

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held remotely on Thursday, 17 December 2020 at 6.00 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor R S Walkden (Vice-Chairman in the chair)

Councillors: R S Walkden  
M Bates  
D G Beaney  
E A Biggs  
T A Bond  
D G Cronk  
O C de R Richardson  
H M Williams  
C F Woodgate

Officers: Principal Planner  
Planning Officer  
Planning Consultant  
Planning Solicitor  
Democratic Services Manager  
Democratic Services Officer

The following persons submitted written statements which were read out by the Democratic Services Manager in lieu of public speaking:

<u>Application No</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>
DOV/20/01076	Mr Clive Tidmarsh	Mr & Mrs Louis Thompson
DOV/20/01063	Mr John MacKenzie	Mr Anthony Byfield Ms Bridget Ransom

71 APOLOGIES

It was noted that an apology for absence had been received from Councillor J S Back.

72 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4, Councillor P D Jull had been appointed as a substitute member for Councillor J S Back.

73 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor H M Williams advised that she had sent an e-mail to residents in relation to Agenda Item 8 (Application No DOV/20/01125 – Site at Cross Road, Deal). However, she confirmed that she had not predetermined the application and was approaching it with an open mind.

Councillor P D Jull advised that he had made representations in relation to the previous application for the site at Cross Road, Deal. However, his views on Agenda Item 8 (Application No DOV/20/01125 – Site at Cross Road, Deal) amounted only to a predisposition, and his decision would be based on the discussions held at the meeting.

74 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

75 ITEMS DEFERRED

It was noted that the deferred item was not for consideration at the meeting.

76 APPLICATION NO DOV/20/01076 - LAND NORTH-EAST OF THE CLOSE NURSERY, STATION ROAD, ST MARGARET'S-AT-CLIFFE

The Committee was shown an aerial view, a map, drawings, plans and photographs of the application site which was located outside the village confines of St Margaret's-at-Cliffe and within the countryside and the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Planning Consultant advised that planning permission was sought for the erection of a detached dwelling and double garage.

The Principal Planner gave an update on the Local Plan in relation to the committee reports. Since they had been written, the draft Local Plan had been presented to Cabinet and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Cabinet had approved the draft for public consultation commencing on 20 January 2021. Whilst limited weight should be attached to the draft Local Plan at this early stage in the process, it was a material consideration. In respect of the application under consideration, the Planning Consultant added that the draft Plan did not propose to change the designation of the site within the AONB.

The Committee was reminded that it had refused an application for a very similar scheme in May 2020, on the same grounds as recommended by Officers for the refusal of the current application. The only difference between that and the current scheme was additional landscaping and tree planting along the boundary of the site, with an area left as natural grassland rather than for domestic purposes. An additional drawing had been submitted with these boundary details. A 2017 application had also been refused and dismissed at appeal in 2019. There had been little change in the physical appearance and condition of the site since 2017. The current condition of the land, the Appeal Inspector's judgement of the scheme and the Committee's previous decision on fundamentally the same proposal were material considerations in determining the application.

To clarify, Members were advised that the Appeal Inspector had stated that, given the separation distances from surrounding dwellings, the proposal would appear as a sporadic form of development that would encroach into the countryside. Furthermore, the development would suburbanise the site, eroding its rural qualities and the AONB, and the site would be clearly visible from surrounding properties, public rights of way and from Kingsdown Road to the east where the site was visible across the valley.

The applicant had referred in submissions to a nearby development of three bungalows in Nelson Park Road, a site which was also in the AONB. It was clarified that that site, unlike the one under consideration, was within the settlement confines and, as such, the two sites were not directly comparable. Although the applicant was proposing an area kept as natural grassland, it was not clear what this entailed nor how it could be controlled or enforced. It was also important to note that some of the hedgerow that currently provided some screening to the site from the AONB

was outside the application site and therefore outside the control of the applicant. This meant that the retention of the hedgerow to the south of the site and partly to the south-east should be accorded limited weight in the Committee's determination as its loss and replacement could not be controlled by planning condition.

