

Public Document Pack

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held remotely on Thursday, 25 February 2021 at 5.30 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor J S Back

Councillors: R S Walkden
M Bates
D G Beaney
E A Biggs
T A Bond
D G Cronk
O C de R Richardson
H M Williams
C F Woodgate (Minute Nos 96-103 only)

Officers: Team Leader (Development Management)
Principal Planner
Planning Officer
Planning Officer
Planning Consultant
Planning Solicitor
Democratic Services Manager
Democratic Services Officer

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

<u>Application No</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>
DOV/20/00851	-----	Ms Catherine Bolton
DOV/20/00541	Ms Elizabeth Welch	-----
DOV/20/00952	Mr Michael Humphries Councillor P D Jull	Ms Elizabeth Woodeson
DOV/20/00132	Ms Eloise Marshall	Mr Jamie Checkland
DOV/20/00419	Mr Alex Kalorkoti Dr Raju Sakaria Councillor S C Manion	Mrs Bridget Ransom Deal & Walmer Chamber of Trade Mr Jim Davies (Miners' Group)

92 APOLOGIES

It was noted that there were no apologies for absence.

92 APOLOGIES

It was noted that there were no apologies for absence.

93 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

There were no appointments of substitute members.

94 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor O C de R Richardson made a Voluntary Announcement of Other Interests in Agenda Item 7 (Application No DOV/20/00952 – Putting Green, The Promenade, Walmer) by reason that he had had contact with the applicant in his capacity as the Cabinet Member for Environment and Corporate Property.

95 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

96 APPLICATION NO DOV/20/00851 - WHITFIELD CHAPEL, CHAPEL ROAD, WHITFIELD

The Committee was shown an aerial view, drawings, plans and photographs of the application site. The Planning Consultant advised that planning permission was sought for the demolition of the existing chapel building and its replacement with three two-storey houses. Since the report was written, Members were advised that an additional response had been received which raised no new material considerations. As a correction to paragraph 1.6 of the report, it was clarified that there was no local list of buildings of historical interest. In addition, the chapel had been erected in 1867 and not in the 1850s as stated in the report.

The proposed development was modest in scale and would make a positive contribution to the street scene. The chapel building was a non-designated heritage asset. Whilst it was considered to have no significant design merit, it did have an historical value. The applicant had submitted a structural report which concluded that the building was not viable for conversion. The report had been a detailed one and, short of carrying out an independent survey of their own, there was no reason for Officers to doubt its findings. The applicant had agreed to maintain the church burial ground and to relocate the war memorial tablet to an alternative location. Kent County Council (KCC) Archaeology had yet to submit comments and, if approved, planning permission should be subject to their advice and conditions, if appropriate. It was clarified that new drawings had been submitted after the plot had been re-measured, and were found to be accurate in relation to the Ordnance Survey plan. It was for the Committee to assess whether the loss of a non-designated heritage asset would be outweighed by the benefits of the proposed development which was considered to be of good quality.

In response to comments made by various Members about the burial ground, the Planning Consultant confirmed that the applicant would be required to submit a landscape scheme and timeline for its maintenance which would be undertaken in perpetuity. It was possible that a covenant would be attached to the sale of the houses by the developer which would make one or more occupiers responsible for its maintenance. Whilst the applicant could be required to install a site notice or information board giving the history of the site, the burial ground was private land and a condition could not be imposed requiring the burial ground to be publicly accessible.

Turning to other matters, the Planning Consultant confirmed that details of energy efficiency measures could be required if Members wished. In relation to foul drainage, he clarified that the applicant would need to work with Southern Water which had advised that some network reinforcement would be required in order to accommodate the development. At Councillor H M Williams's suggestion, he agreed that replacement trees could be sought and included in the landscaping condition.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/20/00851 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) 3-year timescale for implementation;
- (ii) Development to accord with the submitted drawings;
- (iii) Details/specifications of materials and finishes to be submitted;
- (iv) Joinery details (which shall be of timber construction) for windows and doors to be submitted for approval;
- (v) All design components shown on the approved drawings to be provided in the finished scheme;
- (vi) Details of foul and surface water drainage to be submitted for approval;
- (vii) Details of hardsurfacing materials, which shall be permeable, to be submitted for approval;
- (viii) Details of landscaping (including replacement trees) and boundary enclosures to be submitted for approval;
- (ix) Parking spaces to be provided on site;
- (x) Cycle spaces and refuse storage facilities to be submitted for approval;
- (xi) The removal of Permitted Development Rights for extensions, porches, changes to the roof and outbuildings;
- (xii) Details of all external lighting to be submitted for approval;
- (xiii) Details of biodiversity enhancements to be submitted for approval;
- (xiv) Details of the arrangements for the management and upkeep of the burial ground to be submitted for approval;
- (xv) Details of the arrangements for the new location of the memorial plaque/tablet to be removed from the building to be submitted for approval;
- (xvi) Provision of information board for burial ground;
- (xvii) Window reveals no less than 80mm;

