

- a) **DOV/19/00669 - Outline application for the erection of 34 dwellings (8 x 2 beds, 16 x 3 beds and 10 x 4 beds) and means of access with associated landscaping (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved) – Land between nos 107 and 127 Capel Street, Capel-le-Ferne**

Reason for report – Deferred from Planning Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2019

- b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning permission be granted subject to conditions and S106 agreement.

- c) **Planning Policies and Guidance**

Please refer to report attached as an annexe.

- d) **Relevant Planning History**

Please refer to report attached as an annexe.

- e) **Consultee and Third-Party Representations**

Please refer to report attached as an annexe.

**Additional Comments since last agenda**

**Infrastructure and Delivery Officer** – It has been confirmed that the updated off-site payment is £21,260 instead of £19,400 previously referred to. (The Parish Council have also agreed to use this payment towards the upgrade of the Lancaster Avenue playground).

**KCC Highways**: Have confirmed the acceptability of the proposals subject to the required off-site highway works.

**In response to the Technical Note on behalf of Capel Parish Council**

1. The allocation of the site has been accepted by an Inspector through the Local Plan process, with consideration of factors such as sustainability. The principle of development on the site has therefore been accepted with the existing situation in relation to footway networks, access to bus stops, etc. There is more than one suitable route that pedestrians and drivers can and will take to travel to/from New Dover Road.
2. It is accepted and stated that there is additional traffic during school drop off and pick up times. However, there are existing passing places available and traffic is still able to manoeuvre along Capel Street. Site observations have confirmed this. The additional traffic likely to be generated by the development at these times, around 19 two-way movements across each hour (an average of one every three minutes) is considered unlikely to have a severe impact on the existing situation, particularly with the mitigation measures proposed which will improve passing opportunities. The application is for less dwellings than the Local Plan allocation and less dwellings than the previous application which the appeal Inspector considered acceptable in highway terms. Whilst some footway parking may occur at present, pedestrians are still able to use the footway and the proposals do not add to parking demand in Capel Street. There are no recorded personal injury crashes in Capel Street between the site and New Dover Road in the 5 years to

end of September 2019. The development is not required to resolve or improve the existing situation.

3. An 'x' distance of 2 metres for the new private drives onto Capel Street is in accordance with Manual for Streets, as highlighted in the report, and there is enough room for a vehicle to pass with a bonnet slightly overhanging. The existing dwellings to the north of the northernmost private drive have ample off-street parking available and this in combination with the arrangement of existing driveways means that southbound vehicles approaching the new private drive access are unlikely to be on the wrong side of the road. The measurement of the visibility splay to the centre line is therefore considered acceptable.
4. The application is in outline form with layout reserved, therefore swept paths for the layout would be considered at the reserved matters stage. For development such as this on lightly trafficked roads of this nature it is common for refuse vehicles to use the whole width of road when manoeuvring through the site access. It is also common for cars manoeuvring out of the accesses to utilise more than half the width of road if required, as occurs with the existing accesses onto Capel Street. Drivers simply wait until the road is clear for them to make their manoeuvre. Turning space for private driveways would be resolved through reserved matters.
5. The trip rates used are considered robust and it is likely that fewer trips will be generated than indicated. As longer trips are required for work, school, shopping, etc., people in more rural areas tend to combine these into less trips to/from the site. Over time some children from the site are also likely to take up places at the local school and walk to the same, reducing the parking demand for the school. The trip generation during the school pick-up time is essentially no different to that considered for the network pm peak hour, with a difference of less than 1 trip between the two time periods.
6. The parking within the site would be resolved through reserved matters, however the indicative layout shows two parking spaces for each dwelling and sufficient space to accommodate the 5 visitor spaces required within shared private drives or on street, which accords with current guidance. The indicative layout also shows 12 spaces to replace the 15 lost in Capel Street and more could potentially be added in the detailed consideration of the layout at reserved matters stage, such that the overall loss of parking in Capel Street would be minimal or negated completely. A condition can be added requiring replacement parking to be provided as part of a reserved matters submission.
7. More detailed highway works plans were previously submitted and site visits made to clarify that the works required and acceptable visibility splays can be achieved within the highway boundary and land in the control of the applicant. The likelihood of a car manoeuvring in/out of the single private driveway at the same as the adjacent pedestrian crossing being used time is very low, however the pedestrian crossing dropped kerbs can be protected with bollards to prevent overrunning by vehicles if considered necessary. Pedestrians will not be required to walk along private driveways. Street lighting is a detail that would be considered through the separate highway approval process and we are confident that there is room to accommodate the same.
8. A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would be required for the parking restrictions and this can be made by Kent County Council as the highway authority. According to advice to Planning Inspectors TROs must be made for qualifying purposes including avoiding danger to persons or traffic and facilitating the passage of traffic, which clearly apply in this case. Traffic flow and highway safety should be the

