

Application No: 19/4862M

Location: HILLSIDE, 21, ADLINGTON ROAD, WILMSLOW, CHESHIRE, SK9 2BJ

Proposal: Demolition of the existing nursing home and the construction of a new building providing 11 apartments, car parking, landscaping and associated facilities.

Applicant: Mirasa Wilmslow Ltd

Expiry Date: 17-Jan-2020

SUMMARY

The principle of the development can be accepted subject to there being no significant adverse impacts arising from it. The comments from the neighbours and town council are noted; however the site comprises previously developed land in a sustainable location, with access to a range of local services and facilities nearby and has good public transport links. It would add to the stock of housing and its construction and occupation would result in social and economic benefits, albeit relatively minor. The development would make effective use of a previously developed site.

The proposal also raises no significant design, amenity or highway safety issues.

The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to highways and education comments, conditions and s106 contributions.

RECOMMENDATION: Approved subject to conditions and s106 contributions

REASON FOR REPORT

The application was called in by the Local Ward Councillor, Councillor Fox for the following reasons:

"No provision for visitor parking. The applicant acknowledges there is no facility for on street parking in this location.

No information submitted on amenity distances with neighbouring properties.

Replacement of a 2 storey dwelling house in the main with a 2.5 storey apartment block out of keeping with this residential area.

Poor design quality that does not reflect the local character and detailing that is found in neighbouring properties.

Proposal for 6 eurobins to be collected from kerbside on Adlington Road rather than from within the site.”

DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

The application site lies in a predominantly residential area to the west of Wilmslow Town Centre. It is currently occupied by a two storey detached building used as a care home known as Hillside, along with an outbuilding to the rear. There is mature landscaping to the boundaries and trees subject to a blanket TPO across the whole site.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

Full planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing buildings on site and the erection of a replacement building comprising 11no. apartments.

RELEVANT HISTORY

16/6225M Demolition of existing building and erection of a new building comprising 14 no. apartments
Refused 16 March 2018

Reasons for refusal:

- 1. The proposed development by virtue of its size and siting would result in the direct loss of an existing tree which is the subject of the Macclesfield Borough Council (Wilmslow – Hillside 21 Adlington Road) Tree Preservation Order 1996. The loss of this tree is considered unacceptable because of the impact upon the general amenity and character of the area in which the application site is located and would be contrary to policy SE5 of the Cheshire East Local Plan and saved policy DC9 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan.*
- 2. The proposed development by virtue of its size and siting would result in a threat to the continued well being of existing trees which are the subject of the Macclesfield Borough Council (Wilmslow – Hillside 21 Adlington Road) Tree Preservation Order 1996. The loss of these trees is considered unacceptable because of the impact upon the general amenity and character of the area in which the application site is located and would be contrary to policy SE5 of the Cheshire East Local Plan and saved policy DC9 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan.*
- 3. The proposed three storey structure represents an overdevelopment of the site and is out of scale with the surrounding built environment. Whilst the quality of design has improved, it does not reflect the local character and detailing that is found in the neighbouring properties. The scale of the development is such that it fails to recognise the character of the wider area by not providing sufficient amenity space, which is exacerbated by the extensive areas of car parking. The proposal would be contrary to policies SE1 and SD2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan and The Three Wilmslow Parks SPG.*
- 4. The relationship of the proposed building to the adjoining property at Lindfield would lead to an unacceptable impact in terms of loss of light and a loss of privacy due to the increase in mass and overlooking windows overlooking this property contrary to saved*

07/1809P SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION
Approved with conditions 05 September 2007

07/0532P SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION
Refused 11 May 2007

99/2076P TWO-STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND SIDE CONSERVATORY
Approved with conditions 08 December 1999

99/2075P EXTENSION FOR SIXTEEN BED SPACES AND STAFF FACILITIES
Approved with conditions 08 December 1999

