

Application No: 22/4698N

Location: Sydney Cottage Farm, HERBERT STREET, CREWE, CW1 5LZ

Proposal: Demolition of all buildings and structures and the erection of 47 no. retirement living apartments (Use Class C3) all of which would be affordable homes, along with parking spaces, landscaping and associated works.

Applicant: Bowsall Developments Ltd and Housing 21

Expiry Date: 07-Apr-2023

SUMMARY

The proposal seeks permission for the demolition of all buildings and structures and the erection of 47 no. retirement living apartments (Use Class C3) all of which would be affordable homes, along with parking spaces, landscaping and associated works. The application site is located largely within the Crewe settlement boundary, with part of the red edge including an agricultural field to the northeast which is located within the Open countryside and Green Gap.

Policy PG2 sets out that Crewe is a Principal Town where significant development will be encouraged to support its revitalisation, recognising its role as one of the most important settlements in the borough. Development will maximise the use of existing infrastructure and resources to allow jobs, homes and other facilities to be located close to each other and accessible by public transport. Policy PG7 sets out that Principal Towns such as Crewe are expected to accommodate in the order of 65 ha of employment land and 7,700 new homes.

The majority of the site is considered to be a brownfield site with a lawful development certificate approved in 2017 for B8 use across the site. Furthermore, residential development has previously been approved on the site in 2018.

The plans show an area of communal open space located within the open space to the northeast slightly protruding into the open countryside/Green Gap. It is considered that the location of the open space complies with Policy PG6 and PG5 as outdoor recreation and therefore is acceptable in principle.

It is therefore considered that residential development is acceptable in principle, however this is subject to compliance with all other relevant policies within the development plan.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that decisions on planning applications are made in accordance with the Development Plan

unless material considerations indicate otherwise, these matters are discussed further below.

The layout and size of the of the scheme is now considered to be more inkeeping with the character and appearance of the area and rural edge. The Design Officer has raised concerns the bulk and mass of the building on the southwestern boundary and details in terms of landscaping and planting and surfacing materials, however the scheme is largely acceptable and subject to conditions for materials, boundary treatment, hard surfacing, landscaping and tree planting the scheme is acceptable.

The site has raised no significant issues in relation to landscaping, forestry, amenity, highways safety, impact on protected species, flood risk or drainage, subject to appropriate conditions.

The scheme will contribute towards the normal mitigation required in relation to NHS, POS, and Affordable Housing. The scheme will also include a contribution towards an assessment and design of a pedestrian crossing on Sydney Road.

It is therefore considered that the development is on balance acceptable and recommended for approval accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to S106 Agreement and conditions

REASON FOR REFERRAL

The application has been referred to the Southern Planning Committee as it is a Small Scale major development of over 20 units.

PROPOSAL

Full Planning Permission is sought for the demolition of all buildings and structures and the erection of 47 no. retirement living apartments (Use Class C3) all of which will be affordable homes, along with parking spaces, landscaping and associated works.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site relates to the Sydney Cottage Farm, Herbert Street, Crewe. The application site is a commercial site used for storage in relations to a horticultural business. The existing site is located off Herbert Street. There is PROW which goes through the middle of the site onto Bridleway which connects Crewe to Haslington.

The majority of the site is hardstanding, two storage buildings and a portacabin. There is a pond on the site in the lower southwest of the site. The site is bounded by residential development to the north and west, and south with Open Countryside to the east.

The site is located within the Crewe settlement boundary (the existing built development site) with the eastern open space being located within the Open Countryside and Green Gap.

RELEVANT HISTORY

18/3477N – Outline application for residential development with matters of scale and layout included – Approved with conditions and subject to a S106 Agreement 30th August 2019

17/3244N – Lawful Development Certificate Application for an Existing B8 Use (Supply of Sundries to the Horticultural Industry) – Positive Certificate issues 3rd August 2017

P03/1319 – Outline Application for a Dwelling – Refused 14th July 2004

P94/0953 – Erection of 3 No. polytunnels, 1 green house, agricultural building and portacabin – Approved with conditions 12th January 1995

P94/0043 – Conversion and extension of cowshed/loosebox to form additional living accommodation – Approved with conditions 28th February 1994

P93/0940 – Conversion and extension of cowshed/loosebox to form additional living accommodation – Refused 9th December 1993

7/13258 - Use of land for grazing/stabling of horses – approved with conditions 31st July 1986

7/04755 – Residential development and access roads – Refused 14th December 1978

PLANNING POLICY

Development Plan

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS);

MP1 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development)

PG1 (Overall Development Strategy)

PG2 (Settlement Hierarchy)

PG5 (Strategic Green Gaps)

PG6 (Open countryside)

PG7 (Spatial Distribution of Development)

SD1 (Sustainable Development in Cheshire East),

SD2 (Sustainable Development Principles),

IN1 (Infrastructure)

IN2 (Developer Contributions)

EG3 (Existing and Allocated Sites)

EG4 (Tourism)

SC1 (Leisure and Recreation)

SC2 (Indoor and Outdoor Facilities)

SC3 (Health and Wellbeing)

SC4 (Residential Mix)

SC5 (Affordable Homes)

SE1 (Design)
SE2 (Efficient Use of Land),
SE3 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity)
SE4 (The Landscape),
SE5 (Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland),
SE6 (Green Infrastructure)
SE8 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy)
SE9 (Energy Efficient Development)
SE11 (Sustainable Management of Waste)
SE12 (Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability)
SE13 (Flood Risk and Water Management)
CO1 (Sustainable Travel and Transport)
CO4 (Travel Plans and Transport Assessments)
Appendix C: Parking Standards

Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD)

PG9 Settlement Boundaries
PG12 Strategic Green Gap
PG13 Local Green gaps
GEN 1 Design principles
ENV 1 Ecological network
ENV 2 Ecological implementation
ENV 3 Landscape Character
ENV 5 Landscaping
ENV 6 Trees, hedgerows and woodland implementation
ENV 15 New Development and existing uses
ENV 16 Surface water management and floodrisk
RUR 6 Outdoor sport, leisure and recreation outside of settlement boundaries
HOU 1 Housing Mix
HOU 2 Specialist housing provision
HOU 8 Space, accessibility and wheelchair housing standards
HOU 10 Amenity
HOU 12 Housing Density
HOU 13 Housing delivery
INF 3 Highway Safety and access
REC 2 Indoor sport and recreation implementation
REC 3 Open space implementation

National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Other Considerations

The EC Habitats Directive 1992
Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010

Circular 6/2005 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and Their Impact within the Planning System

CONSULTATIONS

CEC Head of Strategic Infrastructure (Highways) – No objections, subject to a contribution of £19,000 towards the assessment and design of a pedestrian crossing on Sydney Road and an informative for a S278 agreement

CEC Environmental Protection – No objections to the proposal subject to conditions regarding electric vehicle charging points, ultra-low emission boilers, travel plan implementation, updated Phase II contaminated land report, verification report, soil importation materials, unexpected contaminated land.

