

Public Document Pack

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 28 May 2015 at 6.00 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor F J W Scales

Councillors: B W Butcher
J S Back
S F Bannister
T A Bond
M R Eddy
B Glayzer
K E Morris
D P Murphy
P M Wallace

Officers: Head of Regeneration and Development
Principal Planner
Principal Planner
Principal Planner
Principal Planner (Renewable Energy)
Senior Planner (Development Management)
Senior Planner
Planning Consultant
Development Planner (KCC Highways and Transportation)
Principal Infrastructure and Delivery Officer
Principal 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/15/00321	Ms Stephanie Burke	Mr Phil Stucken
DOV/15/00101	Mr William Osborne	Dr Angeline Kanagasooriam
DOV/15/00115	Ms Debbie Marriage	-----
DOV/14/00477	Mr Ian Bull	Councillor M J Ovenden Mr Richard Clements
DOV/15/00256	Ms Kate Stewart	Mr Roger Ayling

142 APOLOGIES

It was noted that apologies for absence had been received from Councillors T J Bartlett, B Gardner and A F Richardson.

143 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4, Councillors K E Morris, M R Eddy and B Glayzer had been appointed as substitutes for Councillors T J Bartlett, B Gardner and A F Richardson.

144 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

It was noted that there were no declarations of interest.

145 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings held on 12 March and 9 April 2015 were approved as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

146 ITEMS DEFERRED

The Chairman advised that Application No DOV/14 01013 (The Beacon Church and Christian Centre, London Road, Dover) had been deferred at the meeting held on 12 March 2015 and was not for consideration at this meeting.

147 APPLICATION NO DOV/15/00321 - PENCESTER ROAD CAR PARK, PENCESTER ROAD, DOVER

The Committee viewed a plan of the application site. The Planning Officer advised that the soup kitchen currently operated from the Russell Street car park. However, due to the redevelopment of the St James's area, it was proposed to relocate the soup kitchen to the motorcycle parking bays in the north eastern part of the Pencester Road car park.

There had been 25 objections, 149 representations of support and 3 representations taking a neutral stance. Dover Town Council had raised no objections to the proposal, but had recommended that a more suitable location should be sought after 12 months. The Council's Community Safety Unit had also raised no objections. Members were advised that there were two proposed additions to the conditions detailed in the report. Firstly, it was proposed to restrict the hours of operation to 6.00pm and 6.30pm and, secondly, to include the standard condition that delegated powers to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions.

The Planning Officer advised that the key issues for the Committee to consider were set out at paragraph 2.1 of the report. The need for the development was established, the service having been well used for 25 years. Two alternative locations had been explored and discounted for the reasons set out in the report. The reasons for choosing Pencester Road were its central location and accessibility, good parking for volunteers and effective screening from residential properties. In security terms, there was good CCTV coverage and lighting and it was located on a main thoroughfare. There would be an impact on properties in The Paddock and, to a lesser extent, on properties in Maison Dieu Road. However, the portable building was relatively small and it was the use of the development that was more likely to have the greatest impact. Nevertheless, the proposed hours of use were limited and activity after 6.00pm in a town centre was to be expected. Due to concerns raised about security and disorder, it was proposed to give temporary permission for 18 months, to be reviewed after 12 months.

Supported by Councillors T A Bond and M R Eddy, Councillor K E Morris suggested that the operating hours be extended to 7.00pm to allow serving and clearing up to be conducted in an orderly and unhurried manner. Councillor Bond stated that the car park chosen was not ideal given its proximity to residential properties, but he could accept it. The Chairman reminded Members that any permission given would be temporary for 18 months, and would be reviewed after 12 months to consider any problems and identify alternative sites if necessary.

- RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/15/00321 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:
- (i) Time limit for commencement – 3 years;
 - (ii) List of approved plans;
 - (iii) Hours of operation to be restricted to between 6.00pm and 7.00pm;
 - (iv) Temporary permission – 18 months.
- (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.

148 APPLICATION NO DOV/13/01037 - SNOWDOWN WORKING MEN'S CLUB, SNOWDOWN, AYLESHAM

The Committee viewed photographs and a plan of the application site. The Planning Consultant advised Members that the proposal involved the demolition of the working men's club, and the erection of four pairs of two-storey, semi-detached residential dwellings with a frontage on Holt Street.