52972P EXTENSION FOR SIXTEEN BED SPACES AND STAFF FACILITIES
Approved 22 June 1988

48321P EXTENSION TO REST HOME TO IMPROVE STAFF FACILITIES AND TO
PROVIDE A TOTAL OF 17 BED SPACES
Refused 23 March 1987

34092P PROPOSED USE OF EXISTING HOUSE AS REST HOME FOR UP TO 12
RESIDENTS
Approved 05 August 1983

POLICIES

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – adopted 27th July 2017

MP1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
PG1 Overall Development Strategy
PG2 Settlement Boundaries
PG7 Spatial distribution of development
SD1 Sustainable development in Cheshire East
SD2 Sustainable development principles
IN1 Infrastructure
IN2 Developer Contributions
SC1 Leisure and Recreation
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
SE12 Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability

SE13 Flood risk and water management
CO1 Sustainable travel and transport

Appendix C – Parking Standards

It should be noted that the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy was formally adopted on 27th July 2017. There are however policies within the legacy local plans that still apply and have not yet been replaced. These policies are set out below.

Saved Macclesfield Borough Local Plan Policies

NE11 (Nature conservation interests)
DC3 (Amenities of residential property)
DC6 (Circulation and Access)
DC8 (Landscaping)
DC9 (Tree protection)
DC35 (Materials and Finishes)
DC36 (Road layouts and circulation)
DC37 (Landscaping in housing developments)
DC38 (Space, light and Privacy)
DC41 (Infilling housing or redevelopment)
DC63 (Contaminated land)

The saved Local Plan policies are consistent with the NPPF and should be given full weight.

Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan

LSP2 Sustainable Spaces
LSP3 Sustainable Transport
NE5 Biodiversity Conservation
TH4 The Three Wilmslow Parks
TA1 Residential Parking Standards
TA2 Congestion and Traffic Flow
TA5 Cycling in Wilmslow
H2 Residential Design

Other Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Framework (NPPG)
The Three Wilmslow Parks SPG (2004)
The Cheshire East Borough Design Guide (2017)
Cheshire East Parking Standards - Guidance Note

National Policy:

The National Planning Policy Framework establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Of particular relevance are Chapters 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15.

CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)

Highways: Formal comments awaited

Environmental Health: no objections subject to conditions

United Utilities: no objections, subject to conditions relating to drainage

Housing: no requirement for affordable housing on this site

Education: Formal comments awaited.

Flood risk: no objections subject to condition

Open Space: a contribution of £33,000 would be required for Public Open Space and £5,500 for Recreation and Outdoor Sport.

VIEWS OF THE PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL

Wilmslow Town Council: *“At its meeting on Monday Wilmslow Town Council's Planning Committee objected to this application on the grounds of it being overbearing on neighbouring properties and its construction being out-of-keeping with properties in Wilmslow Park, contrary to Policy TH4 of Wilmslow's Neighbourhood Plan. In addition, the Town Council's Planning Committee expressed concerns regarding how refuse collections would be undertaken.”*

Following re-consultation of the amended plans the town council repeated the above comments.

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

Amended plans were received during the application period. 22no. objections were received prior to the amendments with a further 8no. objections received following, with all of these commenters having already commented earlier. Below is a summary of the main issues:

Principle of development

- An apartment block is not in keeping with the area.
- The application does not address the reasons for refusal from the earlier Jones Homes application.

Design

- The site is overdeveloped.
- Design of the building is not in keeping with the character of the area and particularly the requirements of the SPG and TH4 of the Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan.
- The building is on a larger footprint and comes forward of the current line.
- Inappropriate location of the bin store and cycle store which will be visible from public vantage points.

Residential Amenity

- The proposed development is overbearing and will result in the loss of amenity to the occupiers of Blackcomb and is no better than the previous scheme.
- The building has been reoriented to reduce the potential for overlooking but now includes a blank gable end facing 13 Overhill that has no merit.
- The development is not in accordance with policies DC3 and DC38 of the Macclesfield Local Plan.