CEC Flood Risk – No objection in principle. Conditions suggested for detailed drainage strategy/design

CEC Housing – No Objections

CEC Open Space (ANSA) – No objections in principle to revised scheme. Open Space contribution for offsite improvements required at £1,500 per bed to be used locally, and Recreation/outdoor sports facilities contribution of £500 per 2 bed space apartments to be used in line with the Council's adopted playing pitch strategy or any subsequent document.

CEC PROW – No objection subject to diversion and condition for a scheme of management to be submitted

United Utilities – No objection subject to conditions regarding implementation of drainage scheme, surface water drainage, and sustainable surface water drainage scheme

NHS Primary Care – Request a contribution of £31,657 to offset the impact from extra demand for housing.

Brine Board – No objection, subject to informative regarding the need for specific foundations and services.

Cheshire Fire and Rescue Service – Supply advice on installation of water suppression systems, access for the fire service, and water supply

Crewe Town Council – That, whilst the committee does not object to the principle of the development, it sustains its objection to the proposal on the following grounds:

- i. That the development must demonstrate net biodiversity gain as per planning policy (it was not possible to clearly identify this has been demonstrated from the revised plans and documents).
- i. That the development demonstrates sustainable energy production as per planning policy (it was not possible to clearly identify this has been demonstrated from the revised plans and documents).
- ii. That the form of heating seeks to achieve sustainability eg ground source heat pump or similar method, as per planning policy (it was not possible to clearly identify this has been demonstrated from the revised plans and documents).

- iii. The site does not provide the minimum parking provision within local plan policy and this will inevitably lead to on street parking issues to the detriment of the amenity of neighbouring residences
- iv. It was considered that the proposals are too dense for the site hence the difficulty in provision for parking and meeting policies associated with sustainability

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of representation have been received from around 35no households. The main issues raised are;

- Objection to development in the open countryside
- Object to loss of a Greenland site
- Impact on PROW / Bridalway
- Impact on highway safety, lack of parking provision on site, any on street parking will be hazardous, already too many cars trying to park on Herbert Street and Foxholme Court
- Question if large vehicles such as bin lorries, emergency services will be able to access the site safely
- The bus services are limited and occupants would need to cross Sydney Road to reach the bus stop – there are no safe pedestrian crossings near Herbert street
- The proposal is an over development of the site
- Concerns raised in terms of noise pollution on neighbour during construction
- Impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of overlooking, and overbearing impact, impact on views
- Impact on wildlife using the site
- Impact on flood risk in the area
- There is not enough infrastructure e.g. doctors for additional housing in the area
- Lack of services in the area
- Further affordable housing is not required in the area
- Parking data is not comparable to the application site

A letter of representation has also been received from Cllr Faddes. The main issues raised are (summarised below – full version available to view on the website);

- Lack of parking provision within the scheme
- Significant on street parking currently – concerns over large vehicles accessing the site
- Poor sustainable transport links
- Bus is a circular route into the town centre where the bus stop is located on the opposite side of Sydney Road
- Lack of facilities within walking distance, no doctors, supermarket, shop etc
- Lack of community facilities and amenities on site
- Access into the site is poor

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

The majority of the application site is located within the Crewe settlement boundary. Policy PG2 sets out that Crewe is a Principal Town where significant development will be encouraged to

support its revitalisation, recognising its role as one of the most important settlements in the borough. Development will maximise the use of existing infrastructure and resources to allow jobs, homes and other facilities to be located close to each other and accessible by public transport. Policy PG7 sets out that Principal Towns such as Crewe are expected to accommodate in the order of 65 ha of employment land and 7,700 new homes.

Policy PG9 of the SADPD states that within settlement boundaries, development proposals (including change of use) will be supported where they are in keeping with the scale, role and function of that settlement and do not conflict with any other relevant policy in the local plan.

The majority of the site is considered to be a brownfield site with a lawful development certificate approved in 2017 for B8 use across the site. Furthermore, residential development has previously been approved on the site in 2018.

Whilst the floorspace created by the new development will exceed the floor space of the existing buildings, given the site is located within the settlement boundary this is not a requirement, as development is acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with all other relevant policies of the development plan.

Green Gap

Within the red edge of the site, to the northeast an area of land is located within the designated Crewe / Haslington Strategic Green Gap as identified in LPS policy PG5 'Strategic Green Gaps' and Figure 8.3 of the Local Plan Strategy. LPS policy PG5 'Strategic Green Gaps' identifies that planning permission will not be granted for the construction of buildings that would:-

- i. Result in erosion of a physical gap between any of the settlements; or*
- ii. Adversely affect the visual character of the landscape; or*
- iii. Significantly affect the undeveloped character of the Green Gap, or lead to the coalescence between existing settlements*

Exceptions to this policy are only considered where it can be demonstrated that no other suitable location is available.

In this instance the land is shown on the plans as communal amenity space for the development and is to be planted to create an improved buffer on the rural edge., it is not considered that the small projection would have any significant impact on the openness of the Green Gap due to existing built form to the north of the site.

Open countryside

The same area of land is also noted as being outside of any defined settlement boundary¹ in policy PG 6 'open countryside' of the LPS. In the open countryside, only development that is essential for the purposes of agriculture, forestry, outdoor recreation, public infrastructure, essential works undertaken by public service authorities or statutory undertakers, or for other uses appropriate to a rural area will be permitted.

