

Strategic Planning Board

Updates

Date: Wednesday, 8th December, 2010
Time: 2.00 pm
Venue: The Capesthorne Room - Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1DX

The information on the following pages was received following publication of the committee agenda.

Updates (Pages 1 - 16)

Please contact Sarah Baxter on 01270 686462
E-Mail: sarah.baxter@cheshireeast.gov.uk with any apologies, requests for further information or to arrange to speak at the meeting

This page is intentionally left blank

STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD– 8 DECEMBER 2010

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO: 10/3239M

LOCATION: COLD STORAGE, KNUTSFORD ROAD, CHELFORD

PROPOSAL: RE-DEVELOPMENT OF DEPOT FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (MAXIMUM 50 DWELLINGS)

UPDATE PREPARED: 6 DECEMBER 2010

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

EDUCATION

As discussed within the Committee Report, the proposed development at the application site and the development Agricultural Centre will generate the need for a new classroom at Chelford CE Primary School.

It is anticipated that the developments will generate a **minimum** of 24 children of primary school age. The school can only accommodate 60 children. There are 42 on the roll from January 2011; therefore based on current numbers, when the developments come forward there will be a deficiency of at least 6 spaces.

In order to mitigate against this, a new classroom will be required, in accordance with policy IMP1 of the Local Plan, which advises:

The Borough Council will expect planning applications for the development of sites to include within them provision for infrastructure consequences. Such provision may include:

Off-site facilities necessary as a result of the development in order to avoid placing additional burden on the existing community..

Due to local circumstances, it may be necessary in some cases to view individual applications collectively in assessing off-site infrastructure requirements.

A 80 m2 classroom is considered necessary, incorporating a cloakroom, store & toilets. This will cost £187,000 in total, including fees, furniture and equipment.

This cost is to be spread across the two sites on a pro-rate basis:

136 dwellings in total (50 at the application site, and 86 at the Agricultural Centre)

187, 000 divided by 136 = £1375 per dwelling

50 x 1375 = **£68,750.**

The applicant has confirmed that he is agreeable with this figure, which is a reduction from the £91,745 originally calculated from the Cheshire County Council guidance.

It is considered appropriate for the developers to pay for the price of a new classroom rather than follow the Macclesfield Borough Supplementary Planning Guidance on S106 Agreements, or the former Cheshire County Council guidance, as a new classroom is required to mitigate the development.

A new classroom is essential to accommodate the additional children to the Village as a result of the developments, and will ensure the developments are sustainable well into the future.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

In respect of vibrations from trains using the railway line adjacent to the site, the Environmental Health Officer advises that he has experience of similar applications along this stretch of railway line, and vibration from trains has not been considered to be an issue. Experience shows that complaints of vibrations from railway lines in general appear to be a maintenance issue with the line or the rolling stock.

In respect of land contamination, the Environmental Health Officer advises that the application site has a history of industrial use and therefore the land may be contaminated. The application is for new residential properties which are a sensitive end use and could be affected by any contamination present. The reports submitted in support of the application indicate that there is contamination present which may require remedial measures. As such, a condition is required in respect of carrying out an additional Phase II study and carrying out appropriate remediation works.

FORESTRY

Within the front car park is a mature Silver Birch, which is currently protected by a Tree Preservation Order (G2).

This tree was assessed as part of the Arboricultural Survey (T5), and was found to be compromised, as the roots of the tree had been compacted by the tarmac and cars within the car park. Both stems expressed reduced vitality and vigour and there was peripheral dieback of twigs in the upper Crown. The Forestry Officer concluded that the tree was dying and therefore could not be retained as part of the development.

RECOMMENDATION

The principle of the development has been discussed within the body of the Committee Report. There is no change to the recommendation of approval, subject to the additional condition recommended by the Environmental Health Officer in respect of land decontamination, and alterations to the Heads of Terms in respect of the financial contribution for the classroom.