The Planning Consultant stressed that the main point to consider was whether the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the AONB. In this regard, it was the view of Officers that the development would appear distant from surrounding properties and would be seen as a sporadic form of development in the countryside. The site was not considered to be a natural or obvious extension to the village confines. The building would be visible from surrounding properties and public vantage points, and the full height of the building would be visible from certain locations. The use of the land around the building would be domestic, with the paraphernalia associated with such use. The use of the land would similarly erode the rural qualities of the area, a factor identified by the Appeal Inspector.

Whilst the Planning Committee was entitled to come to a different view to the one that supported its previous decision, the planning reasons for this should be explicitly stated in order to explain how a different outcome was being reached, having regard to all material considerations and the great weight that was afforded in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.

The Planning Consultant advised that Members should be aware of some other matters. Firstly, that the Appeal Inspector had not considered that harm to highway safety was a reason to dismiss the 2019 appeal. Secondly, submitted with the 2017 application was a Preliminary Ecological Impact Assessment of the site which had raised no particular issues or concerns. If permission were to be granted, a series of planning conditions to address the assessment's conclusions should be imposed. Finally, in the event that the Planning Committee concluded that the proposal failed to conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB, the presumption in favour of granting permission for sustainable development (i.e. the tilted balance) would not apply.

In summary, it was considered that the application site made a positive contribution to the open character and beauty of the countryside, within the AONB. The site was visible from surrounding properties, the public rights of way and the open countryside, and should be considered as an integral part of the countryside, acting as an important visual buffer between the confines of the village and the cultivated farmland to the south. The proposed dwelling would be a sporadic form of development, visually sitting in isolation from surrounding development. Finally, the hedgerow that had been relied upon by the applicant's submissions was not within the site and the control of the applicant and, as such, could not be guaranteed as a form of screening. It was considered that the planning benefits of the scheme did not outweigh the harm that would be caused, and refusal was therefore recommended.

Councillor D G Cronk welcomed the explanation of the differences between the former and current schemes. In his view, insufficient changes had been made to come to a different view to that taken in May. He proposed that the application should be refused in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. Councillor E A Biggs agreed that the changes made were insignificant. The proposal was unacceptable due to the harm it would cause to the AONB which should be protected. Councillor H M Williams stated that the dwelling was interesting but in

the wrong place. The proposal was 'nibbling away' at the edges of the AONB and could set a precedent. In response to queries raised by Councillor P D Jull, the Planning Consultant clarified that paragraph 79(e) of the NPPF related to isolated development in the countryside which did not apply in this case. When compared with the scheme that went to appeal, the current design was well composed and an improvement – but not innovative.

Councillor O C de R Richardson argued that the site was scrubland and unattractive. The Planning Consultant stressed that the Appeal Inspector had found that the site contributed positively to the open character of the area and countryside. It was not helpful to look forensically at each parcel of land but to consider the AONB as a whole. Whilst the site might look scrubby and different to the surrounding farmland, it had a value and made a contribution to the overall scene. Councillor M Bates agreed that the site was unsightly and argued that development would enhance it.

In response to Councillor T A Bond, it was confirmed that a landscaping condition could be attached to keep the eastern section of the site as natural grassland, with details of the area required. In addition, permitted development rights could be removed to prevent development of this area. Councillor Bond was of the view that the proposal was innovative and would not detract from views of the AONB. If anything, it would improve views from the AONB by blocking out some of the houses surrounding the site. He noted that the applicant had also made improvements to the landscaping.

In response to Councillor Biggs who referred to setting a precedent, the Planning Solicitor advised that the creation of a precedent was capable of being a material consideration. The question was whether a proposal could be replicated widely across the district and therefore whether the granting of permission in this instance would create a risk of other such applications being submitted. In those circumstances, granting planning permission could be seen to be setting a precedent. By itself, the creation of a precedent would rarely constitute a reason for refusal. However, where the decision being taken was contrary to policy without compelling reason, the creation of a precedent could carry significant weight. In this case, the dwelling would be outside the settlement confines and therefore contrary to the Council's Core Strategy Policy DM1. Furthermore, the Committee was required to give great weight to conserving and enhancing the landscape of the AONB, as set out in paragraph 172 of the NPPF. Ultimately, it was for the Committee to decide how much weight should be accorded to setting a precedent by granting planning permission.