Highways & Parking

- Inadequate parking without the provision of specific visitor parking will lead to parking on Wilmslow Park Road/Adlington Road. Meeting the car parking standards is not a sufficient level of provision.
- Storage of bins in the bell mouth will cause a traffic hazard.
- No electric charging point provision.
- The widening of the access is not necessary and would encroach onto land outside of the applicant's control.
- Access onto Wilmslow Park North was originally agreed by the previous owners of East Lodge and owners of Hillside to allow for emergency access only. It was subsequently blocked when the agreement broke down.
- Access to the site is located on a bend and has poor visibility which is a threat to highway safety.

Ecology

- No provision of a bat loft which was included in the Jones Homes proposals.

Landscaping

- The widening of the access road and realignment of the footpath access onto Wilmslow Park North will have an adverse impact on the trees / vegetation.
- Adverse impact on the Leylandii hedge on the boundary with Blackcomb.
- Consultation with occupiers of Blackcomb regarding proposed works to trees included within G4.

Land Ownership

- The boundary to the site is incorrectly shown.

Following the re-consultation the comments listed below were received:

- Still out of character – low quality design.
- The overall footprint remains the same and no additional garden space has been created.
- Future pressures on the protected trees which will overhang car parking spaces.
- Parking provision remains inadequate.
- The new proposed position of the refuse collection could lead to safety issues along Wilmslow Park North.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Key Issues

- Impact on the character of the area,
- Impact on trees,
- Impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties,
- Highway safety implications

Principle of Development

The site is located within a predominantly residential area, as allocated within the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan. The principle of the development can therefore be accepted subject to there being no significant adverse impacts arising from it.

Residential Mix

Policy SC4 of the Cheshire East Local Plan states that *“New residential development should maintain, provide or contribute to a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes to help support the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities.”* The mix of one and two bedroom apartments located within a residential area would contribute to the mix of housing sizes and would complement the existing provision within the area and would meet other objectives identified in the policies including the provision of accommodation for those wishing to downsize and meeting the needs of the borough’s older population.

The Cheshire East Local Plan (CELP) and the Councils Interim Planning Statement: Affordable Housing (IPS) states in Settlements with a population of 3,000 or more that we will negotiate for the provision of an appropriate element of the total dwelling provision to be for affordable housing on all unidentified ‘windfall’ sites of 15 dwellings or more or larger than 0.4 hectares in size. The desired target percentage for affordable housing for all allocated sites will be a minimum of 30%, in accordance with the recommendations of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment carried out in 2013. This percentage relates to the provision of both social rented and/or intermediate housing, as appropriate. Normally the Council would expect a ratio of 65/35 between social rented and intermediate housing.

This is a proposed development of 11 dwellings with a site size of 0.2 hectares, therefore no Affordable Housing provision is required.

Design and Impact on Character of the Area

Policies SE1, SD1 and SD2 encourage high quality design in all developments.

The site lies within the boundary of the Wilmslow Park SPG. The SPG states: *‘Any proposed development should reflect the characteristics of the specific area, and, in the case of an extension, to the specific building. This applies to every aspect from the density of building on a particular site to the type and pitch of the roofing material.’*

Policy H2 of the WNP states that where appropriate, all new residential development should seek to deliver high quality design and should demonstrate consideration of the Cheshire East Design Guide and compliance with Policies SP1 Sustainable Construction, SP2 Sustainable Spaces and SP3 Sustainable Transport of the WNP.

Policy TH4 of the Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan refers to the Three Wilmslow Parks with a specific reference to Wilmslow Park stating that *“new residential development should respect the existing built form of Wilmslow Park which consists of medium to large detached houses on plots of varying sizes, terraced town houses, semi-detached Victorian 3.5 storey houses, detached bungalows and purpose built apartment blocks.”*

“All new development must demonstrate how it has contributed positively towards the heavy semi-wooded landscape character of Wilmslow Park.”

The site is predominantly shielded by a mature green boundary which buffers the existing care home from the road. This would be strengthened by additional planting and the breaking up of the parking area to the front of the building.

Following discussions during the application process minor amendments have been made to the proposed design of the building since the submission of the application to reflect the comments made by the design officer. For example, the side elevations of the building have been broken up with the inclusion of variances in the roof and the façade to provide relief to the elevations, additional landscaping and enhancements to the amenity space has been included.