¹ as listed in table 8.3 'settlements with a defined settlement boundary' in the LPS

It is considered that the location of the open space albeit private associated with the application site complies with Policy PG6 as outdoor recreation and therefore is acceptable in principle. Furthermore, there is a similar protrusion to the north of the application site, where a communal garden is located beyond the residential development creating a buffer between the development and the wider open countryside. The Development to the north on Foxholme Court, projects further in terms of built development into the open countryside/green gap than the proposed development and therefore will screen the development from the open countryside to the north.

Whilst there is some incursion into the Green Gap on the edges, it is considered that on balance, the development as amended, is acceptable in principle. The development as proposed is therefore considered to comply with policies PG5 and PG6, of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that decisions on planning applications are made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, these matters are discussed further below.

Previously Developed Land (PDL)

On the 3rd August 2017 a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use was granted for the entire application site to establish the lawful use as B8 (Storage or Distribution). Consideration, therefore, needs to be given to the site being Previously Developed Land (PDL).

Policy SD1 of the CELPS and the Framework encourages development on previously developed land. Previously Developed Land (often referred to as brownfield land) is defined within Annex 2 of the NPPF and states;

'Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes: land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures; land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape'

It is considered that the application proposal falls within this category, so its re-development would be supported in this regard by Policy SD1 (Part 15) of the CELPS and the Framework.

Part 1 of Policy SE2 (Efficient Use of Land), states that the Council will encourage the redevelopment/re-use of previously developed land and buildings. The proposal is also deemed to adhere with this aspect of development plan policy.

Paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that *'The use of previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist.'*

Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that *'planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land....in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or 'Brownfield' land.'*

As such, this aspect of development would adhere with both adopted development policy and national planning policy. It is afforded significant weight in this instance as a result of the strong local and national policy support the re-development of such sites.

Locational Sustainability

Both policies SD1 and SD2 of the CELPS refer to supporting development in sustainable locations. Within the justification text of Policy SD2 is a sustainable development location checklist.

The site is within the Crewe Town settlement which is categorised as a Principal Town within Policy PG 2 of the CELPS. The site is considered to be locationally sustainable, and within walking distance of a number of services on Sydney Road, and the Town Centre. Within the town centre is a Bus Service Station which links the town to the wider area. There is a bus service along part of Sydney Road which links to the Town centre, with links beyond.

Housing Mix

Paragraph 62 of the Framework states that ‘the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes’.

Policy SC4 of the Local Plan requires that developments provide an appropriate mix of housing (however this does not specify a mix).

All 47 apartments are to be affordable homes (rented) for retirement living for occupants of 55 and over. The proposed scheme will have 36no 1 bed apartments and 11no 2 bed apartments.

Policy HOU6 of the SADPD requires that new housing developments comply with the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS).

Apartment Type	Size (Bed/Person)	NDSS Standard (m2)	Actual (m2)	Difference NDSS v Actual (+/-) m2	M4(2) and M4(3)	Percentage of plots (%)	No of Plots
1	1 bed 1b2p M4(2)	50	54	4	M4(2)	46.8	22
2 (Corner)	1 bed 1b2p M4(2)	50	57	7	M4(2)	23.4	11
3	1 bed 1b2p M4(3)	50	58	8	M4(3)	6.4	3
4	2 bed 2b3p M4(2)	61	64	3	M4(2)	23.4	11
Total							47

The applicant has confirmed that all apartments are in compliance with National Described Space Standards and all apartments will be adaptable to M4 (2) standards of the Building Regulations (table above). The apartments have been designed to with accessibility in mind with all rooms capable of allowing wheelchair navigation.

Provision of older persons accommodation

Criteria 3 of LPS policy SC4 'Residential Mix' states that development proposals designed specifically for the elderly and people who require specialist accommodation will be supported where there is a proven need; they are located within settlements; accessible by public transport; and within a reasonable walking distance of community facilities such as shops, medical services and public open space.

In this instance the use proposed under C3 as retirement living apartments for over 65's preferably but applications from people of at least 55 years of age will be considered. The scheme includes self-contained apartments whilst having full access to a range of communal facilities including lounges and gardens. The scheme also includes on site Court Manager who is responsible for overseeing the daily operations of the site.

Affordable Housing

Policy SC 5 (Affordable Homes) in the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS) and subsequent Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document sets out the thresholds for affordable housing in the borough. In residential developments, affordable housing will be provided as follows:

- i. In developments of 15 or more dwellings (or 0.4 hectares) in the Principal Towns and Key Service Centres at least 30% of all units are to be affordable;*
- ii. In developments of 11 or more dwellings (or have a maximum combined gross floorspace of more than 1,000 sqm) in Local Service Centres and all other locations at least 30% of all units are to be affordable;*
- iii. In future, where Cheshire East Council evidence, such as housing needs studies or housing market assessments, indicate a change in the borough's housing need the above thresholds and percentage requirements may be varied.*

The National Planning Policy Framework in paragraph 64, states that the provision of affordable homes should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments. Major developments are defined as housing sites of 10 or more homes, or the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or more.

The LPS states in the justification text of Policy SC5 (paragraph 12.44) that the Housing Development Study shows that there is the objectively assessed need for affordable housing for a minimum of 7,100 dwellings over the plan period, which equates to an average of 355 dwellings per year across the borough. This figure should be taken as a minimum.

Affordable housing contributions

Recently, some innovative models of private sector housing for older people have been developed. These schemes are characterised by the availability of varying degrees of care, 24-hour staffing and ancillary facilities. The Council recognises that such models can contribute to meeting affordable and special needs housing, thus the Council will seek an affordable housing contribution from these schemes where the dwellings trigger the thresholds set out in LPS SC5 (affordable homes).

Importantly, reference to 'dwellings' in policy is not only confined to C3 uses (termed 'dwelling houses' in the UCO) in applying affordable housing requirements. LPS policy SC5 (affordable

homes) refers to affordable housing requirements applying to 'residential developments' and this reference can include class C2 (residential institutions) and class C3 (dwelling houses) uses.

Consideration will be given by the Council to any viability issues which arise from this distinction and will assess these accordingly. Due to the difficulty in providing replicable and repeatable guidance for all housing development sites each request to the Council to reduce the affordable housing provision will be assessed on an individual case by case basis in line with point 7 of policy SC5 (affordable homes).

