

- a) **DOV/22/00333 - Erection of 7 dwellings, car ports, electric vehicle charging points, cycle/bin store, formation of new vehicular access, lay-by and associated parking and landscaping - Land south-east of Birnam Mushroom Farm, Hammill Road, Woodnesborough**

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

- b) **Summary of Recommendation**

That planning permission be refused.

- c) **Planning Policy and Guidance**

**Development Plan**

The statutory development plan comprises:

- Core Strategy (2010) (“**the Core Strategy**”)
- Land Allocations Local Plan (2015) (“**the LALP**”)
- Saved Polices of the Local Plan (2002)

Relevant polices of the Core Strategy include:

- CP1: Settlement Hierarchy
- CP2: Provision for Jobs and Homes
- CP4: Housing Quality, Mix, Density and Design
- CP5: Sustainable Construction Standards
- CP6: Infrastructure
- DM1: Settlement Boundaries
- DM5: Provision of Affordable Housing
- DM11: Location of Development and Managing Travel Demand
- DM13: Parking Provision
- DM15: Protection of the Countryside
- DM16: Landscape Character

As is the case with the development plan, where existing policies were adopted prior to the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (“the Framework”), the weight to be given to them depends on their degree of consistency with the policies of the Framework (paragraph 219).

**Other Material Considerations**

The Framework sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It is therefore a material consideration, to which significant weight should be attached in determining the application.

Sections of the Framework are referred to, as relevant, in the assessment section of this report below.

**Draft Dover District Local Plan**

The draft Dover District Local Plan sets out planning policies and proposals for new development in the District over the period from 2020 to 2040 and when adopted will replace the existing development plan. The draft LP is still at an early stage in its preparation. The Regulation 18 consultation closed in March 2021. While the Regulation 19 consultation is due to be published shortly, at the time of the consideration of this application, the Regulation 18 version remains the most recently

published draft. As such, and in accordance with paragraph 48 of the Framework, whilst the draft Dover District Local Plan is a material consideration, only limited weight should be afforded to it at this time.

### Legislation

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that, where regard is to be had to the statutory development plan in determining an application for planning permission, the determination shall be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that the planning authority should pay special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.

#### d) **Relevant Planning History**

19/00307      Erection of 20 dwellings, including 4 affordable dwellings, creation of new vehicular accesses, parking and landscaping. Refused (26/07/19) for the following reasons:

1. Unjustified dwellinghouses, outside of any defined urban or village confines. Unsustainable residential development in a rural location, resulting in additional vehicle movements and the need to travel by private car and would significantly and demonstrably harm the rural character and appearance of the locality.
2. A design and density which would fail to relate to the rural character of the surrounding area. The proposed development would be prominent and highly visible in wider views from the east and southeast. The proposed development would necessitate the loss of hedgerows and intensify the hard built development along this part of the countryside detracting from the verdant, undeveloped character of the site in these views.
3. The site is reasonably likely to provide habitat for birds and reptiles. Failure to demonstrate these protected species would not be adversely affected, or that appropriate mitigation could be secured.
4. Fails to demonstrate that the required visibility splays of 215m x 2.4m x 215m could be achieved over land within the control of the applicant and/or the highway authority or the improvements to the highway which would be necessitated by the development would be provided. A lack of car parking provision.
5. The proposed development has failed to secure the provision of affordable housing or open space.
6. The application has not been supported by a surface water drainage strategy.

21/00343      Erection of 7no. dwellings with formation of new access, parking, and associated landscaping. Withdrawn 06/05/21.

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

Representations can be found in full in the online planning file. A summary has been provided below:

Woodnesborough Parish Council

Object. Houses on plot 1 and 3 should be reduced in size and plot 2 similar to plot 5 and 6 to allow more affordable housing.

The house in plot 3 is too large and out of keeping with the rest of the development and needs to be reduced in size. The style of all houses needs to be similar to the appearance of the village dwellings, without large expanses of glass and not as proposed.