As an update, the Planning Consultant reported that the lead local flood authority, Kent County Council (KCC), although not a statutory consultee on small-scale developments, had confirmed that it had no concerns in relation to local flood risk in the area. KCC Archaeology had raised no objections. However, its comments on the previous application remained relevant and it required a watching archaeological brief. Aylesham Parish Council supported the application and confirmed that it would be able to use the developer contribution sought for increasing the capacity of the play area. Access had been improved following initial concerns raised by KCC Highways, Transportation and Waste. The location was well served by mainline train and bus services. In respect of drainage, surface water details would be covered by condition, with details to be provided and agreed before commencement.

In policy terms, the application site was outside settlement confines and, therefore, contrary to Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy. However, the Council had a shortfall in its 5-year housing land supply which meant that policies in the Council's Development Plan could not be considered as being up-to-date and, consequently, carried less weight when assessing applications. In such circumstances, paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – and its presumption for sustainable development - should be considered as a significant material consideration. Whilst the shortfall would be reduced by the recent outline planning permission given for the Salvatori site at Preston, a shortfall remained nevertheless. Notwithstanding these considerations, other Development Plan policies could be taken into account when assessing the application, where they accorded with the NPPF. For example, DM15 which related to protection of the countryside was still relevant, as was DM16. The proposed development would be visible in the open countryside and therefore contrary to DM15 to some degree. However, it was necessary to weigh the harm that would be caused against the other benefits of the scheme.

In summary, Members were advised that the application must be viewed against its social and economic impacts. The development would assist in addressing the Council's housing land shortfall, and was on a site which had previously been developed and enjoyed good access to public transport. Furthermore, the design was now sympathetic to the location. Officers considered that the limited harm that would be caused to the countryside did not outweigh the benefits of the scheme, and planning permission should be granted.

Councillor B W Butcher welcomed the proposal, stating that it ticked many boxes and would improve a site that was currently a real eyesore. Although drainage was a potential difficulty, this could be overcome by conditions.

- RESOLVED: (a) That, subject to the satisfactory resolution of matters relating to the play space contribution, including the completion of a Section 106 Agreement (if justified/necessary following consultation with the Parish Council), Application No DOV/13/01037 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:
- (i) Development to commence within 3 years of the grant of permission (DP04);
 - (ii) In accordance with the approved plans numbered C.01 Rev B, 101 Rev E, 102 Rev E, 011, 012, 013 Rev A, 004 Rev B and 005 Rev C (DP08);
 - (iii) Contamination found during development (CO5);
 - (iv) Prior to commencement of development, a Surface Water Drainage Scheme, including management and maintenance strategy. The approved scheme shall be fully operational prior to first occupation;
 - (v) Samples of materials;
 - (vi) Soft and hard landscaping details and landscape management strategy to be submitted and approved prior to commencement, with the approved scheme to be in place prior to occupation;
 - (vii) Management and maintenance plan for landscaped areas outside of private gardens;
 - (viii) Boundary details to be submitted and approved prior to commencement; and the details approved in place prior to occupation;
 - (ix) Windows in 100mm reveal;
 - (x) Construction vehicle loading/unloading and turning facilities;

- (xi) Parking facilities for site personnel and visitors during construction;
 - (xii) Measures to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the highway;
 - (xiii) Provision of wheel-washing facilities prior to commencement of work on site and for the duration of construction;
 - (xiv) Provision and permanent retention of vehicle parking spaces prior to the use commencing;
 - (xv) Use of a bound surface for the first 5 metres of the access from the edge of the highway;
 - (xvi) Secure, covered cycle parking prior to the use commencing;
 - (xvii) Completion of the access shown on submitted plans including the necessary vehicle crossing in the footway, prior to the use of the site commencing;
 - (xviii) Provision and maintenance of 80 metres (west) and 2.4 metres visibility splay at the junction of Aylesham Road and Holt Street with no obstructions over 1.05 metres above carriageway level within the splay, prior to the use of the site commencing;
 - (xix) Provision and maintenance of 25 metres x 2 metres x 25 metres visibility splay at the site access with no obstructions over 1.05 metres above carriageway level within the splays, prior to the use of the site commencing;
 - (xx) Provision and maintenance of 2 metres x 2 metres pedestrian visibility splays behind the footway on both sides of the access with no obstructions over 0.6 metres above footway level, prior to the use of the site commencing;
 - (xxi) Provision prior to first occupation and subsequent maintenance of a continuous fence and hedge along the Holt Street frontage;
 - (xxii) Noise mitigation measures to be submitted and approved prior to development commencing;
 - (xxiii) Archaeological watching brief.
- (b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions and Section 106 matters in accordance with the issues set out in the report and as resolved by the Planning Committee.
- (c) Informatives: In respect of bats, works to highway, lighting, burning of waste and demolition and construction noise.