This is a proposed development of 47 retirement dwellings in a Principal Town, therefore, in order to meet the Council's Policy on Affordable Housing there is a requirement for 15 (14.1) dwellings to be provided as affordable homes.

Affordable Housing Mix

Point 3 of policy SC5 (affordable homes) notes that "the affordable homes provided must be of a tenure, size and type to help meet identified housing needs in this case affordable retirement homes and contribute to the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities where people can live independently longer". Paragraph 12.48 of the supporting text of Policy SC5 (affordable homes) confirms that the Council would currently expect a ratio of 65/35 between social rented and intermediate affordable housing. On this basis, 10 units should be provided as affordable/social rent and 5 units as intermediate tenure.

The Housing Supplementary Planning Document states for Specialist, Supported Living and Older Person Housing the below;

8.1 The Council's vulnerable and older persons strategy (2020 - 2024) has identified three main strategic objectives consistent with the 2014 version of the strategy: -

- *That people are supported to live in their own homes independently for longer;*
- *When required, people can receive the support they need in a wide range of specialist, supported accommodation including those members of the community with specific housing needs within the borough;*
- *People are able to make informed choices about the accommodation, care, and support options within Cheshire East.*

In the Vulnerable and Older Persons Strategy it mentions the below for Older Persons.

The 2014 strategy identified that the number of older adults across the borough was due to significantly increase and as such, this would impact on the requirement for a number of housing types including downsizing opportunities, as well as specialist accommodation, to address issues relating to care, access, and mobility.

Affordable Older Persons Need.

The current number of those over 55 on the Cheshire Homechoice waiting list with Crewe as their first choice is 166. From this data there is a shown need for 96 1- and 2-bedroom flats as rented accommodation.

Under the Supplementary Planning Document for Affordable Housing the council expects the rental units to be capped at the Local Housing Allowance. Paragraph 6.18 states;

6.18 There is a clear need to ensure that rented affordable dwellings can be let at rent levels which are truly affordable. Whilst housing schemes across the borough have previously been let at social rent or affordable rent (up to 80% of market rent), Cheshire East Council have an ambition and are now seeking to support rent levels which do not exceed either the Local Housing Allowance (LHA) for the area, or Regulator for Social Housing target rent amounts – whichever is lowest. This total rent amount is inclusive of additional service charges.

There is also still a need for Intermediate units that will cater for those who wish to downsize but cannot buy on the open market.

The applicant in this proposed development is working with a Registered Provider of Affordable Housing (Housing 21). The application is proposing for all 47 (100%) to be 1- and 2-bedroom retirement homes with a tenure of Social Rented accommodation for the over 55's.

The Housing Officer notes that the provided Affordable Housing Statement supports this and is in line with that required under the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document. As the proposed units are to be contained within one building the mix of tenures is not feasible as experience has shown and as such a 100% rented tenure is acceptable.

The affordable housing meets the NDSS (Nationally Described Space Standards) sizing as suggested by the SPD. As this proposed development will be going some way to meet the need for socially rented retirement housing for the over 55's, The Strategic Housing Officer has raised no objections to the scheme. There is a preference for the affordable housing to be secured by S106 Agreement.

Open Space

The Greenspaces officers in Ansa notes that the main focus being Public Open Space - amenity open space, active recreation and play along with food growth/allotments, outdoor sport and green infrastructure connectivity, all minimum standards laid out in Policy SE6, Table 13.1 within Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy.

The proposed scheme is for people aged at least 55 years and over who it would be expected would still mostly lead healthy and active lifestyles.

The layout shows private amenity/communal space being gated on the northeast entrance and enclosed by the apartment block and planting. Private amenity space is not a requirement of Policy SE6 therefore contributions for offsite improvements are sought. There is little to encourage community cohesion outdoors therefore the Greenspaces officer suggests the space to the south of the communal lounge is further utilised. This will in turn support good health and wellbeing linked to evidence on the positive effects of green spaces. In reference to allotment/food production, the introduction of fruiting trees and small raised beds could be incorporated within the development site. This will help to promote a more sustainable development and further social unity. It is considered that a revised landscape plan could achieve this by condition.

With regards to Green Infrastructure. connectivity - some space has been allocated to accommodate the PRoW however it is felt by the Green Spaces Officer that the substation compromises its amenity value. Further soft landscaping should be provided to shield the PRoW from the substation.

Should committee deem this application acceptable then the following contributions for off-site open space and outdoor sport are sought:

- Open space £1,500 per bed space for apartments to be used in the locality of the development – this equates to $47 \times £1,500 = £70,500$
- Recreation/Outdoor Sports facilities £500 per 2 bed space apartment to be used in line with the Council's adopted Playing Pitch Strategy or any subsequent document. – this equates to $11 \times £500 = £5,500$.

Therefore, a contribution of £76,000 is considered to be reasonable and necessary to mitigate the impact of the development and the contributions can be secured by S106 Agreement prior to the commencement of development.

Health

The NHS consultee notes that this application represents a considerable challenge in terms of increased pressures on already stretched capacity. The ICB would therefore object to the application, unless Section 106 monies are allocated to the Primary Care Network's that cover the area of Crewe. This allocation, due to the considerable constraint other recently approved applications have placed on Primary Care, would need to be made available prior to first occupation. The GP Practices affected are:

Eagle Bridge PCN

- Millcroft Medical Centre
- Earnswood Medical Centre

Combined Practice List size of 44,511 patients.

GHR PCN

- Grosvenor Medical Centre
- Hungerford Medical Centre
- Rope Green Medical Centre

Combined Practice list size of 42,435 patients.

There has been little investment allocated for Primary Care as part of the planning process and therefore any additional development must make a contribution to ensure the GP Practice infrastructure has the capacity to cope with the level of population increases being experienced.

The GP Practices within the area, have completed utilisation studies on their existing premises, and across the Practices there was an average utilisation rate of 98%. The GP Practices are currently unable to hire into both clinical and administrative roles and despite best efforts, struggle to provide enough clinical sessions per week due directly to the constraints of the existing Premises. This development would look to considerably negatively impact on the Practices and this needs to be mitigated.

