

a) **DOV/19/00838 – Erection of one detached and six semi-detached dwellings with associated parking, vehicular access and landscaping - 45 Eythorne Road, Shepherdswell**

Reason for report: Number of contrary views (12).

b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning permission be granted.

c) **Planning Policies and Guidance**

Core Strategy Policies

- CP1 – The location and scale of development in the District must comply with the Settlement Hierarchy.
- CP3 – Of the 14,000 houses identified by the plan 9,700 (around 70%) is identified for the Dover Area.
- CP4 - Developments of 10 or more dwellings should identify the purpose of the development in terms of creating, reinforcing or restoring the local housing market in which they are located and development an appropriate mix of housing mix and design. Density will be determined through the design process, but should wherever possible exceed 40dph and will seldom be justified to less than 30dph.
- CP6 – Development which generates a demand for infrastructure will only be permitted if the necessary infrastructure to support it is either in place, or there is a reliable mechanism to ensure that it will be provided at the time it is needed.
- DM1 - Development will not be permitted outside of the settlement confines, unless it is specifically justified by other development plan policies, or it functionally requires such a location, or it is ancillary to existing development or uses.
- DM5 – Development for 15 or more dwellings will be expected to provide 30% affordable housing at the site, in home types that will address prioritised need.
- DM11 – Development that would generate high levels of travel will only be permitted within the urban areas in locations that are, or can be made to be, well served by a range of means of transport.
- DM13 – Provision for parking should be a design led process based upon the characteristics of the site, the locality, the nature of the proposed development and its design objectives. Provision for non-residential development, and for residential cycle provision, should be informed by Kent County Council Guidance SPG4, or any successor. Provision for residential development should be informed by the guidance in the Table for Residential Parking.
- DM27 - Residential development of five or more dwellings will be required to provide or contribute towards the provision of open space, unless existing provision within the relevant accessibility standard has sufficient capacity to accommodate this additional demand.

National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF)

- Paragraph 2 states that “planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise”.
- Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These three overarching objectives are interdependent and need to be pursued in a mutually supportive way.
- Paragraph 11 states that where development accords with an up-to-date development plan it should be approved without delay; or where there are no relevant policies or the most important policies for the determination of the application are out of date, then also granting consent. Where there is a clear reason for refusing the proposed development due to conflict with an area/asset of particular importance (as identified in the framework); and/or where any adverse impacts of granting permission significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when taking the Framework as a whole, then planning permission should be refused.
- Paragraph 12 states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making.
- Paragraph 47 ‘Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Decisions on applications should be made as quickly as possible, and within statutory timescales unless a longer period has been agreed by the applicant in writing’.
- Chapter five of the NPPF seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing, requiring Local Planning Authorities to identify specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing.
- Chapter nine of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable transport.
- Chapter twelve seeks to achieve well-designed places, with the creation of high quality buildings and places being fundamental to what planning and development process should achieve.
- Chapter fifteen requires that the planning system contributes to and enhances the natural and local environment, by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, protecting valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils, recognising the value of ecosystems, minimising impacts on, and where possible enhancing, biodiversity, preventing pollution and remediating contamination.
- Chapter sixteen of the NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment.
- Paragraph 177 states ‘The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless

an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site.'

- National Design Guide (2019)

d) **Relevant Planning History**

DOV/17/00398 - Outline application for the erection of two pairs of semi-detached dwellings, two detached dwelling and the creation of vehicular access (existing dwelling to be demolished). Approved. (Committee decision)

e) **Consultee and Third Party Responses**

DDC Environmental Health Manager – no objection raised subject to the imposition of a land contamination condition and an informative advising of the permissible hours of construction during the week.

DDC Tree and Horticultural Officer – No objections raised. It is recommended that protection measures within the submitted tree survey are secured through imposition of an appropriately worded condition along with the tree protection measures as shown in Appendix IV. The protective fencing must conform with BS837:2012 and be erected prior to site works commencing and be retained throughout the duration.

DDC Ecological Officer – no objection subject to conditions as detailed within the 'ecology' section of the report.