All properties need car barns and parking spaces. Extra space needed for visitor parking.

Sensitive looking solar panels should be installed with battery storage facility.

No trees on the road/overhanging the road as they could reduce visibility and lead to accidents.

All KCC Highways and EA objections/concerns need to be addressed and overcome.

The speed limit should be reduced to 30mph if development is approved.

Environment Agency

Recommend planning permission is refused, as the application does not demonstrate that the risks of pollution to controlled waters are acceptable, or can be appropriately managed.

The previous use of the development site is unclear and may present a risk of contamination that could pollute controlled waters. Controlled waters are particularly sensitive in this location because the site is located within source protection zone 1/2 and is upon a secondary aquifer underlain by principle aquifer. As the planning application is not supported by an appropriate risk assessment or detailed foul drainage strategy, it does not meet the requirements set out in paragraphs 174 and 183 of the NPPF. The EA advise that any permission for housing should not be issued until confirmation that a viable foul drainage option is available.

Natural England

Further information is required to determine the impacts on designated sites. The application could have a likely significant effect on:

- Stodmarsh Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Stodmarsh Special Protection Area (SPA)
- Stodmarsh Ramsar site
- Stodmarsh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)
- Stodmarsh National Nature Reserve (NNR)

The LPA will need to undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to ensure that the proposal will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the sites named above. The following information is required:

- consideration of this project's implications on total nitrogen and total phosphorus nutrient loading within the river Stour catchment;
- mitigation measures to avoid the effects of these nutrient implications;
- consideration of the proposal and required mitigation measures at the appropriate assessment stage of the HRA; and
- any other likely significant effects that could arise from the development should also be assessed.

### KCC Highways

#### *Access and layout*

- The applicant has submitted plans showing visibility splays in both direction of 2.4m x 124.4 and 2.4 x 126.28 however these have been offset 1m from the edge of the carriageway. The applicant will need to resubmit drawings which show the visibility splay drawn to the nearside edge with no offset towards the centre of the carriageway.
- If the splays are based on what appear to be measured speeds indicated on the site layout plan, then details of the speed survey will need to be submitted.
- The visibility splays appears to currently appear to extend over third party land outside the application red line. Highways are therefore unable to confirm if the splays are acceptable without the additional information identified above and clarification on the land over which the splays cross.
- Swept path movements for a fire tender should be demonstrated and submitted for approval to ensure the access is wide enough and there is room for it to turn safely on site ensuring there are no areas of overrun and to demonstrate it turning and exiting back out onto Hammill Road in a forward gear. Such tracking will cover smaller deliveries vehicles that are likely to access the development.

#### *Parking*

- The remote location of the site and the poor public transport access means that most if not all residents are likely to drive. The site is therefore not in a sustainable location.
- The applicant has submitted drawings which show parking for 23 vehicles which include 2 visitor parking spaces. This meets parking standards, however the layout should be revised to ensure the spaces provided are fit for purpose and can be easily accessed. Parking spaces should be a minimum of 5 metres long x 2.5 metres wide, increased to 2.7 metres where bounded by walls/fences/landscaping on one side or 2.9 metres where bounded by such obstructions on both sides.
- Some parking spaces would be constrained due to the use of tandem parking.

### KCC Flood and Water Management (Lead Local Flood Authority)

Development falls outside the definition of major development and falls outside of KCC's remit as statutory consultee.

### Southern Water

Southern Water raises objection, as the site is in the Groundwater SPZ1 for the Sandwich public groundwater supply. Any construction or operational related contamination of the groundwater has the potential to impact the abstraction source within 50 days.

The planning application does not include any information about the proposed drainage design, or a hydrogeological risk assessment that should be undertaken for this hydro geologically sensitive area. This is to ensure development considers construction and operation risks to the Sandwich groundwater source.

### Environmental Protection Officer

Confirmed no observations.