The required analysis and reference to local scale, materials, and architectural detailing has been illustrated and incorporated into the design to provide a modern but locally distinctive design.

The previously refused building displayed a three storey building. Officers have been working with the designer to achieve a much more sympathetic design that responds to the context of the site, breaking down the height of the building closest to the dwellings to the north (15 Overhill and 23 Adlington), and adding in local detailing to break down the massing of the proposal.

The revised design incorporates elements of communal amenity space with improved landscape and private amenity space with the addition of Juliette balcony doors to enable access to the benefits of the outdoors. This solution presents minimal impact avoiding an increased footprint/ overlooking of adjacent properties.

Saved Macclesfield Local Plan policy DC41, relating to infill housing states:

‘The garden space should reflect the typical ratio of garden space within curtilages in the area and the location, size and shapes should be suitable for the intended purpose’.

The building is largely contained within the footprint of the existing building and has a plot ratio consistent with adjoining development. The previous scheme extended the footprint over the site and created parking areas close to the boundary with adjoining properties.

Unlike the refused scheme, the submitted proposals includes amenity space around the development with all existing trees retained which would provide an attractive setting for the building and space for the occupiers of the apartments to enjoy.

It is considered that the improvements satisfy the raised issues of massing, elevational design and the referencing locally distinctive design and scale.

Amenity

Saved Macclesfield Borough local Plan policy DC3 seeks to ensure development does not significantly injure the amenities of adjoining or nearby residential properties through a loss of light, overbearing effect or loss of sunlight/daylight with guidance on space distances between buildings contained in saved policy DC38 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan and guidance within the Cheshire East Design Guide.

The objections have been carefully considered. Cherry Lawns is located due east of the proposed development and contains a bedroom window at first floor and a kitchen diner window at ground floor looking onto the site. The existing building contains a separation between the buildings of approx. 20m and at an angle which would be reduced to approx. 14m at its closest point; however it would be approx. 20m at the point directly opposite. Saved policy DC38 states that a distance of 21m should be retained between habitable windows and 14m if the elevation is blank. This rises to 28m for 3 storey properties. The Cheshire East Design Guide (2017) includes guidance for distances between buildings which is slightly lower than the guidance in policy DC38 with a distance of 12m between a habitable window and blank elevation and 18m between two habitable windows. The distance between the two buildings is over 21m, and while this is below the recommended distance in policy DC38 of the MBLP, the height and position of the proposed second floor window is commensurate to the existing side facing window at first floor so the impact would not be significantly worse than the existing situation. There is also extensive screening with the protected trees positioned between the two properties.

To the north-east of the application site lies Blackcomb (shown as Lindfield on site plan) which sits to the rear of its plot. This means that the majority of the garden area of this property is to the front of the dwelling, alongside the new building.

There is currently good screening between the two properties which is proposed to be retained. The proposed building has been pulled away from the boundary with Blackcomb, confines the windows to broadly the same location as the existing windows, although the proposed is three storey as opposed to the existing two storey building, ensures there are no direct views from habitable windows to habitable windows and as a result will not have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of Blackcomb in terms of increase in massing and overlooking unlike the refused scheme.

To the north-west the re-orientation of the proposed building compared to existing means that the windows would be at a more oblique angle than existing in relation to number 13 Overhill Lane. The overall height of the building is no higher than the existing building, and although the position is slightly closer to the boundaries between the two the re-orientation of the building and removal of rear windows overlooking number 23 ensures that the relationship between the two properties would not be significantly worse than the existing situation.

Highways

The site extends to approximately 0.2 hectares in area and is located approximately 1.5 kilometres to the east of the centre of Wilmslow. Access to the site is taken from Adlington Road.

This is a full planning application for the development of 10no. two bedroom apartments and 1no. one bedroom apartment. Proposed off-street parking of 21 spaces is in accordance with Cheshire East Council parking standards. It is noted that reference has been made to the lack of visitor parking. While the guidance note referred to in appendix C of the CELPS states; *“(For flats: visitor parking required at 1 space per 5 units where local parking congested)”* it would be difficult to make a case to suggest that the local area is congested. The proposed parking provision is therefore considered to be acceptable.