STRETEGIC PLANNING BOARD – 8th December 2010

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO. 10/3448M

LOCATION

Chelford Agricultural Centre, Dixon Drive, Chelford SK11 9AX

UPDATE PREPARED

6th December 2010

CONSULTATIONS

The Councils Arboricultural Officer has commented on the submitted revised plans. The original comments on the outline proposals were provided as a guide for the reserved matters stage should the application progress. The retention of the three identified trees (to the north eastern corner of the site) is noted along with the revised realignment of the bund, however, the Arboricultural Officer is unsure as to what this gains in terms of utilisable space for the properties within this area of the site. The Arboricultural Officer was more mindful of this section of the bund being omitted altogether; however, this could raise landscape and/or environmental health issues.

The remaining arboricultural related matters including the removal of the remaining tree from the centre of the site and the thinning of the linear groups of trees which extend along the northern and western boundaries of the site can be addressed as part of reserved matters.

APPLICANTS SUBMISSION

In addition to submitting revised plans and revised noise assessment, the applicants' agent has commented on the Officers report as follows: -

Locally Listed Building

The applicant is comfortable with the justification set out in the Committee Report as to why the locally listed building will not be retained as part of the application proposals. The development team has considered the feasibility of retaining the locally listed building however, the buildings retention would, unfortunately, create significant implications for the proposed masterplan. Due to the siting of the building, commercial access to the development could not be achieved from Station Road and would have to be taken from Dixon Drive along with residential access. Residential and commercial vehicles using one access would not be compatible and in addition to highway safety concerns, the impact of commercial traffic on existing and proposed residential amenities would be significantly detrimental. For these reasons, the loss of the locally listed building is the most acceptable outcome in order to deliver this high quality comprehensive mixed use scheme. Furthermore, the agent wishes it to be noted that the applicant was not consulted on the proposal to locally list the building and therefore question the weight that should be attached to the listing.

Landscape

The agent shares Officers views in the Committee Report that all the landscape issues can be considered when a reserved matters application is submitted and assessed.

Forestry

The revised proposals show the retention of trees T1, T38 and T39 as requested by the Councils Forestry Officer. The retention of the trees has been possible as the alignment of the bund in the north eastern corner of the site has been revised.

Additional comments have been made by the Forestry Officer to ensure that a series of other trees are retained across the site. As the application is proposed in outline with all matters reserved except for access, the Forestry Officers comments are noted by the applicant and can be addressed at the reserved matters stage when full details in respect of layout are submitted to the Council for approval.

S106 Heads of Terms

Comments have been made with regard to the 5 heads of terms as follows: -

Affordable Housing

The applicant accepts the 25% affordable housing requirement which equates to 21 units with 50% social rented and 50% intermediate tenure.

Open Space

The applicant notes that the development should provide an open space contribution in line with the adopted SPG. However, the agent suggests that a figure of £317 000 would be in line with the adopted SPG formula. It is requested that the Council's proposed contribution for open space is revised accordingly.

Community Facility

The Council has requested a contribution of £47,600, however, as above; when this is recalculated for 86 units the contribution should be £48,160 in accordance with the adopted SPG.

Highways Improvements

The applicant accepts that the development will be required to provide a contribution of £16,300 towards highways improvements. It is however requested that flexibility is incorporated in the S106 Agreement to enable the future developer of the scheme to be able to undertake these highway works if the opportunity arises. If this takes place, the S106 Agreement will need to allow for the monies held by the Council to be released to the developer to enable the works to be undertaken.

Education

The Capital Development Manager has requested that a contribution of £144,957 is made by the development towards the provision of a new classroom at Chelford Primary School. The justification for this request is on

the basis that both the Stobarts and the Agricultural Centre developments will generate 24 pupils (Stobarts – 9 pupils and the Agricultural Centre – 15 pupils). The consultation response does however highlight that the school currently has a capacity for 60 pupils and that as at January 2011, it is likely to have 42 pupils in attendance resulting in 18 spaces available. As such, both Stobarts and the Agricultural Centre development should only be required to contribute towards the provision of the 6 additional spaces required in accordance with adopted SPG. On this basis, a total contribution of £60,000 should be provided by both schemes rather than solely by the Agricultural Centre site as stated in the Committee Report. Stobarts are willing to provide a contribution towards education which is significantly higher than the adopted SPG formula requires. The Trustees of Chelford Market has concerns in providing a contribution of this level from a financial and a planning law perspective.