primary concerns in relation to introducing a prohibition of waiting rather than matters of inconvenience or change. Therefore, if KCC is satisfied that the TRO is required and is the correct form of mitigation then they are in a position to dismiss erroneous objections and make the Order. The TRO could therefore be reasonably secured through a planning condition or s.106 agreement, with the drawings which highlight the TRO also referred to as approved drawings in the decision notice. Any perceived impact on local residential parking amenity is a matter for the Local Planning Authority to consider in its determination of the planning application.

9. The application is in outline form with layout a reserved matter, therefore details of gradients, exact width/layout of private drives, etc. would be dealt with through that process. All the highway-related works will also be considered in detail through the separate highway approval process, allowing amendments to be made if necessary. We are confident that issues can be adequately addressed.
10. Although there is currently no footway in Capel Street to the north of the site, there are likely to be very few if any additional pedestrian trips in this direction generated by the development site and none were witnessed during site observations. Village services/amenities such as the school, bus stops, village hall, shops, etc., are located to the south of the site.
11. Whilst there is no footway along the frontage of existing properties on the western side of Capel Street, this has always been the case and the proposals do not add an unacceptable level of additional traffic. The provision of the new footways offers an improvement for existing residents over the existing situation. There are no recorded personal injury crashes in Capel Street between the site and New Dover Road in the 5 years to end of September 2019. As such the risk of pedestrian and vehicle conflict is unlikely to be increased as a result of the development.
12. Construction Management can be dealt with through a condition requiring a plan for the same, as is standard practice. This can deal with issues such as routing and timing of HGV movements and any temporary traffic management measures required, including avoiding HGV movements during school drop-off/pick-up times.

KCC Development Contributions: The KCC assessment in 2016 was based upon the roll numbers and school capacity that was available at that time. The birth rate in Dover peaked in 2012 and that birth cohort, which entered schools in 2016, has proven to be the largest in the period 2003 to 2018. Demand for places is therefore reducing. This reduction is off-set by new demand generated from new homes. However, where surplus capacity exists which is sufficient to meet that new demand we are unable to seek developer contributions. This is the case in respect of this particular planning application.

Further Comments: Further to the recent KCC request letter upon this application, our clients in KCC Education have been undertaking a review of Secondary school projects in Dover District. Following that review, we are requested to amend the Secondary School project upon this application to now **Dover Christ Church Academy**. We would be grateful if the Secondary request can therefore be amended from Dover Grammar School for Girls to Dover Christ Church Academy.

Capel-le- Ferne Parish Council: Additional Comments

Still object to this amendment. The Architects have realised there is a "highways problem" with the proposed use of yellow lines. This being the loss of 17 parking spaces, which is significant, particularly at school pickup/drop off times, which is neighbouring this site. Their solution is to provide 15 visitor parking spaces on the proposed estate. This solution will never work, it would be an irritation to both drivers wishing to pickup/drop off at the school and potential new home owners on the estate.

It is time the Land Owner, Architects and Planner realises that the only sensible solution for this site is ribbon development, where properties are set back from Capel Street with a lay-by frontage allowing parking without the use of yellow lines. We would draw everyone's attention, especially the Planning Committee, to the attached recorded Kent Police Speed Watch Data for Capel Street 2018-2019. This being one of the main reasonings that Capel-le-Ferne Parish Council are still very unsure the amended drawings will make any difference to Capel Street traffic and therefore, is the cause for continued objection.

Therefore, Capel-le-Ferne Parish Council urge Dover District Council Planning Committee to refuse this application in its current format and also take into account the continued high density of this application on this site, in that the access is on a very narrow rural country lane, where speeding is a major concern, being used as a "rat run" to/from Folkestone and Dover.

Separately, it has been noticed the Architect has made reference to Section 106. Councillors will accept the contribution towards improved play facilities at the Playing Field, Lancaster Avenue, Capel-le-Ferne, CT18 7LX. This is on the understanding, as you have stated "*it only comes into force if permission is granted*" and this is mentioned and made part of the Unilateral Undertaking in Section 6 CONDITION PRECEDENT – i.e. - This Undertaking shall come into effect upon the grant of the Planning Permission.