**KCC Highways**

*Response received on 02 August 2019*

No objection in principle however, the following matters need resolving:

1. The proposed second access onto Eythorne Road will require a visibility strip along the site frontage, measuring 2.4 metres in depth from the edge of carriageway, with no obstructions over 1 metre above carriageway level within the splay.
2. The forecourt depth behind the parking spaces to plots 1, 6 and 7 should be increased to 6 metres to provide sufficient turning room.
3. Parking spaces/driveways which also form part of the pedestrian route to/from the front door of a dwelling should be increased in width to 3.2 metres or a separate path provided.

*Subsequent response received on 09 September 2019*

Adequate access from the highway is provided to all the proposed dwellings (including utilising the existing access off Eythorne Road) and sufficient room is available for off-street parking to ensure the development is unlikely to result in unacceptable parking on the highway. Access and parking for construction-related vehicles can be dealt with through a Construction Management Plan. The following should be secured by condition:

- Construction management plan
- Provision of measures to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the highway.
- Provision and permanent retention of vehicle parking and turning facilities prior to the use of the site commencing
- Use of a bound surface for the first 5 metres of the access from the edge of the highway.

- Provision and permanent retention of secure, covered cycle parking facilities prior to the use
- Completion of the new accesses shown on the submitted plans including the necessary vehicle crossings in the highway, prior to the use of the site commencing.
- Gradient of the accesses to be no steeper than 1 in 10 for the first 1.5 metres from the highway boundary and no steeper than 1 in 8 thereafter.
- Provision and maintenance of a visibility strip measuring 2.4 metres in width from the edge of carriageway along the Eythorne Road frontage with no obstructions over 1 metre above carriageway level within the strip, prior to use of the site commencing.
- Provision and maintenance of 2 metre x 2 metre pedestrian visibility splays behind the footway on both sides of the Eythorne Road access with no obstructions over 0.6m above footway level, prior to the use of the site commencing.

It is recommended that all parking spaces are equipped to allow the charging of electric vehicles.

Further to this, a couple of infomatives are recommended to be attached to the permission.

Southern Water – no objection raised. The following informatives have been recommended to be attached to the permission:

- No development or new tree planting should be located within 3 meters on either side of the external edge of the public sewer.
- All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works.
- No new soakaways should be located within 5 metres of a public sewer.

Shepherdswell Parish Council – object to the planning application for the following reasons:

- increase the current unresolved sewage problem in the area
- increase the traffic in The Glen and Penfold Gardens.

Public Representations:

Eleven (11) representations received objecting to the planning application and making the following comments:

- loss of privacy
- building a pair of semi-detached instead of a detached house is not acceptable
- would detract from the character of Eythorne Road
- limited parking proposed for these properties
- overdevelopment
- car port serving plot 1 will block light entering no.15B The Glen
- the main sewer cannot cope at periods of heavy rainfall and 7 more properties will add to the burden
- sewage overflowing the garden of no.13 frequently
- considerable traffic on this part of Eythorne Road
- interruption of the street view

One (1) letter received neither supporting or objecting to the proposal. No relevant comments were made.

f) 1. **The Site and the Proposal**

- 1.1 The site is within the village confines of Eythorne, with a site area of 0.24 hectares. The site lies within a wholly residential area of Eythorne. The slope of the site falls from southeast (Eythorne Road) to the northwest. The topography of land in the street falls from southwest (The Glen) to northeast (Penfold Gardens). The site shares boundaries with several properties including No.43 Eythorne Road and No.16C The Glen to the southwest, No. 15b The Glen to the west, No.49 Eythorne Road and No.15 Penfold Gardens to the northeast and No.28 Penfold Gardens to the north. To the rear of the site is East Kent Railway with a meadow and drainage ditch separating the application site and the adjacent railway tracks.
- 1.2 The application seeks permission for the erection of 1no. detached and 6no. semi-detached dwellings and associated parking, vehicular access and landscaping. The proposed dwellings annotated as P2, P3, P4, P5, P6 and P7 would be 3-bed two storey semi-detached dwellinghouses whilst P1 would be a 4-bed two storey detached dwellinghouse. The proposed semi-detached pair P6 and P7 would front Eythorne Road. The dwellings would be accessed via an existing access off Eythorne Road. A second vehicular access has been proposed to be formed off Eythorne Road with a view to create an in-out access arrangement. Two further accesses would be created one off Penfold Gardens and another one off The Glen to enable access to the proposed dwellings. No through vehicular access has been proposed whilst a pedestrian link has been proposed which would effectively connect the two cul-de-sacs (only by foot).
- 1.3 The proposed dwellings would be finished in a combination red stock brickwork, composite horizontal boarding, black UPVC rainwater goods and white UPVC sliding sashes. The proposed dwellings would have an artificial slate tiled roof. The hard standings would be provided in block paving whilst the rear gardens of the dwellings would be subdivided by a 1.8m high timber fencing.