In response to a query from Councillor D G Beaney, Members were advised that, whilst possible, attaching a lifetime condition to control a matter like landscaping would be unusual and could be viewed as unreasonable. Landscaping would not last as long as the building itself, but a period of 10 to 15 years might be regarded as acceptable.

It was moved by Councillor D G Cronk and duly seconded that Application No DOV/20/01076 be REFUSED as per the Officer's recommendation.

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

Councillor Bond indicated that he would move a motion to grant planning permission and stated the grounds on which the application should be approved. The Planning Consultant advised the Committee that it would be required to state the reasons

why it was not only coming to a different view to the Officer's recommendation, but also to explain why it was departing from its previous decision of May 2020 and the Appeal Inspector's decision of 2019 which were material considerations. It was suggested that the additional information submitted by the applicant, as shown on the plan, demonstrated how the development could better assimilate with the landscape of the AONB and this, along with the grounds already stated, allowed the Committee to form a different view and come to a different decision to that taken in May 2020.

On the advice of the Planning Consultant, Members agreed that no Environmental Impact Assessment would be required. The Planning Consultant summarised the conditions that could be imposed, including the removal of permitted development rights and a 15-year period for landscaping maintenance and retention. However, he suggested that the finalisation of conditions be delegated to Officers, as was the usual practice.

It was moved by Councillor T A Bond and duly seconded that Application No DOV/20/01076 be APPROVED on the grounds stated.

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

(There being an equality of votes, the Chairman used his casting vote.)

RESOLVED: (a) That, notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation, Application No DOV/20/01076 be APPROVED on the grounds that: (i) The proposal was of an innovative design; (ii) Appeared to be part of existing development and was not in an isolated location; and (iii) Would not be detrimental to the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB which would be conserved. These grounds, together with the additional information submitted by the applicant which had demonstrated how the development could better assimilate with the landscape of the AONB, had allowed the Committee to form a different view and come to a different decision to that taken in May 2020.

(b) Conditions to include:

- (i) Time commencement;
- (ii) Drawing nos;
- (iii) Surface water and foul drainage;
- (iv) Removal of permitted development rights;
- (v) Details of natural grassland area;
- (vi) Landscaping (including hedge) to be retained and maintained for 15 years.

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

APPLICATION NO DOV/20/01063 - MORFIELD HOUSE, 11 BEWSBURY CRESCENT, WHITFIELD

Members viewed an aerial view, map, drawings, plans and photographs of the application site. The Planning Officer advised that the application sought planning permission for the erection of a dwelling and detached garage on a site which was within the settlement confines of Whitfield. The proposal was in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF, and approval was therefore recommended.

Councillor Jull referred to Whitfield Parish Council's policy against the development of back gardens. He asked how much weight could be accorded to the policy, in the way that a Neighbourhood Plan was considered to be a material consideration. The Planning Officer advised that there was no Whitfield Neighbourhood Plan and the Council did not have a policy against back-garden development. In response to Councillor Williams, she advised that no details of the driveway had been submitted, but conditions could require that it should be a permeable bound surface. She went on to clarify that applications for development along the southern side of Bewsbury Crescent had been refused and dismissed at appeal, mostly because of disturbance from driveways in close proximity to habitable rooms and harm caused to the prevailing pattern of development and the street scene.

Councillor Biggs raised concerns about back-garden development and the potential creation of a precedent. In his view the extension to the existing building and the proposed dwelling were not in keeping with neighbouring dwellings. The Planning Officer clarified that it was the roof of the extension that had not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans and which was currently the subject of investigation. The proposal was in keeping with the existing dwelling which, like others in the street, had been modernised. The Planning Solicitor advised that a precedent had already been set by virtue of the existence of other back-garden developments in the street.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/20/01063 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Standard time condition;
- (ii) List of approved plans;
- (iii) Samples of materials;
- (iv) Details of soft and hard landscaping (including boundary treatments and driveway/hardstanding surfaces) and schedule of planting;
- (v) Provision and retention of the parking area with drainage measures installed;
- (vi) Details of surface water disposal;
- (vii) Details of foul sewage disposal;
- (viii) Cables for electric vehicle charging points;
- (ix) Details of secured cycle storage;

(x) Bathroom window on south-east elevation to be fitted with obscured glazing and be non-opening below 1.7 metres above internal ground level;

(xi) Removal of permitted development rights for Classes B and C of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the GDPO.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning, 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.