#### Technical Note

Chapel Parish Council have also submitted a Technical Note produced by Lime Transport. The summary of the document states:

*"The proposals do not meet the objectives set out in the site allocation. In terms of meeting the objective to minimise the loss of the hedgerow, the applicant proposes to replant the eastern hedgerow to avoid junction visibility splays, but it will also be affected by forward visibility splays (not shown on proposals). Also, the proposals fail to provide safe pedestrian routes and the do not take account of the requirement for street lighting.*

*The TS fails to provide adequate survey data to determine the impact of the development, particularly in relation to school traffic.*

*As evidenced by car ownership and travel to work data, the site is not sustainably located. The majority of facilities, including bus stops, are significantly beyond typical walking distances. In addition, the pedestrian network is poor. The use of sustainable modes is unlikely to be a realistic option for the majority of day-to-day trips.*

*The trip generation rates are significantly under-estimated given the site's location and the considerable proportion of larger houses (30% 4-bed).*

*The application does not meet the adopted parking standards and the community parking replaces only seven of the displaced 15 spaces.*

*The design of the access is not safe and suitable for all users. Access is not a reserved matter, so there is no mechanism for the Highway Authority to revise the proposals and, therefore, these unsafe and unsatisfactory access arrangements would be fixed.*

*Vehicle visibility splays included in the application cross the private land of two properties outside the control of the applicant and the achievable splay is significantly below the required standard. This is likely to compromise highway safety.*

*Vehicle swept path analysis and forward visibility have not been provided to demonstrate that the proposed accesses can operate safely and the provision of forward visibility splays at the private driveways is likely to have further impact on the replanted hedgerows.*

*Despite the TS claiming that the additional vehicle trips can be easily accommodated in terms of traffic impact, no assessment has been carried out on the impact of these additional vehicles on the operation and safety of the public highway for all users in relation to the increase in traffic at school pick up and drop off times.*

*The Amended Proposed Highway Works drawing is not sufficient to determine the feasibility of the proposed works. It is unclear how the proposed widening will be achieved given the constraints to pedestrian visibility splays on both sides of the carriageway. The pedestrian visibility splays shown cross private land not in the control of the applicant. These issues compromise the ability to provide a safe pedestrian crossing and route.*

*The Traffic Regulation Orders required to ensure safe access and improve the flow of vehicles along Capel Street are subject to consultation.*

*The Road Safety Audit raised a number of issues that are not addressed in the designer's response.*

*Given the constrained nature of the geometry of Capel Street and the vehicle parking and manoeuvring associated with the school, significant highway safety issues were not considered in the TS as a result of the additional traffic flow along Capel Street including:*

- The impact on the residents on the western side of Capel Street stepping into a running carriageway with no footway protection; and,*
- The operation of the street at school times.*

*Key documents have not been submitted including a Lighting Assessment to consider the impact of the need for street lighting and a sufficiently detailed Construction Management Plan to ensure the development can be built safely."*

Third Party Representations – An additional 23 comments objecting to the proposal have been received since the application was last reported to planning committee. In total 126 representations have been received with 123 objecting, 2 neutral comments and 1 letter of support.

The additional 20 letters of objection that includes an objection from Cllr Rose and the Headteacher at Capel Primary School, have not raised any new comments but have reiterated the narrowness of Capel Street, ongoing parking problems in Capel Street, with limited availability and parking issues connected with the primary school. In addition, there is concern for the safety of school children walking to school (and pedestrians/residents) due to the lack of a public footpath and consequential increases in traffic as a result of this development. In summary, these identify that the replacement car parking being proposed will not be used for its intended purpose and still results in the loss of 4 on-street car parking spaces. Capel Street is therefore not safe and this development will cause more harm and cannot be considered acceptable in terms of highway safety. This is not the right location for new development and the negative impacts of the loss of this greenspace and the impact on wildlife that use the site. It has also been reiterated that drainage in the area is not able to cope with increases in demand.

f) **The Site and the Proposal**

Please refer to report attached as an annex.