If a total contribution of £60,000 is required by both schemes, then the contribution from the applicant for this scheme is £37,800, which is a pro rata calculation, based on the total number of units proposed by the two developments. This accords with the guidance set out in the adopted SPG and is fully consistent with the approach undertaken by the Council in seeking contributions towards affordable housing, outdoor space, recreation/ outdoor sport, and community facilities.

S106

Detailed negotiations on the S106 Agreement based on the above will take place after the Planning Committee following Members resolution to grant planning permission. Whilst this will of course be handled by lawyers for both parties, key considerations that will need to be taken into account include:

- The timing and phasing of contribution payments with no payments being required on grant of planning consent and at the very earliest point in time, being linked to commencement of development with phased payments over the duration of the occupation of the development;
- The requirement for the adopted S106 SPG formula to be inserted against each of the financial contribution requirements so that if a lower number of residential units is brought forward at reserved matters stage, the contributions can be revised accordingly;
- The requirement that if the monies secured by the Council as part of the S106 Agreement have not be spent as intended within a period of 5 years of commencement that the monies are returned to the developer.

Employment Development Implementation

Concern is raised to the proposal in the Committee Report to attach a condition which links the provision of employment floorspace to the progress of the residential development. This matter has only been raised recently. The applicants do not believe this provision to be necessary, or appropriate in the circumstances of this case.

The Committee Report suggests this is necessary because “without the employment development, Chelford would be left with little employment land/prospects for local jobs and the scheme would not be considered as favourably in relation to national and local sustainability objects”. This of course is not accurate, as the land would be secured for employment purposes; it would have the benefit of consent and be available to be developed in response to market demand. There is no policy at national or local level which requires the actual provision of floorspace. Sustainability objectives would thereby be met by the opportunity to carry out a mixed use development in this location, and the agent suggests that this is as far as planning control should go.

It is also considered that a decision on this application might be looked at differently in the absence of such a provision, is not a true reflection of the merits of the proposal. The key benefits are set out in the Supporting Planning Statement and are referred to at various points in the Committee Report. They include:

1. Removal of significant HGV and other traffic from local roads, both during the week when the market is operating as well as at weekends when the Sunday market (which is extremely busy) takes place;
2. Associated environmental benefits for the local community (reduction in noise, disturbance etc) as a result of a much more compatible form of development adjacent to existing residential areas;
3. Townscape improvements following removal of the existing buildings designed for their current purposes and their replacement with a good quality, well designed and landscaped housing scheme;
4. Provision of much needed new homes, including affordable homes within the village’
5. An appropriate package of S106 benefits, providing the village with significant financial support to improve social and other infrastructure, and thereby build sustainable and inclusive communities.

The agent also notes that the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. In consequence, it has introduced an Interim Housing Policy specifically to address this issue, and to encourage applications in sustainable locations and in certain specified locations, in order to make good the shortfall. It is noted that this receives some prominence in the Committee Report on the Stobart application (ref 10/3239M) but does not appear to be referred to in the report on this application, nor is there any reference to the SHLAA, the Councils significant supply of employment land within the Macclesfield Borough or the district, and its conclusions with respect to the site. The formal PPS3 presumption in favour of development which seeks to provide new houses is therefore invoked, and this should be accorded significant weight in the determination of this application, along with the other factors mentioned above. Related to this, the imposition of such an onerous condition would seriously compromise the viability and prospects of the site being developed in the lifetime of the permission. A permission granted in terms which would be unviable, and be so unattractive to house builders, would defeat the purposes of seeking to urgently bolster the Councils inadequate land supply position. The obligation to develop floor space at a

certain point in time, irrespective of whether there is a market demand for it is highly onerous and effectively would require speculative development.

Financial lenders will not fund developments that are speculative as there is no guaranteed return for their investment, which effectively will have a detrimental impact on the marketability and deliverability of the entire scheme. Furthermore, if the developer is sufficiently fortunate to secure funding then if no future operators take up the floorspace once constructed then the developer has to pay empty property rates. Additional considerations such as the cost of promoting a reserved matters planning application and the cost of constructing the employment development should also be taken into account. As a result it is highly unlikely that a developer would risk a speculative venture as it presents a high risk.