78 APPLICATION NO DOV/20/01125 - SITE AT CROSS ROAD, DEAL

The Committee was shown an aerial view and maps of the application site. The Principal Planner advised that the application sought outline planning permission for the erection of 100 dwellings on a site that was situated outside but adjoining the settlement confines of Deal. As an update to the report, she advised that five additional letters of objection had been received, largely reiterating concerns raised previously, but also referring to community woodland, overdevelopment and inadequate sewerage infrastructure, amongst other things.

Members were reminded that the proposed development was a re-submission of a previous application that had been refused by the Planning Committee on 2 July 2020 on the grounds of the development's impact on air quality and the countryside. Subsequently, having sought further legal and expert advice, Officers had recommended that the refusal should not be defended at appeal due to the lack of evidence available to support the reasons for refusal. The Planning Committee had agreed with this course of action at its meeting held on 2 September 2020. Whilst an appeal date had been set for February, the applicants had submitted the application in advance of the public inquiry so as to enable the appeal to be withdrawn in the event that planning permission was granted.

The Principal Planner stressed that, as a duplicate application, the considerations that previously applied were still relevant. As a development outside the confines, the proposed development was contrary to Core Strategy Policy DM1 and in tension with Policies DM11 and DM15. However, the Council was now required to deliver 629 dwellings per annum rather than the 505 dwellings envisaged when those policies had been developed and adopted more than a decade previously. The evidence base underlying Policy DM1 was considered to be out-of-date and, for the reasons explained in paragraph 2.14 of the report, Policies DM11 and DM15 were also considered to be partially out-of-date.

The blanket ban on development beyond the urban confines in policy DM1 was inconsistent with the approach to development in the countryside found in paragraphs 77, 78 and 170 of the NPPF. Where the policies that were most important for determining an application were out-of-date, paragraph 11 of the NPPF directed that sustainable development should be approved unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This was the 'tilted balance' approach that the Committee was required to take when assessing the application.

In respect of the development's benefits, Members were reminded that, as well as making a significant contribution to the district's housing supply, the scheme would

provide 30% on-site affordable housing. It would also provide other benefits such as financial contributions towards education, health and open space. In respect of the concerns raised by residents and others, the highways impact had been thoroughly assessed and was considered acceptable subject to mitigation measures, as was the impact on the Coldblow level crossing. The proposed landscaping and green infrastructure works would ensure that the development's impact on the landscape/countryside was minimal. Expert advice had been sought on the effect on the riding school, and this would be mitigated to an acceptable degree.

Councillor Richardson expressed disappointment that the applicants had submitted the application ahead of the appeal. He also reiterated concerns expressed on previous occasions about the equine consultant having not visited or contacted the riding school. He advised that he had contacts at the British Horse Society (BHS) and would be willing to approach them for advice. On conditions, he stressed that electric vehicle charging points should be provided for every property. The Principal Planner acknowledged that the latter was an oversight, advising that the condition would be amended to provide each property with a charging point. She pointed out that the BHS had been consulted twice for advice and had not responded on both occasions.

Councillor Jull raised concerns about the accuracy of the traffic information provided by the applicants with regard to the Coldblow level crossing, and the applicants' use of Google Drivetime which he claimed was notoriously inaccurate. In particular, he disputed the number of vehicles using the route and the assertion that local residents tended not to use it because of the risk of meeting vehicles coming in the other direction. The Principal Planner confirmed that the level crossing impact assessment report had been assessed by Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Network Rail (NR), both of which had raised no concerns about the projected numbers or other evidence submitted. She reiterated that these issues had been considered previously and were set out in paragraphs 2.70 to 2.75 of the committee report.

In response to Councillor Bates who expressed concerns about the use of old traffic data, she advised that the applicants had used 2011 census data which were the most recent baseline data available. Nevertheless, the 2011 data had been updated to reflect current traffic levels, and the traffic figures provided were found to be satisfactory by the two statutory consultees. She emphasised that the proposed development could only be expected to address its direct impact and not existing and wider problems with the road network or crossing. She clarified that NR would be consulted as a statutory consultee as part of the review of the Local Plan, during which the upgrading of Coldblow level crossing could be discussed if raised by NR.