### DDC Ecology

Desktop information indicates the site and surrounds have potential to support protected and designated species that should be taken account of in the determination of the application.

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identifies the potential for protected reptile species to be present and affected by the proposed development. More detailed surveys must be carried out, with the results and any necessary mitigation proposals submitted to inform the determination of the application.

This would ensure all ecological matters are properly considered in the decision and in accordance with government guidance, planning policy and legislation.

### Third Party Representations:

10 letters of objection have been received as summarised below:

- previous reasons for refusal are applicable;
- high density housing estate out of character with existing properties and low density;
- dense, overly dominant and prominent development out of scale with the local vernacular and density;
- detrimental to rural character;
- isolated, green field site outside the settlement confines of the village and not identified in the land allocation document for development;
- impact on sustainable land policies as the site is far from public transport and local amenities, such as doctors, schools or parks/play areas. Car use essential;
- need for solar panels, ground source heat pumps;
- overlooking, loss of privacy and overshadowing;
- insufficient garden size;
- highways safety concerns due to speed, lack of lighting and pavements, and unsuitable/poor visibility;

- no provision for extra vehicle parking;
- proposal impedes ingress and egress of tenants using the centre, and parking spaces allocated to tenants will not be granted for third parties to occupy;
- land lies in Groundwater Protection Zone 1 without main drains connection;
- flooding of the site and Hammill Road;
- no account for land instability;
- negative impact on woodland trust land;
- impact on hedge from building works damage;
- removal of boundary vegetation and impact on biodiversity, wildlife and habitats;
- no habitat survey has been undertaken;
- impact on doctors and schools;
- precedent for other ribbon development, traffic increase and urbanisation of the rural area

Objection has been received from Miller Woodland Trust (who owns land contiguous with the south east boundary of the site) with comments including:

- urbanisation and out of keeping with the nature and density of existing surroundings. Hard surfacing, fences, walls, gates would jar with the unspoilt rural setting and urbanises the area;
- outside the Woodnesborough village confines;
- previous applications refused on the site;
- previous development on the site refused on the grounds of the impact on the countryside. The refusal emphasised the importance of a gap providing a transition space between existing development;
- impact on wildlife and biodiversity with destruction of species-rich biodiversity boundary vegetation;
- impact on species in the adjacent arboretum, which includes sensitive plants, bee orchids and an owl box. Nesting Quail and grass snakes in zone adjoining the site, which are sensitive to noise and disturbance;
- concerns with groundwater protection in the absence of a foul drainage strategy or risk assessment.

12 letters of support have been received as summarised below:

- enhance the area and tidy up site;
- design in keeping;
- proposal would not impact the rural surroundings;
- houses affordable for local young people;
- offers needed family homes;
- traffic speed is an issue but new houses are not problem;
- new houses help push the cause for a reduced speed limit through the village;
- solutions can be found for the Stodmarsh issue.

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

- 1.1 The site comprises a rectilinear area of land on the south eastern side of Hammill Road, measuring some 135m (south west to north east) by 30m (south east to north west).
- 1.2 The longer front and rear boundaries of the site are defined by mature hedgerows, whilst adjacent to the north east and south west are existing houses and their associated curtilages.

- 1.3 On the opposite side of Hammill Road is a group of agricultural buildings, and further to the north east a small cluster of houses and an automotive garage. Beyond this limited built form the wider landscape is predominantly open farmland, with arable and grazing pastures, fragmented by areas of woodland.
- 1.4 The site is located outside of any settlement and is within the countryside.
- 1.5 The site is located in flood zone 1, as land as least risk of flooding.