2 **Main Issues**

- 2.1 The main issues are:
- The principle of the development
  - The impact on the character and appearance of the area
  - The impact on residential amenity
  - The impact on the highway network
  - The impact on ecology
  - The impact on trees
  - Drainage and flooding

**Assessment**

Principle of Development

- 2.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to

be made under the planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

- 2.3 The site lies within the settlement confines of Eythorne and therefore accords with policy DM1 of the Core Strategy. It is considered that the principle of the development is acceptable, subject to site-specific considerations. Although it is relevant to note that the site benefits from an extant outline permission for 6 dwellings granted under DOV/17/00398, the main difference between the two schemes being the approved detached dwelling fronting Eythorne Road has been subdivided to form a semi-detached pair under the current application.
- 2.4 In accordance with the Government's standardised methodology for calculating the need for housing, the council must now deliver 629 dwellings per annum. The proposed development would make a useful contribution towards that need by providing 7 dwellings in a sustainable location.

#### Impact on Character and Appearance of Area

- 2.5 The application site is an elongated parcel of land which abuts Eythorne Road to the southeast and is sandwiched between two cul-de-sacs i.e. Penfold Gardens to the northeast and The Glen to the southwest. The scale and form of the development in the area is varied, with a mixture of detached and semi-detached properties of one, one and a half or two storeys in height. The properties within The Glen and Penfold Gardens which appear to have been constructed in the 1960s are predominantly chalet style dwellings finished in brick under a tiled roof. They have white UPVC fenestration and dormer windows within the front and rear roof slopes.
- 2.6 The proposed development comprises two storey 1no. detached and 6no. semi-detached dwellinghouses of varied styles, albeit there is consistency in terms of the material palette across the scheme. The street scene elevation (Section EE) shows the relationship between the existing properties and the proposed dwellings. It is noted that the properties 15a and 15b immediately adjoining the application site fronting The Glen are two storey dwellings with a gabled front elevation, whilst No.28 Penfold Gardens directly opposite and abutting the site is a chalet style dwelling. The proposed detached dwelling (plot 1) and a semi-detached pair (plots 2 & 3) whilst have a larger footprint and scale as compared to the immediately adjoining neighbours, the roofline is fairly consistent and is not significantly higher than the properties on either side. Equally, the use of a combination materials palette including brick and weatherboarding with UPVC fenestration is broadly consistent with the materials used in the area and is therefore considered acceptable.
- 2.7 The street elevation (Section FF) shows the relationship between No.15 Penfold Gardens, the proposed semi-detached pair (plots 4 & 5) and No's 16A, 16B and 16C The Glen. It is noted that the immediately adjoining properties fronting The Glen (No's 16A, 16B and 16C) are two storey properties of a substantial footprint and scale and of varied design whilst No.15 Penfold Gardens adjoining the site is a typical chalet style 1960s dwelling. The proposed semi-detached pair (plots 4 & 5) do not intend to replicate the styles on either side but have rather been designed independently, whilst retaining consistency in terms of the use of the materials palette. It is noted that the proposed dwellings would be higher than No.15 Penfold Gardens however, they are sited at a distance of approximately 12m from it, thereby providing the required breathing gap between the existing and proposed development.