- (xviii) Details at scale 1:20 of the finished design of all arched brick window headers shown on approved drawing number;
 - (xix) Details of the roof parapet between plots 1 and 2 shall be submitted for approval;
 - (xx) Archaeology;
 - (xxi) Details of energy efficiency measures to be submitted;
 - (xxii) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, cable ducting and electrical wiring suitable to facilitate a subsequent installation of (an) 7kW 32amp OLEV-compliant wall or ground-mounted charge point(s) adjacent to the car parking space(s) proposed shall be installed and shall thereafter be retained such that it remains capable of providing the electricity required by any future electric vehicle charging point(s);
 - (xxiii) None of the dwellings hereby approved shall be occupied until any necessary sewage network reinforcement work has been carried out to ensure that adequate wastewater network capacity is available to adequately drain the development. In order to demonstrate that sufficient capacity has been provided, prior to the occupation of any dwelling, details of the drainage network that will serve the development shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, accompanied by evidence to demonstrate that the required works have been carried out and that the network does have the required capacity. Occupation shall then not take place until the Local Planning Authority has confirmed in writing that it is satisfied that the submitted details fulfil the necessary requirements.
- (b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary wording in line with the recommendations and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

97 APPLICATION NO DOV/20/00541 - LAND ON THE WEST SIDE OF STATION ROAD, ST MARGARET'S-AT-CLIFFE

Members viewed an aerial view, maps, drawings, plans and photographs of the application site which was situated to the west of Station Road and adjacent to the Station Road/Dover Road junction. The Team Leader (Development Management) (TLDM) advised that planning permission was sought for the erection of four detached dwellings on a site which lay outside the village confines of St Margaret's-at-Cliffe.

The Committee was advised that there were various matters which were not in contention, such as sustainability, highway arrangements, heritage impacts and the

limited weight that could be given to Core Strategy Policy DM1. However, the application site fell within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to which national planning policy gave the highest status of protection, stating that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of the area. The site was a prominent one, currently used as farmland and surrounded on three sides by mature trees and vegetation, with the north-western boundary being open. It signalled a transition from the built-up form of St Margaret's to the start of undeveloped, open countryside, playing a pivotal role in softening the edge of the village. Concerns were that the sylvan character of the area would be eroded by the need for highways engineering and the provision of a walking route from the development to the village centre. The site was not one that had been identified for development in St Margaret's, and it was Officers' view that it did not represent a logical extension to the village.

Justification for the scheme relied on the limited view that would be gained of the development by the provision of extensive screening. However, to rely on screening alone for a site within the AONB which should be afforded the greatest protection would be an unsafe decision. In any case, it was likely that views would be readily gained into the site from new access openings through the tree screen, and as a result of pressure from residents to increase natural light into properties by thinning the tree frontage.

The AONB Unit had raised strong objections to the proposal. It was Officers' view that the loss of the site to housing development in principle, and more particularly by virtue of the nature of the development proposed by the application, would appear as a suburban intrusion into the countryside that would harm both the setting of the village and the character and appearance of the AONB. Due to the harm that would be caused to the AONB, and the highest status of protection required to be given to land with this designation, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) required that the 'tilted balance' for assessing the application should be disengaged. It was considered that the harm identified strongly outweighed any benefits arising from the proposal and, as such, it was recommended that planning permission should be refused.