**Assessment**

- 1.1 This application is being reported back to Planning Committee following its deferral at the 10<sup>th</sup> October 2019 committee meeting where a number of points of further clarification were required relating to principally highway considerations. These were:
- A plan clearly outlining the proposed highway works including new footpaths in close proximity to the site/at the site frontage
  - KCC Highways and Transportation Engineer to attend meeting and explain why the application is acceptable in highway terms
  - The number of on-street car parking spaces that would be lost as a result of the proposed off-site highway works and proposed double-yellow lines
  - Further clarification in terms of the proposed visitor car parking spaces and the number of spaces that would be proposed to replace the on-street car parking
  - Discussions with the agent in respect of the inclusion of layout in the description and the size of the proposed housing set out in the outline application.
  - Clarification from KCC that a primary education contribution is not now required and why
- 1.2 The application was on the agenda for 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 planning committee, but was withdrawn at a late stage due to the submission of a transport technical note by Capel Parish Council the day before planning committee. It was decided that due to the detail in the submitted report this could not be adequately addressed before committee and consequently was withdrawn from the agenda.
- 1.3 A detailed consideration of the planning issues was set out in the previous committee report and it is not intended to reproduce those discussions in detail in this report. These considerations have not been amended or are not materially different from the October Planning Committee report. Please refer to the attached annex/previous committee report in relation to:
- Principle of Development
  - Impact on the AONB and Visual and Rural Amenity
  - Affordable Housing and Dwelling Mix
  - Impact on Residential Amenity
  - Highways Issues
  - Appropriate Assessment
  - Ecology
  - Drainage and Flooding
  - Planning Contributions
  - Other Material Considerations

**Highway Matters**

- 1.4 In respect of the reasons for the application being deferred an amended masterplan and an additional highway works plan have been submitted and have been the subject of re-consultation. These show the proposed highway works along the site frontage and additional off-street car parking spaces that can be used

by parents during school drop-off/collection. The highway plan shows the proposed highway works along the site frontage including the new public footpath (along the frontage) and the crossing point between the site and the new section of public footpath on the opposite side of Capel Street that links to the school entrance and the wider public footpath network.

1.5 In respect of the proposed highway works and car parking the agent states:

“As requested we have prepared Drawing No A1382-106 Rev B to show the full extent of the proposed highway works within the wider context superimposed on the proposed layout plan to provide further certainty for members. We have revised the Illustrative Master Plan Dr No A1382-110 Rev F to identify where visitor spaces will be provided and this includes 5 additional car parking spaces within the turning head...this has also been tracked as it serves as a turning head. We have also spent time quantifying the effects of the proposed highway works to Capel Street upon on street parking capacity. Our highway consultants, Markides Associates, have calculated that because of the waiting restrictions shown, there is a kerb length lost which would be equivalent to 17 parked vehicles along Capel Street. The latest attached layout plan (drawing no. A1382-110 Rev F) incorporates an additional 5 visitor spaces within the turning head which, together with the 10 visitor spaces close to the internal spine road provides a total of 15 non-allocated parking spaces across the site. These spaces could be accessed during school drop off and pick up times.”

1.6 This confirms that up to 17 on-street car parking spaces would be lost in total, due to the proposed off-site highway works. The plans identify that 15 replacement car parking spaces are to be provided on-site for use by visitors and parents when collecting children at the school with on-site turning space. These spaces will not have any restrictions placed on their use and 10 replacement parking spaces will be available along the length of the proposed access road, with a further 5 spaces available at the turning head further into the site. The 5 turning head spaces do appear to be quite detached from school access but could be used by staff at the school. This results in 10 'more causal' parking spaces that parents could use with a public footpath linking to the school gate. The net loss of car parking spaces is therefore 2 in total. This would not be considered to result in a severe impact on highway safety in line with paragraph 109 of the NPPF and a reason for refusal on these grounds would be difficult to defend at appeal.

1.7 As referred to above, Capel Parish Council commissioned a further report into highway matters and a Technical Note was submitted on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2020 that raised a number of concerns. Subsequently a request for further comments on this report was made to KCC Highways and Transportation and the applicant. At the time of writing, additional comments from the applicants highway consultants are still awaited and KCC Highways comments and response are set out above.

1.8 The submitted report considers a number of points, not all of which relate purely to highway considerations. In particular the principle of development on the site and whether a site is in a sustainable location has already been considered by the Planning Inspector in the 2015 Land Allocations Local Plan DPD and has been found to be acceptable. This is not therefore relevant to the consideration of this application. In addition, compliance with policy LA26 and its relevant considerations is a matter to be weighed in the judgement in considering this application and is discussed in detail in the main report. Furthermore details such as a detailed lighting scheme, detailed highway layouts and a construction management plan are all addressed through conditions and are details that would be addressed further during a reserved matters application and are not details to

be considered at this outline application stage.