There are several pipeline projects that the awarded Section 106 monies would be able to support. These include:

- Eagle Bridge Health and Wellbeing Centre – Conversion of a vacant non GMS area into HBN (Health Building Note) compliant clinical rooms to support increase in capacity. *Project Cost Scoping indication - £110,000*
- Rope Green Medical Centre - internal GP Practice modifications inclusive of; adding additional clinical rooms, creating multi-use rooms and converting. *Project Cost Scoping Indication - £100,000*
- Grosvenor Medical Centre – Conversion of office space into clinical space. *Project Cost Scoping Indication - £55,000*
- Hungerford Road Surgery - Extension and remodification internally. *Project Cost Scoping Indication £290,000.*

Given the above, the ICB therefore requests section 106 monies tied to the below formula (set at 2022 costs – requires inflation for RPI as necessary).

No. of Beds	Amount of Occupants	Correlating Cost
1 bed unit	1.4 persons	£612 per 1 bed unit
2 bed unit	2.0 persons	£875 per 2 bed unit
3 bed unit	2.8 persons	£1,225 per 3 bed unit
4 bed unit	3.5 persons	£1,531 per 4 bed unit
5 bed unit	4.8 persons	£2,100 per 5 bed unit

1 bed unit x 36 = £ 22,032

2 bed unit x 11 = £ 9,625

The requested contribution is therefore calculated as £31,657 mitigation towards projects proposed within the Crewe area. It is therefore considered that the financial contribution can be secured as part of a legal agreement to mitigate the harm. Therefore, no objection is raised subject to the mitigation contribution of £31,657 being secured by S106 Agreement.

Education

The proposed development will be aimed at over 65 provision with some over 55's accepted. The applicant states that there is unlikely to be any children in full time residence due to the nature of the provision. Therefore, although there are 11 units with 2 beds which could allow for family to live on site in this instance it is considered unlikely and unreasonable to require a contribution towards Education in this instance.

Residential Amenity

The application site is surrounded by residential development, on three sides with open field to the east and part of the south aspect. Currently the development on site is a relatively low-key storage use, with two warehouse buildings and a portacabin.

The proposed building will be 3 storeys in height with the third storey of accommodation located within the mansard roof of the development.

To the north of the site is a development of terraced dwellings and apartments. The proposed building is to be located to the south of the site within a carpark located between the building and the neighbouring properties.

Policies HOU12 and HOU 13 of the SADPD set out the general principles required for new development in to help safeguard neighbouring amenity and the future occupiers of a development. Table 8.2 set out that there should be a separation distance of 21m retained for rear principal windows facing each other, reduced down to 14m for habitable rooms having non-habitable rooms. Increased to 3 storeys or above the distance between principal windows should be increased to 24m back-to-back; and 16.5m between principle and non-habitable rooms.

The building will be located a minimum of 34m away from the rear elevations of the properties on Foxholme Court, and 23m from the side elevation of No 55 Herbert Street. The front elevation of the buildings will contain a mix of principle habitable windows and non-habitable windows. Nevertheless, the separation distance exceeds the minimum required between new development and existing development. The proposal should therefore not significantly impact on neighbouring amenity by means of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impact. There is also an access road between the existing and proposed buildings and the development includes the retention/improvement of landscaping along the boundary.

The neighbours at No.53 Herbert Street have a low boundary which overlooks the site. The new PROW path is to run along this boundary with tree coverage retained along the southwestern boundary. The building will be set back from the dwellings and will not directly overlook the neighbours windows. A separation distance of 24m will be maintained between the front elevation of the building and the corner of the rear elevation of the No.53. There are windows which overlook the garden of No 53 which runs the full length of the side elevation of the building. The windows will serve bedroom and living rooms and therefore will be principal habitable rooms. There is a separation distance of around 12m between the proposed building and the edge of the garden. There is existing tree and hedge coverage along the boundary and additional boundary treatment will be conditioned along the new PROW, and substation. Whilst there will be some potential overlooking it will be mitigated in part by tree planting and therefore it is considered that the proposed development will not have a significantly detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity by means of overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing impact.

To the south of the site accessed of the adopted part of the Bridleway is No. 236 Sydney Road. The proposed building will be located over 25m away, and therefore is considered to be unlikely to cause any significant impact on neighbouring amenity. The bungalows on Avon Drive are located over 40m away from the development with tree coverage and the rear garden of No 53 Herbert Street between, and therefore will also not be significantly impacted upon by the development.

The apartments have communal amenity space to the south and east of the building. This is considered to be sufficient for its use.

Environmental Protection have raised no objections to the proposal subject to conditions regarding electric vehicle charging points, ultra-low emission boilers, travel plan, Phase II contaminated land

report, remediation scheme implementation, verification report, soil importation materials, unexpected, contaminated land. These conditions are considered to be reasonable.

Highways

The proposal is for affordable housing of 47 retirement living apartments with off-road parking and utilising an amended access from Herbert St. The majority of the apartments will be one beds. The current use of the site is B8 storage and distribution, and the site had approval for a small residential development.

The site is on the edge of Crewe approximately a few minutes' walk from Sydney Road. There is existing footway infrastructure to the wider Crewe area including to bus stops on Sydney Road, outside Sydney Arms, with approximately 2no bus services per hour providing access to the wider Crewe area including the town centre and the Grand Junction Retail Park.

The existing access off Herbert Street will be used but will be formalised and a footway access for pedestrians will be provided. It will be over 5m wide and is sufficient to serve the development. The access has an acceptable level of visibility and has operated safely with the existing B8 use and associated car and HGV use.

As mentioned above, there will be footway access to the wider Crewe area and there is an existing dropped kerb crossing across Sydney Road. There have been comments submitted to the planning portal suggesting the need for a signalised crossing given how busy Sydney Road is. The Strategic Highways Officer in discussions with the applicant considered that there would be a benefit of providing a signalised pedestrian crossing on Sydney Road near the entrance of Herbert Street. The Highways Authority have requested a contribution of £19,000 towards the assessment and design of a signalised pedestrian crossing on Sydney Road. This would encourage more sustainable movements from the site enabling safer crossing to bus stops on the opposite side of Sydney Road.

For this type of development vehicle trips are more distributed over the course of a day. During the typical network peak hours, the development is forecast to generate around 10 trips with the afternoon peak generating approximately 15 vehicle trips. The impact upon the local highway network is considered to be negligible.