APPLICATION NO DOV/15/00101 - LAND NORTH OF BEAUCHAMPS,
BEAUCHAMPS LANE, NONINGTON

Members were shown photographs and a map of the application site. The Senior Planner advised that, since the report was written, two further letters of objection had been received, raising questions about which businesses would benefit from the development, reasons behind the choice of location, health issues and financial compensation for loss of views. One letter of support had been received, referring to the improvement in telecommunications in the area.

The Senior Planner advised that the proposal would provide a service to 18 'not spots' and 95 premises which did not currently have mobile phone coverage. The application site was situated in the countryside where development would not normally be permitted, unless it functionally required such a location which this proposal did. Eleven alternative sites had been considered but discounted. There were a number of listed buildings in the surrounding countryside, the nearest being situated 330 metres away. However, due to separation distances and the numerous areas of vegetation/screening, it was considered that the development would cause no harm to the listed buildings or their settings. Finally, it was the view of Officers that the mast would not be prominent in the landscape albeit that the top would be visible above the trees.

In response to Councillor S F Bannister who questioned whether the proposed location was technically the best place for the mast, the Senior Planner advised that a technical document had been submitted with the application, demonstrating that there would be full coverage of Nonington and beyond to the edges of Aylesham, Elvington and Chillenden. Councillor Bannister indicated his support for the proposal, given the extensive screening. Councillors Bond, Eddy, B Glayzer and P M Wallace also voiced doubts that this was the right location for the mast and questioned whether better coverage could be achieved elsewhere. The Chairman reminded them that this particular site had not been casually chosen.

The Senior Planner clarified that the site had been chosen because it offered the greatest benefits and the fewest disadvantages given its distance from listed buildings and residential dwellings and the adjacent copse of large trees which would help to screen the mast. Moreover, lengthy and detailed technical evidence had been submitted which had demonstrated to Officers' satisfaction why other sites had not been chosen.

Councillor Bannister withdrew his motion to approve the application and suggested that a site visit should be held to assess the relationship between the proposed development and historic assets. Councillor Eddy added that further information on coverage and siting, showing the development in relation to the surrounding topography and heritage assets, should also be provided for the next meeting when the outcome of the site visit would be considered.

RESOLVED: That Application No DOV/15/00101 be deferred on the following grounds:

- (i) That, in order to assist Members in assessing the relationship between the proposed development and nearby heritage assets, a site visit be held on Tuesday, 23 June 2015 and Councillors S F Bannister, B Glayzer, D P Murphy, F J W Scales and

P M Wallace (reserve: Councillor M R Eddy) be appointed to visit this site.

- (ii) That Officers be requested to provide further information relating to coverage and siting in general (including maps).

150 APPLICATION NO DOV/15/00115 - LAND AT MARSHBOROUGH FARM, MARSHBOROUGH, WOODNESBOROUGH

The Committee was shown photographs and maps of the current and previous application sites. The Principal Planner (Renewable Energy) advised that the site was low-lying agricultural land situated to the west of the A256. The current site was 9.7 hectares in size as opposed to the 19.2 hectares of the site that had been the subject of an application refused by the Committee in 2013. Whilst the previous proposal would have involved the loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land of Grade 3 or higher, the agricultural land on the current site was classified as Grade 3B land or lower. It was considered that the development would not be prominent in the landscape, with fleeting or glimpsed views only. Although there would be views from the A256 for a distance of approximately 400 metres, tree and hedge planting mitigation measures would address this. No technical, flooding or highways issues had been raised and no public letters of objection had been received. Officers considered that the benefits of the scheme outweighed any harm that would be caused, and recommended the development for approval.