As such there is no policy basis for the Council to request that the implementation of the employment area is tied to the residential development. Entirely without prejudice to the above planning position, the applicant is prepared to accept a planning condition which requires the employment area to be marketed for a period of time. This will result in the developer actively marketing the proposed employment area which will identify tenant demand. Even though the agent considers that a mechanism is not required to make this application acceptable in planning terms, an alternative condition could be imposed which requires the employment area to be marketed for a period of 3 years from the date the planning permission is granted or for a period of 2 years from the date of commencement of residential development, dependant on which ever is the later date.

The applicant, or developer will submit a marketing strategy for the employment area to the LPA to be agreed in writing prior to the commencement of the formal marketing process. This mechanism should provide comfort to the Council that the applicant is committed to bringing forward employment development at the site, albeit in a commercially sensible way.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

The revised plan shows an indicative revised layout for the site. The other changes worth noting, are the inclusion of a path between the residential area and employment area, alterations to the bunding at the north-eastern corner of the site and removal of the community facility building and increase in number of dwellings to 86. All neighbours and consultees have been sent notification letters to ensure that they are made aware of the revisions. The last date for comments (on the revised plans) has been extended to 14th December 2010. It is suggested that if Members are minded to approve the proposed development, that the decision be deferred to the Head of Planning and Housing, subject to any further issues being raised as a result of the consultation exercise. It is considered that the issues raised in the agents' letter have been considered previously under the appropriate headings of the main Agenda report. However, for clarity the following comments are made: -

Locally Listed Building

As previously suggested, Officers consider that retaining the Coal Masters building would affect the feasibility of delivering this scheme. If Members wanted to see the materials from the development retained and reused on the site, then this could be a possibility. However, it is unlikely that it would be feasible to relocate the building within the site.

Tree and Landscape Issues

The Arboricultural and Landscape Officers agree that any further issues can be resolved at the reserved matters stage, when full details are submitted for approval.

Employment Development Implementation

This matter is considered in the main agenda report. It is considered that it is reasonable to require the employment elements of the scheme to be completed within 3 years of the commencement of the development to ensure that the employment development comes forward. This would be unless another scheme is approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The benefits of the development have been acknowledged in the main report, however, as highlighted previously, the employment provision is required in order to mitigate the impact of the development and ensure that Chelford has some local employment provision and is developed as a sustainable community into the future. A condition should therefore be attached, which requires the employment element to be substantially completed within 3 years of the commencement of the residential scheme unless another scheme is approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

S106 Heads of Terms

Affordable Housing

This remains as previously agreed.

Open Space

The figure should be revised to take into account the extra dwelling. The Leisure Services Officer has revised the contribution in line with the formula in the SPG and after taking into account the additional dwelling, the contribution required is £322 000

Community Facility

The figure should be revised to take into account the extra dwelling. The figure of £48 160 is accepted.

Highways

The figure remains as £16 300. It is considered reasonable for the developer to undertake the works subject to negotiations with the Highways Department in due course.

Education

Further discussions have taken place between Officers, the Capital Development Manager and the applicant with regard to the education requirements of the scheme. As previously stated within the Committee

Report, the proposed development at the application site and the Stobarts site will generate the need for a new classroom at Chelford CE Primary School.

It is anticipated that the developments will generate a **minimum** of 24 children of primary school age. The school can only accommodate 60 children. There are 42 on the roll from January 2011; therefore based on current numbers, when the developments come forward there will be a deficiency of at least 6 spaces.

In order to mitigate against this, a new classroom will be required, in accordance with policy IMP1 of the Local Plan, which advises:

The Borough Council will expect planning applications for the development of sites to include within them provision for infrastructure consequences. Such provision may include:

Off-site facilities necessary as a result of the development in order to avoid placing additional burden on the existing community..

Due to local circumstances, it may be necessary in some cases to view individual applications collectively in assessing off-site infrastructure requirements.

A 80 m2 classroom is considered necessary, incorporating a cloakroom, store & toilets. This will cost £187,000 in total, including fees, furniture and equipment.