In response to Councillor D G Beaney, the TLDM advised that no negotiations had taken place in respect of the design of the proposed dwellings because of Officers' concerns about the principle of development on a prominent site that was within the AONB. It was Officers' view that it would be challenging for a developer to make any residential development acceptable in this location. Several Members agreed that the site was an important one that signified a separation between the village and countryside and, as such, should be afforded the highest protection. There was no justification for developing in the AONB, and granting planning permission was likely to lead to further ribbon development.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/20/00541 be REFUSED on the grounds that the proposed development would result in an unjustified intrusion of built development into an undeveloped countryside location which would harm the prevailing rural character at this point and result in significant and demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the setting of the village of St Margaret's-at-Cliffe within its rural context. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies DM15 and DM16 of the Dover District Local Plan that seeks to protect the character of the countryside, and paragraphs 170 and 172 of the National Planning

Policy Framework, as well as policies SD1, SD2, SD3 and SD9 of the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Development to settle any reasons for refusal in line with the issues set out in the report and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

98 APPLICATION NO DOV/20/00952 - PUTTING GREEN, THE PROMENADE, WALMER

The Committee was shown an aerial view, drawings, a plan and photographs of the application site which was adjacent to other leisure facilities on the promenade at Walmer. The Planning Officer advised that planning permission was sought for the erection of a new 18-hole putting course with various installations and a timber-framed kiosk. As an update to the report, he reported that 33 letters of support, 20 letters of objection and one expressing a neutral position had been received, none of which raised any new issues.

Members were advised that the largest of the installations would be over 3 metres in height and the site would be surrounded by fencing and a hedge. As a site within the Walmer Seafront Conservation Area, the initial scheme had drawn concerns that it would cause harm to the seafront and conservation area. However, with a condition requiring that the height of the existing hedge be raised and maintained at 2 metres, this harm would be reduced to less than substantial, a point at which the proposal needed to be weighed against the public benefits. Whilst the increased hedge height would have an impact on Walmer Green, this would only be for a short distance. KCC Highways had raised no objections. Although the Environment Agency had raised no objections, it had requested that two conditions be attached. In response to concerns raised by Members, it was confirmed that, should the venture fail, the Council as the land-owner had powers to have the site returned to its original condition. A condition to this effect could be imposed if Members wished.

Councillor T A Bond argued that the proposal was a good one but in the wrong location. Walmer Green was a pleasant green area which should be protected. Whilst the existing paddling pool was fairly unobtrusive, the fencing and hedge would be obtrusive and damaging to the conservation area. He also raised concerns about parking and the lack of toilet facilities. Councillor E A Biggs agreed that the proposal was an appealing facility but in the wrong place and would harm the attractive vista of the seafront. Councillor Williams requested that signage to public conveniences be installed within the site. She also raised concerns about parking, particularly the pressure that would be caused by the facility on parking for patients of the nearby GP surgery.

The Planning Officer advised that the site was no more than 60 metres in length and had not been a functional part of Walmer Green for some time. Only the provision of signage within the site could be conditioned. It was recognised that, anecdotally, parking was a problem in the area. However, KCC Highways had concluded that the proposal would not put sufficient pressure on parking to require the applicant to provide parking. In any case, there was no highway access to the site.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/20/00952 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Standard time condition;

- (ii) List of approved plans;
- (iii) Material samples;
- (iv) Kiosk to be painted white;
- (v) Construction management plan;
- (vi) No external lighting, fixed or temporary;
- (vii) No amplified sound;
- (viii) Opening hours;
- (ix) Provision of public convenience signage within site;
- (x) Hedge to be maintained at a height no less than 2 metres on west, south and east boundaries;
- (xi) Grounds and installation maintenance plan and schedule;
- (xii) Existing brick boundary wall to be retained;
- (xiii) Revised drainage scheme if required following update to Planning Committee;
- (xiv) Any conditions required by the Environment Agency if necessary;
- (xv) Land to be reinstated to original condition if facility closes.

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

Members viewed an aerial view, drawings, a plan and photographs of the application site which was situated within the settlement confines of Eastry where the principle of development was considered acceptable. The Planning Officer advised that the application sought planning permission for the erection of a detached dwelling with associated parking and boundary fence, together with the creation of a vehicle access and associated parking for Gore Cottage. As a correction to the report, Members were advised that recommendation II and paragraph 3.3 of the report should refer to paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework rather than paragraph 110. One further representation had been received in support of the proposal from a member of the public who had previously submitted an objection. They stated that they were in support of the application provided the owners would not be allowed to extend upwards in the future. A response had also been received from the Tree and Horticulture Officer who had stated that they were familiar with the site, having

served a Tree Protection Order (TPO) on the pine tree on the neighbours' land at Walnut Tree Cottage. Whilst the retention of the trees within the site would have been preferable, they were not sufficiently prominent or of such quality to be afforded a TPO.