- 1.9 In terms of the technical highway considerations these are dealt with in detail in the KCC Highways and Transportation response above. The details submitted in regard to the proposed on and off-site highway works, including carriageway widths, vehicle sweep paths, proposed new access vision splays, proposed footpath provision, proposed parking controls through a Traffic Regulation Order, additional traffic generated by the development and the proposed highway mitigation measures have all been assessed in some detail by the applicants highway consultant and KCC Highways and Transportation and have all been found to be acceptable from a highways safety perspective and are in accordance with well-established highway guidance documents.
- 1.10 On this basis no highway objection has been raised and the Technical Note submitted by Chapel Parish Council does not change this position. The proposed works go beyond what is required from the development in terms of highway provision and the developer is not required to resolve or improve the existing highway situation to enable a development. Consequently, the proposal does not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in a residual cumulative impact on the road network that would be severe, that is identified as the key test as set out in paragraph 109 of the NPPF. The proposed development is therefore acceptable in highway terms.
- 1.11 A KCC Highways and Transportation engineer will also be attending planning committee to assist in further discussions in respect of highway considerations.

#### Other Material Considerations

- 1.12 In terms of the inclusion of layout and the specific number of units in the description, the applicants have put forward the following:

“During the previous discussion by members at Committee, it was evident that the members considered the layout was of a high quality but questioned how this would be assured to be carried forward to the reserved matters application. We propose to address this by:

  - a. Referencing the specific mix in the application description and decision notice (i.e. 8 x 2 beds; 16 x 3 beds and 10 x 4 bed dwellings); and
  - b. Specifically conditioning the masterplan. Wording that we have used in a similar situation in Medway where members wanted additional design safeguarding at the outline stage is set out below ... “The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan drawing nos. A1382-106 Rev B and Dr No A1382-110 Rev F”.”
- 1.13 The description of the planning application has therefore been amended to include 8 x 2 beds, 16 x 3 beds and 10 x 4 beds and the site layout plan/masterplan will no longer be indicative but will be included in the approved plans list. The layout of the site is not however to be included in the matters being fully determined under this outline application. The site layout could therefore vary in some minor form if a Reserved Matters application were to be submitted, but the layout would largely need to be in conformity with the approved site layout plan. Additionally, the unit numbers and size of the proposed units would need to comply with the outline description to be submitted as a Reserved Matters application.
- 1.14 In respect of the KCC education contribution requests, Members will note that the



previous application required both a primary and secondary education contribution, however, KCC have only requested a secondary contribution in respect of this application. The KCC Development Contributions team were asked to clarify this position and stated:

“The KCC assessment in 2016 was based upon the roll numbers and school capacity that was available at that time. The birth rate in Dover peaked in 2012 and that birth cohort, which entered schools in 2016, has proven to be the largest in the period 2003 to 2018. Demand for places is therefore reducing. This reduction is off-set by new demand generated from new homes. However, where surplus capacity exists which is sufficient to meet that new demand we are unable to seek developer contributions. This is the case in respect of this particular planning application.”

- 1.15 Seeking a primary education contribution when there are sufficient primary school places to meet the needs of the development would fail the three specific legal tests set out in the Planning Act 2008 and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (CIL Regulations) which require that requests for development contributions of various kinds must be necessary, related to the development, and reasonably related in scale and kind. A primary school contribution could not therefore be justified as necessary or related directly to the development.
- 1.16 In addition KCC Development Contributions have recently undertaken a review of secondary education projects and on this basis have revised their designated project from Dover School for Girls to Dover Christ Church Academy. Any legal agreement will therefore need to be amended accordingly.
- 1.17 The Heads of Terms that are considered necessary, related and reasonable to make the development acceptable in planning terms are as follows. At the time of writing the report and legal agreement is in the final stages of being signed by all parties.
  - Secondary Education- towards Phase 1 expansion of Dover Christ Church Academy of £139,910
  - Library - contribution towards additional book stock for Capel mobile library of £1,632.54
  - Social Care - £2639.42 towards Dover Social Care Hub
  - Community Learning - £871.72 towards Adult Education at Dover Discovery Centre
  - A total of £1,990 is required as a contribution towards the Thanet and Sandwich Coast Management Strategy
  - An off-site public open space contribution of £21,260 towards enhanced play space facilities at Lancaster Avenue (which equates to 60% of the total cost of that project).
  - Payment of all associated legal costs.
- 1.18 In addition, a separate s278 Agreement under the Highways Act with KCC Highways and Transportation in respect of the access arrangements and off-site highway improvements will be required.