Councillor J S Back supported the proposal which was significantly better than the application that had been refused. Councillor Butcher referred to Woodnesborough Parish Council's support for the proposal and the absence of any objections from local residents.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/15/00115 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Standard time limit;
- (ii) Approved plans;
- (iii) Development carried out in accordance with Construction Management Plan (as amended);
- (iv) Landscaping and biodiversity to be carried out in accordance with submitted details;
- (v) Archaeological watching brief;
- (vi) Further details of land drainage run-off to be submitted;
- (vii) Works to stop in event of contamination being found;
- (viii) Details of bunds to be submitted to ensure no oil spillage in construction compound area;

- (ix) Construction compound to be removed post completion;
 - (x) Arrays to be removed after 25 years;
 - (xi) Implementation of decommissioning plan;
 - (xii) No external lighting;
 - (xiii) Colour of buildings in accordance with revised details.
- (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.

151 APPLICATION NO DOV/14/00477 - LAND AT MONKTON COURT LANE, EYTHORNE

Members were shown photographs and plans of the application site. The Senior Planner (Development Management) updated the Committee on the additional representations that had been received since the report was written. One e-mail circulated to Committee members before the meeting referred to the proposal being a major development that would affect the Conservation Area and be seen from Waldershare Park. Two other representations had raised points regarding car headlights shining into properties and construction vehicles which, if parked on Monkton Court Lane, could impede access for emergency vehicles. An e-mail had also been received regarding outbound vehicle traffic movements in Shepherdswell. The traffic data provided were a duplication of those submitted as part of Shepherdswell and Coldred Parish Council's comments the preceding year.

The Senior Planner read out the preamble to a petition that had been received containing 352 signatures. In respect of the most recent amended plans, it was clarified that these had been sent to parish councils for information only. It was confirmed that the draft Section 106 Agreement was with the Council's Solicitor and, provided that it was specific in respect of securing book stock provision for the mobile library serving Eythorne, it would satisfy Community Infrastructure Levy tests in respect of the pooling of contributions. It was also clarified that the reference in paragraph 3.43 of the report related to peak times.

The proposal was for 20 dwellings on a site which lay outside the village confines of Eythorne, adjacent to the Conservation Area. The original scheme had proposed 26 dwellings and allotments, but the number of dwellings had been reduced and the allotments removed following discussions with Officers. The amended layout and design now provided a looser grain of development, with a central adopted highway from Monkton Court Lane with four private drives, each serving 5 dwellings. A 10 to 20-metre deep landscaped buffer with the countryside was also proposed. In respect of drainage, the proposals included a sustainable urban drainage system that would use a series of swales along the front boundary and eastern boundary of the development. Each garden would also have a private soakaway.

The Senior Planner summarised the main issues detailed in the report. There were several key policy issues for the Committee to consider. The site lay outside the settlement confines and was therefore contrary to Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy. It was also a site which had not been allocated for development in the Council's Land Allocations Local Plan. However, due to the fact that the Council did not have a 5-year housing land supply, DM1 carried less weight and it was therefore necessary to assess the application primarily against paragraphs 14 and 49 of the NPPF. That said, whilst DM1 carried less weight, Core Strategy Policies DM15 and DM16 which were concerned with the protection of the countryside remained relevant and continued to attract considerable weight as they accorded with the NPPF. In accordance with paragraph 14, Members would need to consider whether any adverse impacts of approving the scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits of doing so.

The Senior Planner advised that, whilst the proposal would result in the direct loss of countryside, it would not significantly affect the character of the landscape given the relative containment of the site. The visual impact would also be contained in a local setting. The benefits of the scheme included that it would help to meet the shortfall in the Council's 5-year housing land supply and deliver 30% affordable housing. There would also be no harm in ecological terms. The scheme's impact on nearby designated heritage assets, Waldershare Park and Eythorne Conservation Area, and their setting, had to also be considered. However, Officers had concluded that there would be no harm to views into or out of these heritage assets or their settings. It was also felt that there would be no detrimental harm to residential amenity. Developer contributions would be secured in respect of mobile library book stock, play space improvements and the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area. Traffic counts had been questioned by third parties, and counts provided by Eythorne and Shepherdswell and Coldred Parish Councils had been taken into account. The proposal was considered acceptable in highways terms. Flood risk and water management issues were considered to have been satisfactorily addressed by way of a pre-commencement condition, further to consultation with the relevant statutory consultees.

A disadvantage of the scheme was that it would lead to the loss of a significant amount of Best and Most Versatile Grade 1 agricultural land. However, the loss of this land would not by itself be a compelling and overriding reason to justify refusal of the application. In conclusion, Officers were satisfied that, having considered all matters in the report, the proposal would constitute sustainable development where social, economic and environmental gains would be achieved.