### The Proposal

- 1.6 Planning permission is sought for the erection of seven dwellings, arranged in a single row lengthways across the site.
- 1.7 There would be a variety of design across the seven dwellings:
  - houses plot 1 and plot 2 would be detached, timber clad with a barn-like vernacular;
  - on plot 3 the house would be a large 2.5 storey building (with dormer accommodation in the roof) across five bays, with pitched roof and gables, white rendered elevations and tiled roof;
  - the house on plot 4 would be detached with a traditional pitched roof and gabled form, brick elevations and tiled roof;
  - houses on plots 5 and 6 would be semi-detached, pitched and gabled roof, white rendered elevations and tiled roof; and
  - the house on plot 7 is detached, two storeys, again with a pitched and gabled roof, but timber boarded.
- 1.8 Four detached car ports would be provided across the site.
- 1.9 Designated cycle parking and electric vehicle charging points would be provided.
- 1.10 Vehicular access would be from Hammill Lane in the centre of the site, which would require the removal of a section of boundary hedgerow.

## **2. Main Issues**

- 2.1 The main issues of this planning application for consideration are:
  - principle of development
  - affordable housing
  - character and appearance of the area
  - heritage
  - open space
  - impact on residential amenities and living conditions of future occupiers
  - highways
  - ecology
  - groundwater, drainage and flood risk

## **Assessment**

### **Principle of Development**

- 2.2 The proposed development, outside of urban boundaries or any rural settlement, is contrary to Core Strategy Policy DM1 that limits development in the countryside unless functionally requiring such a location.
- 2.3 Where the proposed development in the countryside is not supported by Policy DM1 it is also contrary, in principle, to Policy DM15 and paragraph 174 of the Framework that seek to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
- 2.4 The rural location of the site, where there are limited opportunities for sustainable travel by public transport, is contrary to Core Strategy Policy DM11 and Framework paragraph 105 – that development would be greatly dependent on the less sustainable use of the private car.
- 2.5 Whilst in some circumstances the weight to be placed upon policies of the Core Strategy (and its evidence base) may be reduced, in this instance the objectives of the policies relevant to the principle of proposed development here (to protect the countryside and guard against an unsustainable pattern of development) are sufficiently consistent with those of the Framework for them to be afforded significant weight.

### **Affordable Housing**

- 2.6 Core Strategy Policy DM5 seeks for schemes of between five and 14 homes to make a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing. However, this lower threshold (of less than 10 dwellings) is inconsistent with the Framework (paragraph 64) that requires affordable housing only from major developments other than in very specific circumstances. Given this variance and datedness of the Core Strategy, an affordable housing contribution either on site or as a contribution in lieu is not sought.

### **Character and Appearance of the Area**

- 2.7 The application site abuts a narrow rural lane with no footpaths or streetlights and is bound by hedges and trees which gives the area a strong rural character.
- 2.8 There is a cluster of development to the north east (on the junction of Hammill Road / Beacon Lane). The pattern of development here is not consistent: the area is typically low density, sporadically located and of diverse scale and design, with each building differing from the next. Some properties sit within rectangular plots sited close together whilst others have larger plots in a staggered fashion such that not all dwellings front Beacon Lane. This defining character is unplanned, sporadic and diverse.
- 2.9 In contrast the proposed development would be of a significantly higher massing, scale and density (with small garden areas that cramp the large houses to the rear boundary). The proposed layout has a more planned suburban pattern of development parallel to the road which fails to reflect the prevailing 'scattered' character seen elsewhere.



- 2.10 Whilst there is some variation between buildings and there is some screening along Hammill Road, this does not sufficiently make up for the harmful suburbanising impact identified.
- 2.11 In this context the proposed development is contrary to objectives of good design in the Framework (including paragraph 130) and Core Strategy Policy DM15 that directs that planning permission for unessential development that adversely affects the character and or appearance of the countryside should be refused.
- 2.12 Where there is such harm to the rural character of the countryside, that harm is also considered detrimental to the wider landscape character where the buildings will be seen in short and longer distance views – thus development is contrary to Core Strategy Policy DM16 (landscape character).

