking. The Chairman advised that there was no evidence to support a refusal on parking grounds. Whilst the future occupancy of the property was relevant, the Committee needed to assess the application in front of it. The Planning Officer added that the proposal's effect on the street scene had been assessed. However, Members were reminded that, under permitted development rights, the applicant (and other residents) could build an extension with a lower roof pitch without planning permission and this was likely to be worse in appearance.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/17/00226 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) 3-year commencement;
- (ii) Built in accordance with approved drawings;
- (iii) Finishes to match existing.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

10 APPLICATION NO DOV/17/00135 - LAND FRONTING BEVAN CLOSE AND REAR OF 223 TELEGRAPH ROAD, DEAL

The Committee was shown plans and photographs of the application site. The Senior Planner advised that the application related to the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings on a site which was within the urban confines of Deal. The key issues – these being the impact on residential amenity and the overbearing and oppressive form of development - were set out in detail at paragraphs 3.3 to 3.6 of the report. Whilst there were some benefits to be derived from the proposal, it was considered that these would not outweigh the harm. The applicant had appealed to the Planning Inspectorate against non-determination and the decision on the application therefore rested with the Inspectorate. However, the Committee was requested to indicate how it would have determined the application. This would then form the basis of the Council's case at appeal.

Councillor Gardner praised the report which made a well-argued case for refusing the application.

RESOLVED: That, if an appeal for non-determination had not been received, the Committee determined that it would have REFUSED Application No DOV/17/00135 on the following grounds:

- (i) The proposed development, by reason of its scale, height, form and siting in close proximity to the neighbouring properties on Telegraph Road, would result in an unacceptable level of actual and perceived overlooking to the rear garden of 221 Telegraph Road by virtue of the increased land levels and fenestration arrangements, contrary to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 56, 58, 60, 61 and 64, and the Kent Design Guide.
- (ii) The proposed development, by virtue of the proposed height and scale of the proposed dwellings, coupled with the topography of the application site, would result in an overbearing and oppressive form of development, in particular in respect of the occupants of 221 and 223 Telegraph Road, at a level that would be harmful to their residential amenity, in conflict with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

11 APPLICATION NO DOV/17/00267 - LAND ADJOINING SUNHOLLOW, GORE LANE, EASTRY

Members viewed plans, drawings and photographs of the application site. The Team Leader (Development Management) advised that the proposal was for the erection of three detached dwellings at a site which was largely within the settlement confines of Eastry, albeit that a small part (approximately three quarters of a driveway width) of the site extended beyond the western side of the settlement boundary. The development of the site was established in principle by virtue of its inclusion in policy LA30 of the Land Allocations Local Plan. Several applications for the development of the same site had previously been refused. However, Officers considered that the scheme now proposed was suitable for the site and approval was therefore recommended.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that several previous applications for the site had proposed access via Gore Lane which had been regarded as unsatisfactory. The current application overcame those concerns. The Team Leader clarified that the two most recent applications had been refused on the grounds of the size and scale of the proposed buildings and the access arrangements which were deemed unacceptable. She confirmed that the size and scale of the current proposed dwellings had been reduced considerably. Any changes to these would be regarded as a material change and would require further permission.

In response to Councillor Gardner who suggested a deferral or refusal on the grounds of encroachment into the countryside, the Chairman suggested that a refusal on those grounds would be difficult to defend given the negligible amount of land involved. Councillor Butcher spoke in favour of the proposal which was now acceptable as a result of amendments made by the applicant, including reducing the number of dwellings and changing the access arrangements. Following concerns raised by Councillor Wallace, the Team Leader advised that the maintenance and management of communal landscaped areas could be included in conditions.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/17/00267 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Time limit;
- (ii) Plans;
- (iii) Samples;
- (iv) Hard and soft landscaping, including boundary treatments;
- (v) Submission of landscape management and maintenance plan;
- (vi) Parking spaces;
- (vii) Turning space;
- (viii) Visibility splays;
- (ix) Bound surface first 5 metres;
- (x) No surface water onto highway;
- (xi) Bin storage;
- (xii) Cycle storage;
- (xiii) Obscure glazing – plot 3, first floor, northern elevation;
- (xiv) Construction Management Plan;
- (xv) Archaeology.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

12 APPLICATION NO DOV/16/01460 - LAND ADJACENT TO FORMER NIGHTCLUB, ADRIAN STREET, DOVER

The Committee was shown an aerial view, drawings and photographs of the application site. The Team Leader (Development Management) advised that the site was considered suitable for accommodating the Dover soup kitchen for a temporary period. The granting of temporary planning permission would give the operators of the soup kitchen an imperative to find an alternative site. If one was not forthcoming, it would be open to the operators to apply for an extension of the temporary permission.