For the 47 apartments, 28 parking spaces are to be provided. As this proposal is for retirement living only with an age restriction it is more suited to sheltered accommodation and the applicant has stated that there will 2 full-time staff, resulting in a requirement for 40 car parking spaces. It is therefore short by 12 spaces. The Strategic Highways Officer notes that subject to justification a relaxation of car parking standards can be acceptable.

The applicant manages over 22,000 retirement living and extra care properties throughout England, including 224 rented retirement living schemes, and when comparing to other sites they owners have stated that the provision is sufficient to serve the development. This retirement living development differs from others typically received in Cheshire East in that it is 100% affordable and tenanted by residents with a relatively low rate of car ownership. The applicant has stated that on their other sites the parking ratio of flats to spaces is around 2.7 equating to 17 spaces for this application, and that 2,684 cars are owned by residents that are parked in the Housing 21 car parks with a total capacity of 3,156, resulting in 85% occupancy. From these numbers the Strategic

Highways Officer considers that it is clear that the proposed provision is adequate to serve the development. Nevertheless, given the concerns raised regarding parking and that the site is on the edge of Crewe rather than more centrally located, the applicant has agreed to increase the parking provision from the initial 21 proposed to 28. As extra confirmation, the applicant also carried out a parking accumulation survey of one of their sites on the edge of Winsford which is considered a comparable location. The site has 38 apartments, and the maximum occupancy was 9 spaces.

From the available information the parking will cater for residents, staff, and visitors. In the event that parking will overspill, it will be minimal and infrequent and onto a residential street which is not a through route, and does not raise a highway safety concern.

It is therefore considered that for the reasons set out above, despite the parking provision being below normal standards the proposal is acceptable, and no objection is raised subject to contribution of £19,000 towards the provision of a signalised crossing on Sydney Road, and a condition for a Construction Management Plan.

Landscape

Located on the edge of an urbanised area of housing various ages, the site has been of light industrial use beforehand. Users of the local footpaths can see this previous use as they walk through the site, with areas of storage etc. The proposals sit seemingly lower than adjacent housing. The proposals as seen in the viewpoints within the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA), sit below the existing built housing and in this aspect they fit into some of the existing built form horizon as seen from the south and east. Becoming an addition to an existing character area of residential properties on the countryside fringe.

The Landscape Officer considers that the site feels a little 'compressed' with regards to landscape design, due to the larger form footprint of the proposed building. The Landscape officer notes that some viewpoints within the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) (including ones not assessed within the residential areas) will have a Slight Adverse to Neutral impact depending on the viewpoint. Notwithstanding, this the Landscape Officer considers that a more considerate landscape masterplan with more boundary tree planting of an appropriate type could be a remedy and adverse impacts. The proposals will probably over time with the maturing of the landscape proposals (if tweaked) sit into this edge urban landscape, and therefore it is recommended that a revised landscape scheme is conditioned for submission.

The Landscape Officer has raised some concerns over the limited communal space for the number of apartments, and the lack of more communal features such as seating and pathways to encourage communal use. Nevertheless, it is considered that this can be dealt with by means of an updated landscape master plan and this can be conditioned.

The Landscape officer has also raised concerns that there are gaps within the boundary tree/hedge proposals allowing occasional views into the proposal from the rear of some properties and a channeled view on the highway of Foxholme Close in one particular place. The lack of CGI views from this estate means one cannot realistically assess the visual impacts at this location with confidence from existing residential users. Improved planting along these boundaries can be dealt with by the updated landscaping condition. It is therefore considered that on balance improvements to the landscaping masterplan can be conditioned for submission to ensure the impacts of the development limited.

Design

The Design officer has considered the most recent plans and made the following comments on the scheme.

Levels, massing scale

There has been no change to the building footprint or a reduction to the rear wings of the building, as suggested by the Design Officer previously and therefore consequently, he still has some concerns regarding the transition at the countryside edge. However, the design officer notes that the visualisations submitted do show that the building, particularly the western wing as being visible in the first few years, but that the landscaping should mature to help screen and soften views by year 10. The Design Officer remains of the opinion that a reduction in height of the western wings would further help transition the building at the rural edge but nevertheless, given the visualisations do show that the height of this building is comparable to that of the modern housing to the north of the site (which is up to 3 storeys in height) does not raise objections to it.

Architectural design and character

The Design Officer notes that the dominance of the southern brick gables has been reduced a little by the wrapping of the roof cladding over the gables for the upper storey. Information in relation to the materiality of the scheme has been submitted as part of the original submission but this will need to be conditioned if the application were to be approved.

Amenity space, landscaping & PRoW

There has been a change to the central courtyard space, providing for a partially hardened area, screening planting and what appear to be planters. The Design Officer considers that potentially more could be made of the eastern landscape area as suggested previously for informal sitting out, food growing etc. This is also set out in the Greenspaces Officer comments. There is potential to add further soft landscape to help screen the sub-station and the cycle parking, as noted above a revised landscape scheme to include soft and hard landscaping features will be conditioned to address these concerns.

Access & parking

Parking provision has increased from the original submission, and planting areas have reduced in width, but the same number of beds/trees is still proposed. Additional parking to the northern edge of the site impacts the hedgerow in a couple of areas necessitating replacement planting, the detail of which is a little unclear. Full details can be conditioned for submission.

Conclusions

The revisions to the building and external areas, have made some progress in reducing the impact of the overall bulk and mass. As highlighted there are still some minor concerns about the appearance of the building at the edge of countryside, however the CGIs give some reassurance that, in time, the appearance of the building will soften. The Landscape Officer has also concluded this in their consultation response.

If the development is to be proposed for approval, conditions in relation to materials, both for the building and the external hardscape, as well as landscape management conditions are suggested.

Forestry

This application for residential living apartments has been supported by updated Arboricultural information; Tree Survey Report which confirms the presence of 1 individual moderate quality B Category Oak (off site), 11 individual and 1 group of low-quality C Category trees and 5 hedgerows within and adjacent to the development area. None of the trees are afforded any statutory protection and neither are they of such arboricultural quality or significance to warrant consideration for formal protection by virtue of their existing quality, growth habit and species characteristics.

The revised layout has been supported by an updated AIA and Method Statement and Tree protection Plan. The report confirms that 3 individual low-quality Willow and 1 group of Elder and section of 2 hedgerow will be removed to accommodate the proposal. It's noted that the same tree losses were effectively allowed with the previously approved application on the site.