### Heritage

- 2.13 Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that *“in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the Local Planning Authority or Secretary of State should pay special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”*.
- 2.14 There is a semi-detached pair of listed buildings (Forge Cottage and Hawthorne Cottage, Drainless Road) at a distance of approximately 100m from the site to the north. However, by virtue of the separation distance and intervening buildings, it is considered that the proposed development would not have any material impact upon the setting of these listed buildings. This is as considered under application 19/00307.
- 2.15 KCC Archaeology (as per consideration of application 19/00307) is of the view that development on the site could impact on the remains of archaeological interest. Consequently, in the event of grant of planning permission, it is recommended to attach a condition to secure implementation of a programme of archaeological work.

### Open Space

- 2.16 In accordance with Policy DM27 of the Land Allocations Local Plan, the development (as of more than five dwellings) is expected to provide open space on site, or a contribution towards off-site provision, to meet the demand it would generate. Without any on site open space, or off-site contribution offered by the applicant and secured, development is contrary to Policy DM27 and Framework paragraph 93.

### Impact on Residential Amenity and Living Conditions of Future Occupiers

#### *Hammill Lodge to the southwest*

- 2.17 To the south west of the site is Hammill Lodge. The nearest proposed dwelling (plot 7) would provide a suitable distance of separation to the common boundary and facing flank elevation of Hammill Lodge to ensure adequate residential amenities are maintained. There would not be any undue loss of privacy or outlook. It is noted that driveway to Hammill Lodge is alongside the boundary with the site.

*Prince of Wales, Celendine and Glengary*

- 2.18 To the houses to the north east of the site (Prince of Wales, Celendine and Glengary), the nearest proposed dwelling (plot 1) would maintain a suitable distance of separation to ensure adequate residential amenities are maintained.

*Future occupiers*

- 2.19 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 have some private amenity space (although noting this is smaller than characteristically nearby for other properties) sufficient for amenity purposes. The living conditions of future occupiers would be acceptable.

Highways

- 2.20 KCC Highways has confirmed, as addressed in the 'principle of development' section of the report above, that the site has a remote location, with poor public transport so that most (if not all) residents are likely to drive. It concurs that the site is therefore not a sustainable location.
- 2.21 It has not been demonstrated that safe access to the site can be provided – KCC Highways advise that visibility splays shown on the drawings are not correctly drawn and are predicated on a speed survey for which details have not been provided. Without agreement on this, objection is raised that access to the site cannot be considered safe.
- 2.22 On other transport matters, KCC Highways advise that whilst the amount of overall parking is acceptable, some spaces are awkwardly located and / or of insufficient size. Similarly, it has not been demonstrated by the applicant that the layout has adequate turning and manoeuvring space for delivery vehicles and firefighting appliances. If all other matters were acceptable, such issues could readily be resolved through a revised layout, but given the in-principle objection to the scheme this has not been progressed. Instead objection to a lack of car parking and adequate delivery/serving provision is raised on grounds of highway safety and convenience.

Ecology

- 2.23 The Preliminary Ecology Appraisal (PEA) submitted by the applicant identifies the site's potential to support foraging / commuting bats and reptiles. It advises that further reptile survey work is required, which should be carried out to inform consideration of the planning application.
- 2.24 In the absence of this survey work, objection to the development is raised. The proposed development is contrary to national policy, most particularly paragraph 98 of Circular 06/2005 'Biodiversity and geological conservation – statutory obligations and their impact within the planning system' and paragraph 180a of the Framework.
- 2.25 The PEA provides a range of ecological avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures that would be accommodated should development progress, including bird and bat nesting boxes, specific stag beetle habitat, appropriate hedgerow management and planting of native species. These could reasonably be secured by condition.

### *Sandwich Bay and Pegwell Bay*

- 2.26 The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, Regulation 63: Appropriate Assessment: The development causes uncertainty regarding the likely significant effects on Sandwich Bay and Pegwell Bay due to the potential disturbance of birds due to increased recreational activity.
- 2.27 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.
- 2.28 Following consultation with Natural England, the identified pathway for such a likely significant 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.
- 2.29 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.
- 2.30 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.
- 2.31 Having had regard to the proposed mitigation measures, it is considered that the proposal would not have a likely significant adverse effect on the integrity of the protected Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar sites. The mitigation measures (which were agreed following receipt of ecological advice and in consultation with Natural England) will ensure that the harmful effects on the designated site, caused by recreational activities from existing and new residents, will be effectively managed.