- 2.8 Concerns were raised by the residents in relation to the scale and design of the dwellings fronting Eythorne Road. It is relevant to note that the properties fronting Eythorne Road are of a varied scale and design consisting of predominantly detached properties with the exception of a semi-detached pair No.41 fronting Eythorne Road in close proximity to the site. The land levels in the street fall from southwest to northeast, i.e. the application site is at a higher level than No.49 to the northeast and slightly lower than No.43 to the southwest. The proposed semi-detached dwellings fronting Eythorne Road have canted bay windows, cills, a chimney and small pitched roofs over the entrance doors. The dwellings would be finished in brick and would have a brick boundary wall abutting Eythorne Road. From the review of representations received, it is noted that the proposed in-and-out access arrangement has been objected to. Whilst this is not a dominant feature in the street, a similar arrangement has been utilised by a couple of properties in the street. Notwithstanding the lack of commonality of this arrangement, it is not considered that it would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene which is mixed. Finally, the overall scale, design and height of the proposed dwellings is considered acceptable and would not cause harm to the visual amenity of the street scene.
- 2.9 In conclusion, the proposed development is considered well designed and sited and would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scenes or the wider area in accordance with paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

#### Highways/Travel Impacts

- 2.10 Policy DM13 of the Core Strategy suggests that a minimum of two independently accessible car parking spaces be provided for residents of the dwelling, together with an additional 0.2 spaces per dwelling for visitors, although parking should be a design-led process. The proposed development makes provision for two off-street car parking spaces for each dwelling. Whilst the development would lack the provision of visitor parking spaces (1.2), it is not considered that this would justify withholding planning permission.
- 2.11 The development includes the provision of independent cycle storage for each dwelling which aligns with the recommendations of the Kent Design Guide (including Interim Guidance Note 3) and the NPPF. It is considered that the proposed cycle provision could be secured via a suitably worded condition.
- 2.12 KCC Highways have been consulted on this application. KCC Highways have not raised any concerns. A few conditions have been recommended in relation to the proposed access off Eythorne Road, discharge of surface water onto the highway, and provision and retention of permanent parking facilities on the site. KCC have also advised that access and parking for construction-related vehicles can be dealt with through construction management plan which should include routing of construction and delivery vehicles to/ from site; parking and turning areas for construction and delivery vehicles and site personnel; timing of deliveries; provision of wheel washing facilities; temporary traffic management/signage. In the event that the permission is granted, the recommended conditions would be attached to the permission.

#### Impact on Neighbours

- 2.13 Paragraph 127(f) sets out that planning decisions should ensure that all developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. The site shares boundaries with several properties including no.43 Eythorne

Road and no.16C The Glen to the southwest, no. 15b The Glen to the west, no.49 Eythorne Road and no.15 Penfold Gardens to the northeast and no.28 Penfold Gardens to the north. Given the massing, scale and proximity of the proposed dwellings to the neighbouring properties, it is necessary to consider the residential amenity impacts on these properties.

2.14 Nos 43 and 49 Eythorne Road

The proposed semi-detached pair P6 and P7 would be sited at a distance of approximately 5m from the side elevation of No.49 to the northeast and approximately 3m from the side elevation of No.43 to the southwest. Having regard for the sufficient separation distance between properties, no loss of light, sense of enclosure or overshadowing would occur from the proposal. It is noted that no windows are proposed to the side elevations of the proposed dwellings serving habitable rooms, albeit there is a single casement window to both side elevations which serves the internal staircase landing area. To mitigate any potential loss of privacy through the side windows, a suitably worded condition could be imposed which would require the windows to be obscure glazed and fixed shut.

2.15 It is noted that views of the rear gardens of Nos. 13 and 15 Penfold Gardens and No.16C The Glen would be achievable from the windows to the rear elevations of the proposed dwellings (P6 & P7), however, this would be a over significant distance of approximately 25m. Therefore, on balance, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to warrant a refusal on this basis.

2.16 No 15 Penfold Gardens and Nos 16a and 16b The Glen

It is noted that land slopes from southwest to northeast i.e. the land levels in Penfold Gardens are higher than the land levels in the The Glen. A horizontal site section has been submitted during the course of the application which demonstrates that a cut and fill approach would be adopted to ensure that the proposed semi-detached pair (P4 & P5) would not be significantly higher than No.15 Penfold Gardens whilst No.16C The Glen would sit on a higher ground than the proposed semi-detached pair. In terms of separation distances, the finished dwellings would lie at a distance of approximately 12m from the side elevation of No. 13 Penfold Gardens and 4m from the side elevation of No.16C The Glen. Having regard for the above, it is not considered that the proposed development would cause a sense of enclosure, loss of light or overshadowing. Furthermore, no windows have been proposed to the side elevations of the proposed dwellings, therefore, no loss of privacy would occur.