This application however proposes heavy pollarding of 3 mature and established Willows which are shown to be retained, however the reduction proposed will have a visible impact on views of the site from the west and south. The Tree Officer states that works would not accord with the requirements of BS3998:2010 Tree Work – Recommendations and the report acknowledges that pollarding of the mature trees is likely to trigger terminal decline. A lesser reduction would likely reduce the impact of this but the proposed proximity to the closest elevation of the apartment block with this application is accepted as being unsustainable if the trees were retained in their existing form.

There are also concerns regards the potential impacts of development on hedgerow 12H given the proximity of construction and in the absence of any level's information. The relocated PROW runs immediately adjacent to the western boundary to such a degree that hedgerow 11H is now also shown to be removed or cut back to the boundary.

The report makes provision for tree protection to retained trees and hedgerow, provides a methodology for implementing the development while seeking to minimise harm, and identifies those areas requiring controlled removal of hard surfaces and no dig construction methods.

It is apparent that the layout submitted with this application will arise in a more significant impact to trees and hedgerows to the south and southwestern corner of the site than was formally approved and which had allowed for appropriate separation between the closest dwelling which would not have compromised the trees and the green screening they presently provide. It is considered that opportunities may exist to provide increased separation between the trees in this area, or a provide increased space to retain hedgerows in full and accommodate new tree planting to provide enhancements to this corner of the site and ensure that tree cover is sustained in the longer term. The landscape plan proposes a total of 32 new trees on the site which is accepted to demonstrate some commitment to according with Policy SE5 however no new tree planting is indicated in the area where the most significant impact to trees would occur.

The Forestry Officer has confirmed that there is no objection to the scheme and that the trees on the site are not worth of protection. The main concern is the impact of the tree works to the

southwestern edge of the site and the accepted decline the works would do to those trees, and how the loss would impact on the landscape visuals.

The applicants Arboricultural Officer has responded below;

“The trees are classed as a low value in an arboricultural classification, a point that does not seem to be disputed by the tree officer. This low value classification is largely based on the species’ unsuitability within the vicinity of residential infrastructure. The trees would require removal due to root disturbance with the present scheme. Pollarding will allow retention of the trees, as the main structure of the trees will be removed. It has to be accepted that the trees would likely decline thereafter, however. But this may take years and the trees may provide some benefit as monoliths.

The tree officer has suggested that the trees could be retained and pruned if given more space, but I think this is unlikely to be practical. The development would need to be adjusted to provide adequate clearance from the trees, but even then, given the limited area for open space, the area beneath the trees would still likely be utilised for open space and accessed by residents. Pruning the Willows to reduce the potential for branch drop/fracture would not be sustainable in my opinion – the pruning would be hazardous and would require cyclic works on a basis of some 3 to 5 years. It would provide little benefit in reducing the risk of branch breakage in an area likely to be frequented by residents. In short, I question the practicality of retaining Willows in a confined development regardless of root impacts.

Loss of the Willows (either by felling, or pollarding) would provide benefits to the adjoining oak tree (8T), which has long term viability. This, in my opinion is far the more practical and sustainable approach. The canopy of the oak, will become the dominant landscape feature.”

It is therefore considered that on balance as there is no formal objection to the scheme, there is the potential to improve tree coverage on the edge of the site with new planting and therefore it is considered that whilst the loss/pollarding of the Willows is unfortunate on balance, the initial retention will benefit the scheme and will not have a significant impact on the scheme as a whole.

Ecology

The application includes a protected species survey, which the Councils Ecologist has considered.

Breeding Birds

If planning consent is granted, a condition for safeguarding breeding birds is required.

Wildlife sensitive lighting

In accordance with the BCT Guidance Note 08/18 (*Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK*), prior to the commencement of development details of the proposed lighting scheme should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme should consider both illuminance (lux) and luminance (candelas/m²). It should include dark areas and avoid light spill upon bat roost features, bat commuting and foraging habitat (boundary hedgerows, trees, watercourses etc.) aiming for a maximum of 1lux light spill on those features.

Ecological Enhancement

Local Plan Policy SE 3(5) requires all developments to aim to positively contribute to the conservation of biodiversity. This planning application provides an opportunity to incorporate features to increase the biodiversity value of the final development in accordance with this policy. It is therefore recommended that if planning permission is granted a condition should be attached which requires the submission of an ecological enhancement strategy.

Air Quality

Policy SE12 of the Local Plan states that the Council will seek to ensure all development is located and designed so as not to result in a harmful or cumulative impact upon air quality.

The Environmental Health Officer has requested the following conditions in relation to air quality;

- Travel Plan implementation
- Electric Vehicle Infrastructure
- Ultra Low Emission Gas Boilers

Subject to the imposition of these conditions the impact upon air quality from this development is considered to be acceptable.

Flood Risk

The Strategic Flood Risk team have confirmed that there are no objections in principle to the revised proposals. Additional information has been requested however this has not yet been submitted. Nevertheless the Flood Risk Officer has stated that without the information supplied up front a prior to commencement condition will be required for a detailed drainage strategy. This is considered to be reasonable.

United Utilities have been consulted on the application have raised no objection, subject to conditions for the implementation of the drainage scheme, and a detailed strategy for SUDs to be submitted.

PROW

There is a PROW which runs diagonally through the application site, which meets a Bridlepath to the south. The proposed development would have a direct and significant effect on the Public Right of Way, which constitutes "a material consideration in the determination of applications for planning permission and local planning authorities should ensure that the potential consequences are taken into account whenever such applications are considered" (Defra Rights of Way Circular (1/09), Guidance for Local Authorities, Version 2, October 2009, para 7.2). A proposal for the diversion of Public Footpath no.5 under s.257 of the TCPA has been submitted and is being considered.

The PROW officer has confirmed that subject to the successful outcome and completion of the legal order process and planning approval the diversion of the PROW is acceptable and the landscape proposals along the amended PROW are acceptable.

Climate Change

Policy ENV7 of the SADPD requires that all 'major' residential development schemes should provide for at least 10% of their energy needs from renewable or low carbon energy generation on site unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that having regard to the type of development and its design, this is not feasible or viable. This could be controlled via the imposition of a planning condition.