This cost is to be spread across the two sites on a pro-rate basis:

136 dwellings in total (86 at the application site, and 50 at the Stobarts site)

187, 000 divided by 136 = £1 375 per dwelling

86 x 1 375 = **£118 250.**

The applicant has expressed that they would agree to a contribution as outlined in the Macclesfield Borough S106 SPG (worked out on a pro rata basis between the Chelford Market site and Stobarts) of £37 800. It should be noted that the figure of £118 250 (which is now required by Officers) is a reduction from the figure originally requested £144 957, originally calculated from the Cheshire County Council guidance.

It is considered appropriate for the developers to pay for the price of a new classroom rather than follow the Macclesfield Borough Supplementary Planning Guidance on S106 Agreements, or the former Cheshire County Council guidance, as a new classroom is required to mitigate the development. A new classroom is essential to accommodate the additional children in the Village as a result of the developments, and will ensure the developments are sustainable well into the future.

CONCLUSION

The principle of the development has been discussed within the main agenda report. The revised indicative layout plans are considered to be acceptable from both a layout, tree and landscape perspective. The recommendation remains as one of approval, subject to any new matters arising as a result of the renotification of neighbours and consultees in relation to the revised plans, and the additional condition relating to securing the employment element of the scheme. Alterations to the Heads of Terms in respect of the financial contribution for the classroom and POS contributions should also be made.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement.

STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD – 8 DECEMBER 2010

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO: 10/0346M

LOCATION Woodside Poultry Farm, Stocks Lane, Over Peover

UPDATE PREPARED 7 December 2010

REPRESENTATIONS

Following the preparation of the report on 26 November 2010, two further representations have been received from one of the occupiers of the properties on Stocks Lane that adjoin the site. The main points raised are summarised below:

- Query what stage funding for the proposed affordable housing was and is at
- Question the independence of the affordable housing statement submitted by the applicants
- Do not feel that the points raised by the QC appointed by local residents were accurately reported to Members
- Continue to question the need for low cost housing in this location and question the opinion of the Council's Rural Housing Enabler
- Question how drainage is to be provided to the development
- Request that the S106 agreement also covers the removal of asbestos from the site

POLICY

Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)

Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) were revoked by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on 9 July 2010 under Section 79 (6) of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction act 2009. However, the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West has been reinstated (protem) as part of the statutory Development Plan by virtue of the High Court decision in the case of Cala Homes (South) Limited and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Winchester City Council on 10 November 2010.

At the time of considering the application on 15 September 2010, no RSS policies were referred to as at that time, the RSS did not form part of the Development Plan. However, as it does now form part of the Development Plan, the relevant policies of the RSS need to be considered.

These policies are:

DP1 Spatial Principles
DP2 Promote Sustainable Communities
DP4 Making the Best Use of Existing Resources and Infrastructure
DP5 Manage Travel Demand: Reduce the Need to Travel, and Increase Accessibility
DP7 Promote Environmental Quality
DP8 Mainstreaming Rural Issues
DP9 Reduce Emissions and Adapt to Climate Change
RDF1 Spatial Priorities
RDF2 Rural Areas
RDF4 Green Belts
L2 Understanding Housing Markets
L4 Regional Housing Provision
L5 Affordable Housing
RT2 Managing Travel Demand
RT9 Walking and Cycling
EM1 Integrated Enhancement and Protection of the Region's Environmental Assets
EM2 Remediating Contaminated Land
EM18 Decentralised Energy Supply
MCR3 Southern Part of the Manchester City Region

Draft Interim Planning Statement on Affordable Housing

Additionally, subsequent to the Committee on 15 September, the Council has recently produced a Draft Interim Planning Statement on Affordable Housing. This document sets out the Council's definition of affordable housing and specific site requirements, as well as providing guidance on development considerations and means of securing their provision. It also sets out the Council's requirements for achieving mixed and balanced communities including the housing needs of specific groups.

The statement has been produced within the framework of the three adopted Local Plans for the former District authorities of Crewe and Nantwich, Congleton and Macclesfield, the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and government guidance as expressed in national planning guidance and policy statements. It is also consistent with the Council's Corporate Objectives and the Sustainable Community Strategy.