## **2. Conclusion**

- 2.1 In terms of planning policies, development of this site within the settlement confines and on land allocated for residential development under Policy LA26 of the LALP is acceptable in principle and is in accordance with policies in the Core Strategy, Local Plan and the NPPF. The additional information and clarification provided has

sought to underline this approach and no new material considerations have been raised that outweigh the benefits of this proposed development or would result in significant harm that cannot be addressed through conditions or legal agreements.

- 2.2 In addition, there are no development plan policies or policies in the Framework that suggest development should be refused. When weighing up the adverse impacts of the development identified in the report, although there is a large number of local objections to the proposed development, there are no clear planning reasons that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of providing additional housing on an allocated site within the district, including the provision of 30% affordable housing.
- 2.3 The proposed development of 34 dwellings will be a substantial addition to the availability of housing sites within the district and will contribute towards the 629 units per annum now required under the standardised methodology for the calculation of housing need. The additional housing will also have social benefit of providing 10 affordable housing units on the site, along with the relevant contributions towards local infrastructure costs that have largely been agreed in principle.
- 2.4 The proposal is within the quantum of housing suggested by LA26 (and other development plan policies) which also seek to retain a significant amount of natural screening in the context of the site location and its setting. The impact on the setting of the AONB is minimised and its special character protected. The proposed plans have also sought to address the concerns raised by the Planning Inspectorate by providing a mix of housing sizes, form and design rather than a standardised housing design with a similar footprint that would be out of keeping in the highly varied character of the dwellings in Capel. The proposals are therefore considered to be in keeping with the character and street scene of Capel Street and development should be approved.
- 2.5 Additional details and plans have been submitted in respect of highway matters and KCC Highways consider the revised proposals to be acceptable, subject to necessary conditions and agreements relating to off-site highway works. The proposed impact on the highway is therefore not severe and accords with paragraph 109 of the NPPF, the impact on the highway network is therefore acceptable.
- 2.6 The proposed development, although only in outline form, largely addresses most of the criteria identified in Policy LA26 of the Land Allocations Local Plan and accords with the principles of this policy, with the frontage hedgerow proposed to be replaced and the provision of an accessible public footpath along the site frontage. The proposal is therefore acceptable for this housing allocation site, accords with relevant development plan policies, the NPPF and is acceptable in principle. All other matters raised can be addressed by planning conditions. Consequently, the application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions and a s106 legal agreement to secure the required contributions.

**g) Recommendation**

- I. PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to a Section 106 legal agreement to secure necessary planning contributions and subject to the following conditions to include:
  - 1) Reserved matters details
  - 2) Outline time limits
  - 3) Approved plans

- 4) Existing the proposed site levels and building heights
- 5) Ecological mitigation and recommendations implemented
- 6) Ecological/biodiversity mitigation, enhancement and management plan
- 7) Construction Management Plan
- 8) Highway conditions (parking, visibility splays, highway works fully implemented, turning facilities, cycle parking, gradient, surface, works to all footpaths and drainage)
- 9) Affordable housing provision (numbers, type, tenure, location, timing of construction, housing provider and occupancy criteria scheme)
- 10) Landscaping Details and maintenance of buffer zones
- 11) Open space management plan
- 12) Protection of Trees and Hedges
- 13) Hard landscaping works and boundary details/enclosures
- 14) Reporting of unexpected land contamination
- 15) No works on site until final SuDS testing is undertaken and submitted
- 16) Design details of surface Water drainage strategy
- 17) Implementation and verification of SuDS scheme
- 18) No other infiltration on site other than that approved
- 19) Contamination safeguarding
- 20) Off-site highway works undertaken and implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order
- 21) External lighting to be addressed at reserved matters
- 22) Details of replacement/visitor parking to be submitted for approval

- II. Powers to be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions and to agree a s106 agreement in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by Planning Committee.

Case Officer

Lucinda Roach

Annex 1: Previous Committee Report 10<sup>th</sup> October 2019