In response to Councillor Bond who questioned the purpose of the application whilst an appeal was outstanding, the Principal Planner confirmed that the Council would attend the public inquiry only to answer questions to assist the Inspector and would not be presenting evidence of any kind. She emphasised that the application should be judged on its merits. At the inquiry the Council would be required to agree a Statement of Common Ground with the applicant. This was likely to state that another planning application had been submitted and the outcome of that application.

Councillor Williams questioned why updated landscaping and equine reports had not been sought. She suggested that Councillor Richardson be asked to approach the BHS on behalf of Officers. The Principal Planner advised that there had been

no material change in circumstances since the previous application. There was therefore no requirement or justification for the Council to ask the consultants to undertake further reports at additional cost. In respect of the riding school, she advised that a significant amount of time had been spent on assessing the development's impact on the school. There was no planning evidence to suggest that there would be a long-term harmful impact on the school. Furthermore, it was difficult to see what would be gained by approaching the BHS at this late stage. In summary, independent advice had been commissioned by the Council to assess the impacts on the landscape/countryside and the riding school. This advice had allowed Officers to assess the application in the fullest way possible.

In response to concerns raised by Councillors Williams and Jull about the landscape consultant, the Principal Planner stressed that the consultant was suitably qualified, and there was no reason to believe that his practices fell short of the requirements of his professional body. Whilst there may be guidance about contacting third parties, there was no requirement for the consultant to undertake public consultation when reporting to the Council.

Councillor Bond raised concerns about the inadequate sewerage infrastructure and flooding which was an historical and ongoing problem in the area, in particular Southern Water's (SW) advice that the existing foul sewer lacked capacity for the new development. He questioned what benefits the proposed development would provide apart from some additional dwellings, a benefit that did not justify going against Policy DM1 in his opinion. In respect of DM11, no information had been provided to demonstrate how the development would encourage walking and cycling. Moreover, given that primary schools in Deal and Walmer were operating at full capacity, it was doubtful that children of primary school age would be able to walk to school from the new development which would inevitably generate more travel by car. He could not support development of the site, being of the view that the countryside should be protected unless there were sound and justifiable reasons to overturn the Council's policies.

The Principal Planner advised that the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency had been consulted on the proposed measures to deal with surface water, including an outline surface water drainage strategy, flood risk assessment and an on-site drainage pond. They had raised no objections. In addition, the site complied with the five criteria set out in the NPPF relating to the need to ensure that developments did not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. It was accepted that foul drainage was an ongoing problem in Deal, largely caused by a combined sewer in Deal town centre. The Council had been in discussions with SW in recognition that the issue needed to be resolved. Whilst the applicants were not responsible for addressing existing problems, they were required to demonstrate that their development would not make matters worse. Imposing a condition until the requisite infrastructure works had taken place was an acceptable approach and one that was supported by case law.

In respect of harm to the countryside, the Principal Planner reiterated that the site was a non-designated site. The landscape consultant had concluded that there would be no substantial harm to the countryside, such that a refusal of planning permission could be justified. On travel, she advised that the site was in a sustainable location and well connected to cycle routes and footpaths, as well as a bus route.

(The meeting was adjourned at 9.25pm for a short break and reconvened at 9.37pm.)

The Planning Solicitor advised the Committee that it should consider the circumstances surrounding the determination of the application. With the agreement of the Committee, the Council (on the basis of legal advice) had accepted that the reasons for the refusal of the previous application were not ones that could be defended at appeal due to the lack of supporting evidence. At the same time, it had been concluded that there were no other reasons on which to refuse the application. In this context, when considering the current application which was identical to the previous one, it appeared to him that the logical conclusion to reach would be that there were no grounds on which to refuse it and that planning permission should therefore be granted. Members should be mindful that Officers would be attending the public inquiry to advise the Planning Inspector that there were no reasons to refuse the previous application. A decision to refuse the current application would then appear somewhat perverse. Whilst not a material consideration, it was relevant for the Committee to note that a decision to grant planning permission was likely to lead to the applicants withdrawing their appeal, resulting in a saving of costs and resources for the Council.