The Planning Officer advised that Gore Cottage was a non-designated heritage asset. Conditions were proposed that would remove permitted development rights in relation to the roof, and require details of the ridge and floor levels of the new dwelling in relation to Gore Cottage. Paragraphs 2.25 to 2.29 of the report dealt with the matter of visibility splays. There was a legal requirement to provide safe access and if the visibility splays could not be provided then the application should be refused. She clarified that KCC Highways had initially recommended refusal because the visibility splays could only be provided on land outside the applicant's ownership. However, following discussions, KCC Highways had agreed that the development would be deemed acceptable if visibility splays could be provided on land to the north of the site.

Some Members questioned why the application had been brought to the Committee without any guarantees in place regarding the visibility splays. The Planning Officer clarified that the split report recommendation was designed to achieve an acceptable outcome if at all possible. On occasions it had proved possible to achieve a satisfactory resolution between the parties once planning permission had been granted. In this regard, there was a period of two months within which the applicant could resolve matters with the neighbours and/or KCC Highways. It was confirmed that no pre-application advice had been sought, and the application had been submitted with the driveway in the location indicated. In the event that the location was changed, the applicant would need to hold further discussions with KCC Highways. Councillor M Bates raised concerns about the narrow lane which carried a significant amount of traffic. This, together with the narrow access and uncertainty surrounding the visibility splays, meant that he found it difficult to support the proposal.

In response to comments made by Councillor O C de R Richardson, the TLDM clarified that policies that were included in the emerging Local Plan could only be given limited weight for the time being unless they reflected national planning policies. As a consequence, it was possible to include conditions relating to the provision of electric vehicle charging points since these were referred to in the NPPF. Officers considered that there would be sufficient distance between the two properties, and a condition would establish the different levels across the site.

It was proposed by Councillor R S Walkden and duly seconded that Application No DOV/20/00132 be APPROVED as per the Officer's recommendation.

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

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

RESOLVED: (a) That, subject to a legal agreement being entered into with the applicant and the adjoining landowner to secure visibility splays at the access, Application No DOV/20/00132 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Standard time condition;
- (ii) List of approved plans;

- (iii) Samples of materials;
- (iv) Details of soft and hard landscaping (including boundary treatments and driveway/hardstanding surfaces) and schedule of planting;
- (v) Cross-sections of the site with ridge and floor levels of the proposed bungalow and Gore Cottage;
- (vi) Provision and retention of the parking area with drainage measures installed;
- (vii) Details of surface water disposal;
- (viii) Cables for electric vehicle charging points;
- (ix) Details of refuse storage;
- (x) Bathroom window on north-west elevation to be fitted with obscured glazing;
- (xi) Removal of permitted development rights for Classes B, C and E of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the GPDO;
- (xii) Archaeological watching brief;
- (xiii) Unexpected contamination.

(b) That, should the securing of a Section 106 agreement referred to in (a) not be possible, powers be delegated to Officers to REFUSE the application on the grounds that, without the visibility splays in place, the development would fail to provide safe access, contrary to paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(c) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary Section 106 agreement, planning conditions or refusal, and to determine the reasonable period (which should not be more than 2 months from the date of this meeting) within which a decision should be taken to determine the application under (a) or (b) above, in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

100 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 8.35pm for a short break and reconvened at 8.45pm.

101 APPLICATION NO DOV/20/00419 - ALMOND HOUSE, BETTESHANGER SUSTAINABLE PARKS, SANDWICH ROAD, SHOLDEN

The Committee was shown an aerial view, maps, plans and photographs of the application site. The Principal Planner advised that outline planning permission was sought for the erection of up to 210 dwellings, including up to 12 self-build plots, together with office and retail floorspace. She advised that the reference to the use class in the application description had been amended to read Class E rather than

A1 as a result of legislative changes that had occurred after the submission of the application. Since the report was published, an additional ten letters of objection and seven letters of support had been received. These largely reiterated points that had been addressed in the report. A few additional points had been raised by objectors and supporters, including that it was one of the most biodiverse sites in Kent, the site should be put to community use and that it was a well-balanced proposal. In addition, a letter had been received from the applicant addressing a number of ecology issues that had been raised.