Councillor J S Back stated that he was finding it difficult to refuse the application on planning grounds. However, he disliked the location and suggested that the Ladywell car park would be more suitable. Councillor G Rapley stated that she was approaching the application with an open mind, and would listen to all the arguments for and against the proposal. That said, she had concerns about the suitability of the proposed location, and questioned why a permanent site had not been found. The siting of the portable building and Portaloo in the car park would deprive children living in Adrian Street of somewhere to play outdoors as it was currently used for this purpose. She also raised concerns regarding the lack of lighting on the Portaloo and queried who would be responsible for cleaning it. The proposed use was likely to lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour in the area, as had been seen at Pencester Road car park, the soup kitchen's previous location. It was evident when considering the scoring given by Building Control that there were other, more suitable car parks available.

The Chairman agreed that other sites were probably more suitable. However, Members needed to assess the application before them. Members' hands were not

tied and they could refuse the application in the expectation that a better site would come forward. He reminded Councillor Rapley that the rights of children had to be balanced against material planning considerations.

Councillor Bond shared concerns raised about children and the fact that the proposed location was in a residential area. However, like Councillor Back he could find no solid planning grounds on which to refuse the application. Notwithstanding this, he suggested that the hours of operation could be conditioned so as to restrict the soup kitchen to operating from 8.30 to 9.30pm to reflect the sort of activity that would have occurred when the nightclub was open. The Chairman advised him that the application before Committee could not be modified, and this was particularly the case when Members did not know how such a condition would affect the practical operation of the soup kitchen.

Councillor Wallace praised the work of the soup kitchen, but argued that the Ladywell car park was a much better location, being next to the police station and surrounded by CCTV. There had been problems in the ward with a stabbing and anti-social behaviour. Coupled with the closure of the park and the presence of several tent-dwellers, there was an impression that Adrian Street and the surrounding area was being regarded as a bit of a dumping ground. He was minded to approve the application in order to help the soup kitchen but, at the same time, it was crucial to try and find a permanent, long-term solution in order to help the residents of Adrian Street.

Councillor P J Hawkins expressed concerns that a deferral of the application would deprive people who relied on the soup kitchen. Councillor Bond agreed that a temporary permission had to be granted, but suggested that this be amended to 6 months. Councillor Conolly queried why a permanent location in one of the church halls had not been identified. He also raised concerns regarding the proximity of the soup kitchen to the St James's development which was due to open in January 2018. Councillor Hawkins advised that church facilities were usually in use in the evening and therefore not available for the soup kitchen. Councillor Rapley commented that she was not against the soup kitchen being given 6 months' temporary permission, provided the operation was controlled and any problems arising were acted upon.

It was moved by Councillor B Gardner and duly seconded that the application be approved as per the report recommendation, subject to the inclusion of lighting and the installation of CCTV.

On being put to the vote, the motion was LOST.

It was moved by Councillor J S Back that the application be approved as per the report recommendation, subject to temporary permission being granted for no longer than 6 months and the inclusion of lighting and the installation of CCTV.

On being put to the vote, the motion was CARRIED.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/16/01460 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Time;
- (ii) Approved plans;
- (iii) Temporary permission, not longer than 6 months;

- (iv) Site restoration to former condition and appearance after use has ceased;
- (v) Management scheme including details of lighting, and installation and details of CCTV;
- (vi) Hours of operation.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

13 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 8.15pm for a short break and reconvened at 8.21pm.

14 APPLICATION NO DOV/16/01479 - LAND AT DEERLEAP, 50 MILL LANE, SHEPHERDSWELL

The Committee viewed photographs of the application site. The Planning Consultant advised that the application sought planning permission for a change of use of the land for the keeping of horses, together with the erection of stabling and the construction of a manège. The principle of horse-related development was recognised in Policy DD21 of the Council's Core Strategy. The proposed stabling was of an appropriate design and it was considered that the development would not harm the character or appearance of the area. In addition to those set out in the report, it was proposed that further conditions be added, namely the removal of permitted development rights for the agricultural land to protect the grazing area, and the prohibition of public/private events and gymkhanas and jumps and other paraphernalia outside the manège. The use of lighting would also be restricted.