### Groundwater, Drainage and Flood Risk

- 2.32 The site is sensitively located within Groundwater SPZ1 for the Sandwich public groundwater supply. Southern Water advise any construction or operational related contamination of the groundwater has the potential to impact the abstraction source. This is consistent with the Environment Agency's response that without information to consider this risk to groundwater, including appropriate foul drainage details, planning permission should not be granted.
- 2.33 In this situation, where the proposed development does not demonstrate construction and operation risks of pollution to controlled waters are acceptable, or can be managed, through an appropriate hydrogeological risk assessment or detailed foul drainage strategy, it is contrary to Core Strategy Policy DM17 and Framework paragraph 185.

2.34 Given the sensitivities relating to ground water protection, information on surface water drainage is also considered necessary at this stage. In the absence of any information, it is uncertain whether or not the development with appropriate surface water drainage provision is achievable – thus objection is raised with the development being contrary to Framework paragraph 167.

### **3. Conclusion**

3.1 In light of the planning assessment above it is considered the proposed development would result in an unsustainable form of development within the countryside, which would be harmful to the intrinsic character of the area and be overly reliant on use of the private car for travel.

3.2 The development would adversely impact the rural appearance and wider landscape character of the area.

3.3 Development would fail to make any provision for public open space, contrary to the adopted development plan and the Framework.

3.4 On more technical grounds, the development has not demonstrated it can be accessed (from Hammill Road and within the site) in a suitably safe and convenient manner; and the extent of any impact on protected reptile species has not been adequately assessed.

3.5 There is further harm from development through unknown / unassessed risks to groundwater supply.

3.6 Against this harm, the benefits of development are limited to a minor boost in the supply of market housing and minor associated economic activity. On either a tilted balance (as per Framework paragraph 11) or neutral consideration, the adverse impacts of development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits such that planning permission should be refused.

### **g) Recommendation**

I PERMISSION BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. Within the open countryside without need or justification, with poor walking accessibility and limited opportunities for travel by public transport, the proposed development is located in an unsustainable location and would be greatly dependent on use of the private car. Development would unduly increase congestion and emissions associated with such travel and be contrary to Core Strategy Policies DM1 and DM11 and paragraph 105 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The location of the development outside any settlement, along with its urbanising form and appearance, would harm the intrinsic character and landscape appearance of the countryside, detracting from its undeveloped and rural character, contrary to Core Strategy Policies DM15 and DM16 and paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. With the failure to make provision for open space, the development would not provide for the recreation and wellbeing of a future community. The

development is contrary to Land Allocations Local Plan Policy DM27 and paragraph 93 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. With the failure of development to demonstrate suitable vehicular access to and within the site, including for car parking and deliveries/servicing, the proposed access and layout arrangement cannot be considered safe and is contrary to Core Strategy Policy DM13 and paragraph 110-112 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
  5. Without detailed reptile surveys to inform consideration of the proposed development, unacceptable impacts on this protected species cannot be discounted and development is contrary to paragraph 98 of Circular 06/2005 (Biodiversity and geological conservation – statutory obligations and their impact within the planning system) and paragraph 180a of the National Planning Policy Framework.
  6. Located within an area sensitive for groundwater protection and without appropriate assessment work to consider the construction and operational risks of development, and to consider whether appropriate foul and surface water drainage can be provided, the proposed development poses an unacceptable risk to groundwater contrary to Core Strategy Policy DM17 and National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 167 and 185.
- II Powers be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any outstanding issues in line with the matters set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee

Case Officer

Andrew Somerville