2.17 Nos 15b The Glen and 28 Penfold Gardens

The proposed dwelling (P1) would be sited at a distance of approximately 6m from the side elevation of No.15b whilst the semi-detached pair P2 and P3 would be sited at a distance of approximately 10.5m from No.28 Penfold Gardens. A street scene has been submitted with the application which shows the relationship between the existing properties and the proposed dwellings. It is noted that the land on which the proposed dwellings would sit would be levelled to ensure that the dwellings do not sit on a higher ground relative to the position of the properties on either side. Having regard for the above, it is not considered that the proposal would cause loss of light, sense of enclosure or overshadowing. It is noted that no windows are proposed to the side elevations of the proposed dwelling (P1) serving habitable rooms whilst a single casement window is proposed to the side elevations of the semi-detached pair (P2 & P3) which would serve a bathroom. To mitigate any potential loss of privacy through the side windows, a suitably worded condition could be attached which would require the windows to be obscure glazed and fixed shut.

### Living Conditions of Future Occupiers

- 2.18 The proposed dwellings, together with their individual rooms would be of a good size, whilst all habitable rooms would be naturally lit. Each dwelling would be provided with a private garden and areas which could be used for refuge storage and bike storage. As such, the living conditions of future occupiers would be acceptable and would accord with paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

### Impact on Trees

- 2.19 There are three mature trees along the northwest boundary of the application site. Having reviewed the submitted drawings, it is apparent that it is the intention to retain the existing mature trees. A tree survey has been submitted during the course of the application which also includes an arboricultural method statement and a tree protection plan. The tree protection plan identifies the precise location of the trees, crowns and the root protection zones of the trees. A Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) has been marked and the protective fence positions have been shown to clearly demarcate the area from the construction zone, to ensure that there is no compaction of the soil or severance of tree roots.
- 2.20 DDC's Tree Officer has raised no concerns regarding the proposal and recommended that in the event of grant of planning permission, appropriately worded conditions be attached to the permission to secure the tree protection measures as detailed within the submitted tree survey.

### Ecology

- 2.21 The application site has recently been cleared off vegetation. Previous ecological surveys carried out under DOV/17/00398 were submitted with the application. The Ecological Appraisal dated February 2018 noted one sycamore tree with the potential to support bats. The subsequent bat activity survey dated September 2018, noted that detailed aerial inspection of the trees found potential for bat roosts to be very limited. The reports demonstrate that the site is used by foraging and commuting bats and makes a few recommendations for enhancement and protection of the area. DDC's ecological officer has advised that should permission be granted, the recommendation for the plantation of native deciduous trees and hedge lines should be secured via a condition.
- 2.22 It is also advised that a bat friendly lighting scheme should be incorporated into the scheme and should comply with the guidelines produced by the bat Conservation Trust and the Institute of Lighting Professionals entitled bats and Artificial lighting in the UK (2018).
- 2.23 Further biodiversity enhancements have been recommended by DDC's ecological officer which include the following:
- Provision of hedgehog nesting boxes & 12cm square gaps under any new fencing to allow hedgehogs access into grassland areas.
  - Provision of sparrow terrace timber boxes or house martin nests or mix of open-fronted and hole-nesting boxes and constructed from woodcrete.
  - Bat roosting spaces within the new buildings or installation of ready-made bat boxes

- Reptile/amphibian hibernacula (as stand alone or within new walls by creating recesses into wall structures)
- Log piles for invertebrates (including stag beetles), reptiles and amphibians.
- Native wild flower grassland planting
- Establishment of climbing plants on walls and other vertical structures
- Creation of drought-resistant wildflower garden to attract invertebrates and reduce need for water

In the event that the planning permission is granted, the above recommendations could be secured via suitably worded conditions.