In response to the Chairman, the Planning Solicitor clarified that, at this late stage and given the Committee's recent resolution not to defend its reasons for refusal, the Council's approach at the public inquiry would not change if the current application were refused. However, the existence of a separate, contradictory decision could leave the Council open to a finding of unreasonable behaviour with the potential for costs to be awarded against it. He added that Members needed to consider the 'tilted balance' and the presumption in favour of development unless any benefits were significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the adverse impacts. The addition of a significant number of dwellings to the district's housing supply was a significant benefit in this case. He advised that the draft Local Plan, which was due to go out to consultation in January, proposed to include this site in those allocated for development. Whilst the draft Local Plan carried little weight at this time, and the allocation of the site was not certain, its inclusion indicated how it was likely to be viewed in a policy context in the near future.

In response to Councillor Jull, the Planning Solicitor advised that there were no grounds on which to defer the application until the appeal had run its course as the Council's stated position was that there were no grounds on which to refuse the application.

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

**RESOLVED:** That, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9, the Committee proceeds with the business remaining on the agenda.)

In response to Councillor Williams, the Principal Planner advised that landscaping and open space at the southern boundary would form part of a legal agreement. These would be undertaken earlier than would normally be expected in order to address concerns about the impact on the riding school. Whilst the applicants had offered to undertake the works before occupation of 70% of the site, the Principal Planner advised that the applicant could be requested to carry out the works earlier than this if Members were in favour.

It was moved by Councillor D G Beaney and duly seconded that Application No DOV/20/01125 be APPROVED as per the Officer's recommendation, subject to an

amendment regarding the landscape buffer and open space at the southern boundary being brought forward of the 70% occupation figure.

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

(On there being an equality of votes, the Chairman used his casting vote.)

RESOLVED: (a) That, subject to a Section 106 legal agreement to secure necessary planning contributions and an undertaking for landscape works to be brought forward of occupation, Application No DOV/20/01125 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Reserved matters details;
- (ii) Outline time limits;
- (iii) Approved plans;
- (iv) Existing and proposed site levels and building heights;
- (v) Ecological mitigation and recommendations implemented;
- (vi) Ecological/biodiversity mitigation, enhancement and management plan;
- (vii) Construction Management Plan (inc. route for construction vehicles);
- (viii) Highway conditions (parking, visibility splays, highway works and access fully implemented prior to construction works, turning facilities, cycle parking, gradient, surface, works to all footpaths and drainage);
- (ix) Affordable housing provision (numbers, type, tenure, location, timing of construction, housing provider and occupancy criteria scheme) (if not covered in Section 106 agreement);
- (x) Landscaping details and maintenance of green spaces;
- (xi) Open space management plan;
- (xii) Protection of trees and hedges;
- (xiii) Hard landscaping works and boundary details/enclosures;
- (xiv) Reporting of unexpected land contamination;
- (xv) No works on site until final SuDS details are submitted;
- (xvi) Design details of surface water drainage strategy;
- (xvii) Implementation and verification of SuDS scheme;
- (xviii) No other infiltration on site other than that approved;

- (xix) Environmental Construction Management Plan (inc. dust management plan);
- (xx) Internal acoustic requirements for dwellings;
- (xxi)4 Stage contamination, remediation and verification conditions;
- (xxii) Programme of archaeological works;
- (xxiii) No piling on site;
- (xxiv) Details of foul drainage;
- (xxv) No occupation of development until foul infrastructure reinforcement works are completed;
- (xxvi) Details of a scheme for Secure by Design principles compliance;
- (xxvii) Broadband connection;
- (xxviii) Cabling for electric vehicle charging points to be provided for each dwelling;
- (xxix) Road signage to advise of riding school/horses;
- (xxx) Off-site highway works prior to commencement and in accordance with a phased scheme;
- (xxxi) Scheme for Traffic Regulation Order along Station Road to be implemented prior to construction works.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions, and to agree a Section 106 agreement in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

79 APPEALS AND INFORMAL HEARINGS

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

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

The Committee noted that no action had been taken.

The meeting ended at 10.08 pm.