The history of the site was set out in paragraphs 1.1 to 1.3 of the report. The site had been enabled for development since approximately 2000, and was considered to be mostly developed and not in the countryside. Specifically, infrastructure works such as access roads, utilities, drainage and street-lighting had been completed by the South East England Development Agency (SEEDA). Other works associated with planning permission granted in 2004 had also been carried out. Planning permission granted in 2017 for a new incubation building with café had recently expired. Whilst the site was outside the settlement confines, it was close to them, and part of it had been partially allocated for employment development under Policy AS1, a saved policy. The site had been promoted for this purpose for ten years without success. As such, the NPPF permitted the land to be considered for other uses.

The recommendation to the Committee was unusual in that it meant that Members were unlikely to be making a decision that evening unless they resolved to refuse the application - an option that was open to them. Instead, it would allow them to consider all the issues associated with the application (save for ecology), and give a view on whether development on the site was acceptable. Ecology issues had been the subject of discussions for the preceding six months and had yet to be resolved. Whilst it was believed that they could be resolved, it was an appropriate time to give the applicant some certainty over whether planning permission was likely to be granted. Subject to the Committee's decision, Officers would bring a report back to the Committee dealing with the ecology matters. It was confirmed that at that point all other matters could also be reconsidered.

The Principal Planner referred to paragraphs 2.22 to 2.40 of the report that set out some of the ecology considerations which were complex and wide-ranging. She clarified that an environmental impact assessment had not been required. It was clear that the site was being used by a wide range of protected species and was of high importance at both county and national level. It had also been identified as containing a number of priority habitats, including an Open Mosaic Habitat. Other matters, such as highways, sustainability, drainage and developer contributions were considered to be acceptable and covered in detail in the report.

Councillor Williams raised concerns that the Committee was expected to consider a complex application along with four others at the same meeting. She stressed that a separate meeting on the Betteshanger application would have been preferable. In response to Councillor D G Cronk who raised a query about buses, it was confirmed that a road safety audit had been submitted. Discussions with Stagecoach had taken place and there were plans for buses to serve the development. This matter could be dealt with under the Section 106 agreement.

Councillor Richardson praised the report. He referred to the site's industrial past which suggested that it was a developed or brownfield site. There had been a lot of public interest in the development, particularly about the presence of turtle doves and orchids. Whilst he welcomed the proposal, he stressed the importance of

sustainability (particularly with regard to bus services) and ecology. He also sought reassurance that all issues could be looked at again.

The Principal Planner advised Members that there had been disagreement about the quality of the Mosaic Open Habitat. There were currently four pairs of breeding turtle doves on the site. Under the proposals, sufficient habitat would be retained for three breeding pairs, but trees would be lost that currently supported the other breeding pair. However, not enough evidence had been submitted regarding the future of the birds and this needed to be addressed. She clarified that, whilst the Climate Change Strategy had been adopted by the Council, it had not been adopted for planning purposes. That being said, sustainability and climate change issues naturally formed part of an Officer's assessment of an application. Turning to highway matters, a number of traffic studies had been carried out by the applicant's consultants and KCC. It was recognised that there was an issue with the Mongeham Road/London Road junction. The carriageway was not wide enough to allow two cars to pass each other. Works to address vehicles queueing back up on to the A258 were proposed and could be secured by condition. In response to a query from Councillor Williams, she undertook to establish what long-term improvements the applicant was intending to fund at Betteshanger Country Park.

Councillor R S Walkden spoke in support of the proposal, arguing that it was developed land and, whilst ecology issues were important, the erection of over 200 houses should not be stymied because of turtle doves and orchids. He proposed that the application should be approved. Councillor Bates indicated that he was willing to support the proposal provided the wording of the resolution was changed to indicate that the Committee was minded to approve the application in principle. In his view this would leave the Committee in a more open-ended position when the application returned for determination. The Planning Solicitor expressed the view that the alternative wording suggested by Councillor Bates did not change the substance of the matter and that, in either case, the Committee was not bound or fettered by the proposed wording, and would be free to come to a contrary conclusion when the application returned to Committee. He reminded Members that they also had the option to defer the application, although doing so would not give the applicant the comfort of knowing that the Committee was broadly content with matters other than ecology.