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, Regulation 63: Appropriate Assessment

- 2.24 All impacts of the development have been considered and assessed. It is concluded that the only aspect of the development that causes uncertainty regarding the likely significant effects on a European Site is the potential disturbance of birds due to increased recreational activity at Sandwich Bay and Pegwell Bay.
- 2.25 Detailed surveys at Sandwich Bay and Pegwell Bay were carried out in 2011, 2012 and 2018. However, applying a precautionary approach and with the best scientific knowledge in the field, it is not currently possible to discount the potential for housing development within Dover district, when considered in-combination with all other housing development within the district, to have a likely significant effect on the protected Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar sites.
- 2.26 Following consultation with Natural England, the identified pathway for such a likely effect is an increase in recreational activity which causes disturbance, predominantly by dog-walking, of the species which led to the designation of the sites and the integrity of the sites themselves.
- 2.27 The Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar Mitigation Strategy was agreed with Natural England in 2012 and is still considered to be effective in preventing or reducing the harmful effects of housing development on the sites.
- 2.28 Given the limited scale of the development proposed by this application, a contribution towards the Councils Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar Mitigation Strategy will not be required as the costs of administration would negate the benefit of collecting a contribution. However, the development would still be mitigated by the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar Mitigation Strategy as the Council will draw on existing resources to fully implement the agreed Strategy.

Drainage and Flooding

- 2.29 The site lies within Flood Risk Zone 1, where there is the lowest risk of flooding. However, given the size of the site, it is appropriate to consider whether the development would be likely to lead to localised on or off-site flooding. The NPPF, paragraph 163, states that local planning authorities should ensure that flooding is not increased elsewhere and priority should be given to the use of sustainable drainage systems. In furtherance to this, the Planning Practice Guidance states that

sustainable drainage systems should be designed to control surface water run-off close to where it falls and replicate natural drainage as closely as possible.

- 2.30 Concerns have been raised over the potential flooding and foul water sewerage capacity of the existing sewers. It is noted that under the previous application DOV/17/00398, Southern Water recommended a condition to be attached in respect of foul water and surface water disposal. Whilst Southern Water have raised no objection in this instance, it is considered reasonable to attach the same pre-commencement conditions requiring the submission of detailed schemes for both foul water and surface water disposal. In addition, to ensure that the risk of localised flooding is not increased, a timetable for the implementation of sewerage works (with no occupation until implementation) and maintenance, should be included. It is also relevant to note that under the previous application (DOV/17/00398), the exact location of the sewer was unknown. However, in this instance, the site has been surveyed and the exact location of the sewer on the site has been identified. The proposed semi-detached pair (P4 & P5) has therefore been sited at a distance of approximately 3m from the sewer, in line with the recommendations made by Southern Water which states, "No development or new tree planting should be located within 3 meters on either side of the external edge of the public sewer". Having regard for the above and subject to appropriately worded conditions, the proposed development is considered acceptable.

### **3. Conclusion**

- 3.1 The proposed development is considered well sited and designed and would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene or the wider area. It would not cause harm to the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. It is considered acceptable in terms of highways impact, ecological matters and drainage. Having regard for the above, it is recommended that the application be approved.

### **g) Recommendation**

- I Planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:
- (i) 3-year time limit
  - (ii) Approved plans
  - (iii) samples of materials
  - (iv) provision of parking facilities
  - (v) measures to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the highway
  - (vi) use of bound surface for the first 5m of the access from the edge of the highways
  - (vii) cycle parking retention
  - (viii) bin storage details
  - (ix) completion of access prior to first use
  - (x) Gradient of the accesses to be no steeper than 1 in 10 for the first 1.5 metres from the highway boundary and no steeper than 1 in 8 thereafter
  - (xi) Provision and maintenance visibility strip measuring 2.4 metres in width from the edge of carriageway along the Eythorne Road frontage with no obstructions over 1 metre above carriageway level within the strip, prior to use of the site commencing
  - (xii) Provision and maintenance of 2 metre x 2 metre pedestrian visibility splays behind the footway on both sides of the Eythorne Road access with no obstructions over 0.6m above footway level, prior to the use of the site commencing
  - (xiii) removal of PD rights (classes A, B and E)
  - (xiv) hand dug condition and tree protection measures including protective fencing
  - (xv) contamination land condition
  - (xvi) construction management plan
  - (xvii) ecology – plantation of native species and biodiversity enhancements as detailed within the report.
  - (xviii) Sensitive lighting Scheme (bats)
  - (xix) Surface water disposal
  - (xx) foul water drainage
  - (xxi) Windows conditions pd removal and 1.7/obscure glazing
  - (xxii) Existing and proposed site levels
  - (xxiii) landscaping scheme
  - (xxiv) boundary treatments and hard surfacing materials
  - (xxv) front boundary constructed prior to first occupation.

- II Powers to 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.

Case Officer

Benazir Kachchhi