The Head of Regeneration and Development clarified that the supply of housing at Farthingloe had already been included in the Council's housing land supply calculations. Whilst planning permission for this site had been granted, the development was the subject of a judicial review. Calculations on the housing land supply were based on several factors and subject to change, which is why they were reviewed annually. It was not simply a question of deducting the number of houses in a proposed development from the housing land supply shortfall.

Councillor Morris commented that it was his understanding that, due to the Council's housing land supply shortfall, the Committee was forced to fall back on the NPPF which had a presumption in favour of approval unless there would be significant and demonstrable harm. Whilst Officers had concluded that the scheme would be sustainable, this was surely a matter of opinion.

The Head of Regeneration and Development advised that this was broadly correct. There was a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the NPPF which applied in all cases. Where the Council was unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, its policies for the supply of housing (i.e. the Local Plan) became out-of-date. Whilst the Council may have policies which constrained or prevented developments such as the one proposed, these had a lot less weight as a result of the mechanism within the NPPF. The onus shifted on assessing proposals against the sustainability tests of the NPPF which presumed that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Councillor Back felt that sufficient planning permissions had been granted to meet the Council's housing land supply. Not only was the proposed development contrary to DM1, but the applicant had failed to address all of the Officers' concerns which were set out in a series of bullet points in paragraph 1.6 of the report.

Councillor Bannister was concerned that new house-building targets were being used as a 'straitjacket' around communities and residents. Whilst the report was logical and well written, and a good deal of work had been done to achieve a good development, he was against the proposal because it was outside the settlement confines and would involve the loss of agricultural land. In addition, the development would generate significant traffic since it was unlikely that many people would drive or cycle to Shepherdswell to use the train. It was beholden on the Committee to take residents' views into account, and policies to protect the countryside were there for a reason. Councillor Bond was of the view that the LPA's policies were not automatically 'defunct' because of the NPPF. If there was to be a departure from the Local Plan, Members needed to weigh up the pros and cons of the scheme. He doubted the estimated traffic movement figures and expressed concerns about the location of the site opposite the Conservation Area. He also questioned whether there was sufficient infrastructure in place, and referred to the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land.

The Senior Planner clarified that the site was not in a flood plain but rather in a Flood Zone 1 area where Environment Agency maps indicated that localised flooding occurred. The necessary statutory consultations had been undertaken. It was for the LPA and Environment Agency to ensure that the development did not exacerbate existing problems, but it was not a requirement that the proposal should rectify an existing problem. In terms of school capacity, KCC had confirmed that no financial contributions were required towards additional school places and/or improvements, demonstrating that the primary school had sufficient capacity. KCC Highways and Transportation had considered the traffic data and its conclusions were set out in the report. The KCC Highways and Transportation Development Planner added that traffic movements had been calculated using information from a national database which took into account that some residents would be retired and others, whilst working, would work flexible hours or from home. In terms of the development's effect on heritage assets, it was only the south-west corner of the development that adjoined the Conservation Area, and views from and to the Conservation Area were limited. Moreover, it was considered that the development would be relatively contained within the landscape. In response to the point raised by Councillor Back, it was confirmed that all of the concerns raised by Officers had now been addressed. Members were advised that they would need to judge the application on sustainability grounds and their decision would be one taken on balance.

Councillor Eddy proposed that the application should be refused on the grounds that it was outside the settlement confines, would have an adverse impact on the countryside and heritage assets, would involve the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land and increase travel demand. Following advice received from Officers, the Committee agreed that the application should be refused on the grounds that it conflicted with Policies DM1, DM15 (and by extension DM16) of the Core Strategy and saved policy CO8 of the Local Plan, and would involve the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land.

RESOLVED: That, notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation, Application No DOV/14/00477 be REFUSED on the following grounds:

- (i) The development would result in the significant development of Grade 1 Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land, and the permanent, irreversible loss of such land, that would result in harm to the environmental quality of the area, such that the harm is not outweighed by the benefits of providing housing. The development would thereby be contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- (ii) The development outside of confines would result in the direct loss of countryside, and loss of part of the hedgerow to Monkton Court Lane, and by virtue of the location of the site adjoining the edge of the village settlement, and the scale, height, form and design of the dwellings, would result in localised harm to the character of the countryside immediately adjoining Eythorne where it forms an important transitional, soft edge between the settlement and the countryside. The harm to the countryside is not outweighed by the benefits of providing housing, and would be contrary to policies DM1, DM15 and DM16 of the Dover District Core Strategy, saved policy CO8 of the Dover District Local Plan and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- (iii) In light of the foregoing reasons, it is considered that the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.