The draft statement was approved by the Strategic Planning Board on 6 October 2010 and is currently out to public consultation until 17 December 2010.

Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

The SHMA carried out on behalf of Cheshire East Council was only at a draft stage when the application was previously considered in September 2010.

This document has now been published and reports that there are 271 households in need in the Knutsford Rural Area (the area within which Over Peover falls) and a need for 31 dwellings per annum within the Knutsford Rural Area between 2009/10 to 2013/14.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Policy Update

Whilst the RSS policies listed above are now relevant to the consideration of the application, with the exception of Policy EM18, it is not considered that any of the RSS policies raise any new issues that were not previously considered by officers and Members when considering the proposal in September. At that time it was acknowledged that the site does not score well in terms of locational sustainability but it was recognised that this is difficult to achieve in rural locations and that in relative terms, Over Peover has many more services than other rural locations.

Policy EM18 requires that all residential developments comprising more than 10 units should secure at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources, unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design that this is not feasible or viable. This matter could be addressed by an additional condition if necessary. However in this case given that the scheme is for 15 dwellings (only 5 dwellings above the threshold) and given that the scheme is for 100% affordable housing, it is not considered feasible or viable to attach a condition regarding decentralised energy supply.

With regard to the Draft Interim Planning Statement on Affordable Housing, as this is still subject to public consultation, it is considered that limited weight should be afforded to it in the consideration of the application. Nevertheless, it is not considered that the proposal is inconsistent with the interim statement.

The publication of the SHMA adds weight to the fact that there is a general need for affordable housing within the wider Knutsford Rural Area.

Representations

Each of the additional points raised by the additional representations will be dealt with in turn.

When the application was considered at the meeting in September, Members were advised that HCA (Homes & Communities Agency) funding for the proposal would rest on the outcome of the application and that if the application was refused, then funding could potentially be placed in doubt. Following the approval of the application in September, the HCA confirmed to Plus Dane Housing that their bid for funding for Woodside Poultry Farm has been approved. The grant allocation for the site has now been secured and it is intended to submit a 'start on site' claim in the New Year.

A question mark has been raised as to the independence of the affordable housing statement submitted in behalf of the applicants. This statement was referred to in the original committee report dated September 2010 when it was concluded that the statement, together with other evidence available to the Council, was sufficient to adequately demonstrate that a need existed for the number of houses proposed. The statement submitted by the applicants was prepared by Pioneer Property Services Ltd, a company which specialises in housing market analysis and the provision of affordable housing. At the time of considering the application in September, officers were satisfied with the evidence available which did not rest solely on the affordable housing statement submitted by the applicants but as stated, was based on a combination of evidence. Whilst the Council's Rural Housing Enabler has been involved with the application, the opinions expressed within the committee reports and at the meeting in September represented the view of the Head of Planning and Housing and followed extensive consultation and discussion with numerous officers and specialists within the Council.

The points raised by the QC appointed by residents were considered by officers at the time of making the recommendation and were also summarised within both the original report and the update report.

The application form submitted with the application states that foul sewage is to be disposed of via mains sewers. However, it has been stated by third parties that main drainage is not available on the site. The Council's building regulations department has confirmed that there are no mains drains on Grotto Lane and that drainage would therefore have to be provided by connecting to drains on Stocks Lane or by the provision of septic tanks. This would be dealt with at the building regulations stage and whilst it could also be dealt with by a drainage condition, given the scale of the development this is not considered necessary.

With regard to the request to contain a clause regarding asbestos removal within the S106 agreement, this is not considered reasonable or necessary as the removal of asbestos is covered by other legislation and can be adequately dealt with by an informative.

CONCLUSION

As stated in the original report on this agenda, the reason that this application needs to come back before Committee is to address the need for an additional condition regarding protected species. The principle and detail of the proposal was fully considered at the meeting on 15 September 2010 when Members of the Committee resolved to approve the application. It is not considered that there are any new issues that have arisen since then or that have been raised in representation that result in the need to amend the original recommendation or decision, other than to add an additional condition regarding protected species. Any need for further additional conditions regarding drainage and/or decentralised energy will be dealt with verbally at Committee once a response on these issues has been received from the applicants.

This page is intentionally left blank