The Chairman advised that the number of acres required to keep horses depended on how they would be exercised and whether their feed would be supplemented. Whilst the application site was moderate in area, the land outlined in blue on the plans was within the applicant's ownership and would be used to graze the horses.

In response to Councillor Gardner who suggested that the application should be deferred for drainage and sycamore details, the Planning Consultant advised that details of drainage would be conditioned, but details were not currently available. Unless Councillors were of the view that the site could not be adequately drained, a condition requiring that details be submitted for approval was appropriate. The issue of poisonous trees was a matter for the applicant.

In respect of highways, the Committee was advised that Officers acknowledged that the roads were narrow, although this was not unusual for a rural area. However, there would be a maximum of 8 horses at the site not owned by the applicant, and it was unlikely that the owners would all be visiting at the same time. It was therefore considered that the amount of traffic generated by the development would be acceptable.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/16/01479 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Time limit;
- (ii) Correct plans;
- (iii) Drainage;

- (iv) Landscaping details;
- (v) Landscape implementation;
- (vi) Provision of parking and turning facilities;
- (vii) Details of the storage of jumps and horseboxes. No jumps or equestrian paraphernalia outside of the manège;
- (viii) Details of lighting on stables. No lighting anywhere else on site;
- (ix) No subdivision of land (including blue land) at any time. Removal of permitted development rights for agricultural land;
- (x) No chattels, buildings or hard surfaced areas;
- (xi) No events (public or private) or gymkhanas.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

15 APPLICATION NO DOV/16/00626 - LAND AT RINGWOULD ALPINE NURSERY, DOVER ROAD, RINGWOULD

Members were shown photographs of the application site which lay within the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and outside the village confines of Ringwould. The Planning Consultant advised that the application sought planning permission for a water bottling factory on land that currently hosted a low-key plant nursery. As an update to the report, Members were advised that 21 letters of support had been received, referring to the provision of jobs. As a change to the reasons for refusal set out in the report, 'noise' in recommendation 2 should be amended to read 'activity and disturbance'.

The application needed to be judged against policies DM3, DM15 and DM16 of the Core Strategy. DM3 required that permission should only be given for new commercial development in a rural area where it was located in a rural service centre. This was not the case with Ringwould which was designated as a village. Policy DM3 also required that the development should be consistent with the scale and setting of the settlement and not generate significant travel demand. DM15 was designed to protect the countryside, and DM16 reaffirmed the importance of landscape character and the special protection enjoyed by the AONB. The NPPF promoted strong rural economies, and the relocation of a successful local business would normally be supported by the Council. However, the development's proposed location in the AONB meant that paragraph 116 of the NPPF was relevant. This stated that development in the AONB should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.

The proposed development would bring about significant change in Ringwould resulting from the erection of a large building (with the associated lighting and hardstanding) which would dwarf nearby properties. It would undoubtedly have an impact on the adjoining settlement and character of the area, and would appear incongruous in the location. Views of the building from the main road would generate harm, as would the lighting on the AONB, particularly in winter months. The Council's Landscape Officer had advised that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the countryside and the AONB. Whilst the applicant claimed that the development would create 15 new jobs, no timeframe had been given for these. Moreover, no evidence had been submitted to

demonstrate that alternative sites had been researched and discounted. It was accepted that there were potential economic benefits, but these did not overcome the harm that would be caused to the countryside and AONB.

Kent County Council (KCC) Highways had raised no technical objections to the proposal and considered parking to be acceptable. In respect of the impact on residential amenity, a detailed assessment had been submitted, and the Council's Environmental Health Officer had raised no objections. Nevertheless, the view of Officers was that residents living in the AONB could expect a certain level of quietude, and introducing an industrial use into such an area would lead to alien and unusual activity which would result in disturbance and harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring residents.

Councillor Back commented that the site lay outside the settlement confines on a busy road which would present difficulties for large lorries trying to join it from the factory. The site was not suitable for such a development and the application should be refused. The Chairman advised Members that it would be inadvisable to include highways as a reason for refusal when KCC Highways had raised no technical objections to the proposal. Councillor Wallace stated that the existence of exceptional circumstances might have persuaded him to approve the application. However, he had concerns about lighting, disturbance, the effect on the AONB and, in particular, highways.