Councillor Bond argued that the application should be deferred because there was insufficient information to make a rational decision. In particular, he cited land contamination, ecology and the loss of public rights of way as being of concern. The Principal Planner reiterated that the ecology issues were set out in paragraphs 2.22 to 2.40 of the report. As for contamination, the site had been fully remediated by SEEDA and the documentary evidence was available. There was no expectation that any public rights of way would be lost and, if anything, they would be enhanced.

Councillor Biggs voiced concerns about the report recommendation, and believed that there was insufficient information to come to a view on the application that evening. He was concerned about the ecological impact of the proposal, and mindful that there had been a significant number of public objections. For these reasons he could not support the proposal.

RESOLVED: (a) That the Planning Committee indicates that it is minded to grant planning permission in principle for Application No DOV/20/00419, subject to the resolution of the outstanding ecology matters and the consideration of a further report to the Planning Committee for a final decision; and

(b) Subject to a Section 106 legal agreement to secure necessary planning contributions and the following conditions:

- (i) Reserved matters details;
- (ii) Outline time limit;
- (iii) Approved plans;
- (iv) Phasing plan to be approved in writing;
- (v) Self-build design code to be agreed as part of reserved matters;
- (vi) Details of play space to form part of reserved matters;
- (vii) Existing and proposed site levels and building heights;
- (viii) Internal acoustic requirements for dwellings;
- (ix) Construction Management Plan;
- (x) Highway conditions (parking, visibility splays, highway works fully implemented, turning facilities, cycle parking, gradient, surface, works to all footpaths and drainage, bond surface, surface water);
- (xi) Sustainable Travel Plan to be agreed prior to commencement;
- (xii) Completion of the A258 Sandwich Road bus-stop scheme prior to first occupation;
- (xiii) PROW upgrades and management scheme;
- (xiv) Completion of off-site improvements to Mongeham Road prior to commencement and subject to a safety audit process;
- (xv) Provision and maintenance of a pedestrian connection to Circular Road;
- (xvi) Landscaping details and maintenance of green spaces;
- (xvii) Open space management plan;
- (xviii) Protection of trees and hedges and root protection zones;
- (xix) Hard landscaping works and boundary details/enclosures;

- (xx) Reporting of unexpected land contamination;
- (xxi) No works on site until final SuDS details are submitted;
- (xxii) Design details of surface Water drainage strategy;
- (xxiii) Implementation and verification of SuDS scheme;
- (xxiv) No other infiltration on site other than that approved;
- (xxv) Full foul drainage strategy for approval;
- (xxvi) Environmental Construction Management Plan;
- (xxvii) Internal noise levels;
- (xxviii) Programme of archaeological works;
- (xxix) Details to be submitted at reserved matters for compliance with Secured by Design principles;
- (xxx) Electric Vehicle Charging points for each dwelling & 10% unallocated & employment parking spaces;
- (xxxi) Broadband connection;
- (xxxii) 4 Stage contamination, remediation and verification conditions;
- (xxxiii) Reporting of unexpected land contamination;
- (xxxiv) Update survey to be carried out for badgers prior to commencement;
- (xxxv) Production of ecological mitigation strategy setting out safeguards to be implemented during the construction phase;
- (xxxvi) Production and implementation of method statement for translocation of notable plant species (including Grass-poly) and invertebrates;
- (xxxvii) Production of detailed management plan for retained onsite habitats and new habitat creation, to include details of green roof/brownfield habitat provision and faunal habitat features;
- (xxxviii) Production of detailed management plan for the open mosaic habitat management area within the country park;

- (xxxix) Design of a sensitive lighting scheme in relation to bats and other nocturnal species;
- (xl) Implementation of a habitat manipulation exercise in relation to reptiles;
- (xli) Works affecting nesting bird habitat to be undertaken outside of the nesting bird season, or following nesting bird checks;
- (xlii) Sustainable energy measures to be approved in accordance with the approved Energy Statement and Sustainability Assessment;
- (xliii) BREEAM very good criteria for commercial buildings.

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

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

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

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

102 APPEALS AND INFORMAL HEARINGS

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

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

The Committee noted that no action had been taken.

The meeting ended at 10.57 pm.