152 APPLICATION NO DOV/15/00256 - LAND AT SALVATORI, NORTH OF GROVE ROAD, PRESTON

Members viewed photographs, layout plans and a location map of the site. The Principal Planner advised that the application was a Reserved Matters application for the erection of 70 dwellings on a parcel of land that was one of three granted outline planning permission in December 2014. The other two parcels of land were former depots owned by Salvatori and not part of the application before Committee.

Since the report was written, Kent Fire and Rescue had confirmed that it had no objections to the proposals. Two letters had been received, the first raising concerns that sewers would not cope, particularly during periods of heavy rain. The second, from the National Farmers' Union, raised concerns about sewage control and the potential effect on high value crops in nearby land, urging that a robust sewerage system must be in place. Finally, following concerns raised by Preston

Parish Council about the proposed use of white weatherboarding, the applicant had agreed to look at other colours and to consult the Parish Council before submitting details to the LPA.

The outline permission had required the cessation of the Salvatori business, together with the demolition of buildings, remediation of land and creation of meadow land. Since the issue of the decision notice in March, along with the Section 106 Agreement covering financial contributions and various trigger points, the site had been sold to David Wilson Homes which would be bound by the notice and the legal agreement. The principle of development on this site was not for reassessment, only those reserved matters such as layout, appearance and landscaping. Reserved matters relating to the meadow land and depot land would be the subject of separate applications. Members were referred to the report which set out details relating to foul and surface water drainage. These would be conditioned and the relevant bodies consulted once details had been submitted, and were not for consideration at the meeting.

The Local Planning Authority (LPA) had worked with the applicant on the layout of the scheme with a view to achieving various objectives, such as road-fronting houses, spacious residential plots, a soft buffer along the northern boundary and satisfactory parking, access and highways arrangements. Officers were now satisfied that these objectives had been met.

In response to Councillor Bannister, the Chairman clarified that there was no provision for affordable housing within the development itself. However, there was an option for the LPA to acquire a one-acre site for this purpose. The land in question would be gifted and had been included in the Section 106 Agreement. That said, there was no guarantee that the LPA would take this site forward as much would depend upon whether it was suitable for such a development. Councillor Bond queried whether the 30mph speed limit outside the site could be extended and the Chairman supported this proposal. In response to Councillor Bond, the Chairman advised that conditions were already in place to ensure that adequate drainage infrastructure was in place. Southern Water's agreement to foul and surface water plans was required before development could commence and it was they who should be held to account in the event of problems relating to foul sewerage.

The Principal Planner advised that the speed limit was a matter of principle for KCC Highways and Transportation to raise at the outline stage and it had not raised any concerns at that time. The issue was one that could be addressed during Section 278 discussions between the developer and KCC. The Chairman welcomed that the developer had agreed to consult the Parish Council on materials.

RESOLVED: (a) That Reserved Matters Application No DOV/15/00256 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) A list of the approved plans;
 - (ii) Archaeology condition for the implementation of archaeological field evaluation works.
- (b) Informatives:

(i) It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure, before the development hereby approved is commenced, that all necessary highway approvals and consents, where required, are obtained and that the limits of highway boundary are clearly established in order to avoid any enforcement action being taken by the Highway Authority. The applicant must also ensure that the details shown on the approved plans agree in every aspect with those approved under such legislation and common law. It is therefore important for the applicant to contact KCC Highways, Transportation and Waste to progress this aspect of the works prior to commencement on site.

(ii) Extension of the 30mph speed limit.

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

153 APPEALS AND INFORMAL HEARINGS

Members were referred to the report which indicated that, for the period January to March 2015, 20% of appeals had been upheld, well within the annual target of 25%.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

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

The Committee was advised that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee had given their agreement on the conditions and the content of the Section 106 Agreement relating to Phase 1 of the Whitfield expansion scheme.

RESOLVED: That the verbal update be noted.

The meeting ended at 9.08 pm.