RESOLVED: That Application No DOV/16/00626 be REFUSED on the following grounds:

- (i) The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, form and materials, together with the level of lighting and outdoor commercial activity and the alterations to the vehicular access, would lead to unacceptable detrimental and harmful impact upon the open, natural and scenic beauty of the landscape and character of the area which would be contrary to policies DM15 and DM16 of the Dover District Core Strategy, Policy LLC1 of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan, and the requirements of paragraphs 115 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- (ii) The proposed development would result in additional activity and disturbance and light spill that would result in a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, over and above that expected within a rural locality and within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposal would therefore prove to be contrary to paragraphs 17 and 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

16 APPLICATION NO DOV/16/01026 - LAND SOUTH-WEST AT HAMMILL BRICKWORKS, HAMMILL ROAD, WOODNESBOROUGH

The Committee was shown a map, drawings and photographs of the site. The Principal Planner reminded Members that the application site was situated in an isolated location outside the settlement confines, in the southern part of, and on a corner opposite, a wider site known as Hammill Brickworks. Outline planning permission was sought for the erection of 18 dwellings, and full planning permission

was sought for the change of use of two engine sheds to office accommodation and five residential dwellings.

The site had been the subject of a number of previous applications, and 19 dwellings were currently being built on the site. The planning history of the site was set out at section d) of the report. Since the previous applications had been determined, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) had achieved a 5-year supply of housing land which meant that the policies of the Council's Local Plan could be considered up to date. These policies included DM1 of the Core Strategy which sought to prevent development outside the settlement confines.

Referring Members to paragraphs 2.17 to 2.20 of the report, the Principal Planner advised that the conversion of the engine sheds to residential and office accommodation was supported by Policy DM4 of the Core Strategy, and the proposals were considered acceptable. The outline application for 18 dwellings was indicative only. However, the development would be high density and Officers were of the view that it would be a prominent and alien feature in the landscape, exacerbating the impact of the existing development.

The applicant had submitted a Viability Assessment which had been independently assessed by the Council's consultant. The applicant had originally agreed to make a contribution of £450,000 towards off-site affordable housing. However, a revised offer of £575,000 had been put to Officers immediately before the meeting.

Paragraphs 2.48 to 2.66 of the report set out a range of material considerations, including the potential benefits of the scheme. However, it was considered that the latter were not sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the countryside. In summary, the development would be contrary to Policies CP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF. There were no material considerations that would justify setting aside the Local Plan and for this reason refusal was recommended.

Councillor Gardner proposed that the application should be deferred in order for Officers to assess the increased affordable housing contribution offered by the developer.

The Chairman reminded Members that planning permission was not available to whoever made the highest bid. The increased contribution needed to be weighed against the wider public benefits and loss of land in the countryside. The Hammill Brickworks site had been a thorn in the LPA's side for years, and the site had been much improved as a result of considerable efforts by the developer. However, the Committee would need sound reasons to depart from the Local Plan.

Councillors Conolly and Wallace supported the scheme which in their view was completing the job started by phase 1 of the development. There would certainly be benefits in tidying the site up rather than leaving it in its current state. Councillor Bond had disliked the first phase of the scheme, but recognised that there was a need in the district for more executive housing to serve employers such as those at the Discovery Park. Whilst he was reluctant to depart from the Local Plan, he understood the benefits of the scheme.

The Principal Planner advised that the Local Plan could be set aside if there was a material consideration that justified the granting of planning permission. Policy DM1 required that there should be compelling reasons for doing so. Officers were of the view that not only was the site unsustainable, the proposed development was

larger and of a higher density than the existing scheme, and therefore unacceptable.

In respect of drainage, it was clarified that Southern Water had no responsibility for the site which was in a groundwater protection zone. Water was treated on site and then taken to the farm owned by the developer for disposal. The Environment Agency had granted a licence for this purpose and this would need to be updated.

RESOLVED: That, notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation, Application No DOV/16/01026 be DEFERRED for: (i) Further assessment of the Viability Assessment; and (ii) To understand whether there will be any additional public benefits arising from the developer's revised financial offer.

17 EXTENSION OF MEETING

The Chairman advised the Committee that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9, the Committee was required to pass a resolution to continue the meeting beyond 10.00pm.

18 APPEALS AND INFORMAL HEARINGS

The Committee noted that there was no information to receive regarding appeals or informal hearings.

19 ACTION TAKEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ORDINARY DECISIONS (COUNCIL BUSINESS) URGENCY PROCEDURE

The Committee noted that no action had been taken since the last meeting.

The meeting ended at 9.57 pm.