CIL Compliance

In order to comply with the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 it is necessary for planning applications with planning obligations to consider the issue of whether the requirements within the S106 satisfy the following:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

A contribution of £70,500 to mitigate for the lack of onsite open space provision and a further £5,500 to mitigate the lack of Recreational/outdoor sports provision on site are required by Local Plan Policy . The requirement to secure the commuted sum by legal agreement is considered to be fair and reasonable to ensure the mitigation is secured and used offsite appropriately.

A contribution of £31,657 is required to mitigate the impact on the NHS. This is directly related to the development to ensure the increased use of the site and access is mitigated. This is considered to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

The development will provide 100% affordable housing provision, with a minimum age limit of 55. The tenure will be full socially rented and this should be secured by legal agreement. This is considered to be reasonable and fair.

A Contribution of £19,000 towards the assessment and design of a pedestrian crossing on Sydney Road is considered to be directly related to the development and will help to create a more sustainable development. This considered to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

On this basis the S106 recommendation is compliant with the CIL Regulations 2010.

PLANNING BALANCE

The proposal seeks permission for the demolition of all buildings and structures and the erection of 47 no. retirement living apartments (Use Class C3) all of which would be affordable homes, along with parking spaces, landscaping and associated works. The application site is located largely within the Crewe settlement boundary, with part of the red edge including an agricultural field to the northeast which is located within the Open countryside and Green Gap.

Policy PG2 sets out that Crewe is a Principal Town where significant development will be encouraged to support its revitalisation, recognising its role as one of the most important settlements in the borough. Development will maximise the use of existing infrastructure and resources to allow jobs, homes and other facilities to be located close to each other and accessible

by public transport. Policy PG7 sets out that Principal Towns such as Crewe are expected to accommodate in the order of 65 ha of employment land and 7,700 new homes.

The majority of the site is considered to be a brownfield site with a lawful development certificate approved in 2017 for B8 use across the site. Furthermore, residential development has previously been approved on the site in 2018.

The plans show an area of communal open space located within the open space to the northeast slightly protruding into the open countryside/Green Gap. It is considered that the location of the open space complies with Policy PG6 and PG5 as outdoor recreation and therefore is acceptable in principle.

It is therefore considered that residential development is acceptable in principle, however this is subject to compliance with all other relevant policies within the development plan.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that decisions on planning applications are made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, these matters are discussed further below.

The layout and size of the of the scheme is now considered to be more inkeeping with the character and appearance of the area and rural edge. The Design Officer has raised concerns the bulk and mass of the building on the southwestern boundary and details in terms of landscaping and planting and surfacing materials, however the scheme is largely acceptable and subject to conditions for materials, boundary treatment, hard surfacing, landscaping and tree planting the scheme is acceptable.

The site has raised no significant issues in relation to landscaping, forestry, amenity, highways safety, impact on protected species, flood risk or drainage, subject to appropriate conditions.

The scheme will contribute towards the normal mitigation required in relation to NHS, POS, and Affordable Housing. The scheme will also include a contribution towards an assessment and design of a pedestrian crossing on Sydney Road.

It is therefore considered that the development is on balance acceptable and recommended for approval accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to S106 Agreement to secure:

S106	Amount	Triggers
Affordable Housing	100% affordable rent for over 55	Affordable Housing - All development to accord with Affordable Housing Statement
Public Open Space	Contribution total of £76,000 • Open space £1,500 per bed space for apartments to be used in the locality	Contribution – Prior to commencement

	<p>of the development – 47 x £1,500 = £70,500</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation/Outdoor Sports facilities £500 per 2 bed space apartments to be used in line with the Council's adopted Playing Pitch Strategy or any subsequent document. – 11 x £500 = £5,500. 	
NHS	Contribution of £31,657	Contribution - Prior to first occupation
Highways	Contribution of £19,000 towards the assessment and design of a pedestrian crossing on Sydney Road	Contribution – Prior to commencement

And the following Conditions

1. Standard Time
2. Approved plans
3. External Materials
4. Surfacing materials
5. Revised Landscape Scheme with a 10 year management plan
6. Landscape Implementation
7. Boundary Treatment
8. Tree Retention
9. Implementation of AIA and AMS
10. Tree Protection
11. Levels survey
12. Biodiversity enhancement features
13. Safeguard Nesting Birds
14. Lighting strategy – prior to occupation
15. Secure and covered cycle parking – prior to occupation
16. Construction Management Plan to be submitted and approved
17. Detailed strategy/design limiting the surface water runoff generated by the proposal, and associated management /maintenance plan - required prior to commencement
18. Foul and surface water to be drained separately
19. Prior to occupation – EVI
20. Prior to occupation – Low emission boilers
21. Travel Information Pack
22. Contaminated Land – Phase II report and remediation scheme
23. Contaminated Land – verification report to be submitted
24. Contaminate land – Soil Importation

25. Contaminate land - Unexpected Contamination

26. 10% of energy needs to be from renewable or low carbon energy

27. At least 30% of the dwellings in housing developments should comply with the requirements of M4(2) Category 2 of the Building Regulations regarding accessible and adaptable dwellings.

28. At least 6% of the dwellings in housing developments should comply with the requirement m4 (3)(2)(a) Category 3 of the Building Regulations regarding wheelchair adaptable dwellings.

In order to give proper effect to the Southern Committee`s intent and without changing the substance of its decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Planning (Regulation) in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice Chair) to correct any technical slip or omission in the resolution, before issue of the decision notice.

If the application is subject to an appeal approval is given to enter into a S106 Agreement with the following Heads of Terms;

S106	Amount	Triggers
Affordable Housing	100% affordable rent for over 55	Affordable Housing - All development to accord with Affordable Housing Statement
Public Open Space	Contribution total of £76,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Open space £1,500 per bed space for apartments to be used in the locality of the development – 47 x £1,500 = £70,500• Recreation/Outdoor Sports facilities £500 per 2 bed space apartments to be used in line with the Council’s adopted Playing Pitch Strategy or any subsequent document. – 11 x £500 = £5,500.	Contribution – Prior to commencement
NHS	Contribution of £31,657	Contribution - Prior to first occupation
Highways	Contribution of £19,000 towards the assessment and design of a pedestrian crossing on Sydney Road	Contribution – Prior to commencement