All dwellings will be served from the existing point of access to Adlington Road, which will be widened to allow two-way traffic movement and designed to allow a refuse vehicle to enter and exit the site in a forward gear.

A cycle store is proposed to the south west of the building and will be a secure enclosure built in brickwork to match the main building. The facility will be sufficiently sized to accommodate 12no. cycles.

The refuse collection would be made from the pedestrian entrance onto Wilmslow Park North. This is located approx. 28m from the junction with Adlington Road. This distance when considered alongside the nature of Wilmslow Park North, a relatively lightly trafficked road, should be sufficient.

The Transport Note sets out that there would be a marginal reduction in movement to and from the site with the proposed apartment development when compared with a former nursing home.

While no comments have yet been received from the Strategic Infrastructure Manager it is considered that the proposal would comply with the adopted car parking standards with the CELPS. It is also noted that there were no highway objections in respect of the previously refused scheme which was for 14 apartments, also with no visitor parking. Comments from the Strategic Infrastructure Manager will be reported as an update.

Arboriculture and Forestry

Policy SE5 of the CELPS states that development proposals which will result in the loss of, or threat to, the continued health and life expectancy of trees, hedgerows or woodlands (including veteran trees or ancient semi-natural woodland), that provide a significant contribution to the amenity, biodiversity, landscape character or historic character of the surrounding area, will not normally be permitted, except where there are clear overriding reasons for allowing the development and there are no suitable alternatives. Development proposals which will result in the loss of, or threat to, the continued health and life expectancy of trees, hedgerows or woodlands (including veteran trees or ancient semi-natural woodland), that provide a significant contribution to the amenity, biodiversity, landscape character or historic character of the surrounding area, will not normally be permitted, except where there are clear overriding reasons for allowing the development and there are no suitable alternatives.

The application site benefits from mature and established tree cover, both internally and to the perimeter boundary which are afforded protection by area A1 of the Macclesfield Borough

Council (Wilmslow – Hillside 21 Adlington Road) Tree Preservation Order 1996. The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment by Ascerta Ref: P.1230.19 August 2019, Rev C has identified that the proposed development will not require the removal of any of the existing tree cover and has made provision for tree protection measures throughout any demolition and construction period.

The proposal as indicated will result in an improved relationship with some trees to that which presently exists. Some minor incursion of the new building is indicated to affect T7 but this can be carried out under arboricultural supervision. The rooting area of trees T7 and T10 stands to be improved in the longer term where existing hard surfaces are shown to be broken out and returned to amenity areas.

The submitted Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) gives consideration of below and above ground constraints and has provided a pruning specification to achieve the necessary clearances of proposed structures and access routes. A specification for an engineered designed surface and the areas in which this is to be implemented has been included within the AMS.

Following concerns from the Council's Arboricultural Officer regarding the lower quality and vitality of trees to the southern boundary of the site which provide screening between the adjacent property and the proposal, a more detailed landscaping scheme has been submitted. The scheme which makes provision for additional tree planting along this boundary ensuring the long term continuity of the existing screening given the extent of new surfacing which is proposed in this area.

In the light of the above, the proposal is considered to comply with policy SE5 of the CELPS and the Council's Forestry Officer also raises no objections.

Nature Conservation

Bats

Bat surveys carried out in 2019 found evidence of bat activity in the form of a minor common pipistrelle bat roost within the building. Surveys in previous years identified a locally important brown long-eared bat (BLE) maternity roost within the roof of the building, and DNA testing of droppings retrieved from the loft in 2019 confirmed that they were BLE droppings. The loss of the buildings on this site in the absence of mitigation is likely to have a high impact on bats at the local level and a medium impact upon the conservation status of the species as a whole.

Article 12 (1) of the EC Habitats Directive requires Member states to take requisite measures to establish a system of strict protection of certain animal species prohibiting the deterioration or destruction of breeding sites and resting places.

In the UK, the Habitats Directive is transposed as The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. This requires the local planning authority to have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive so far as they may be affected by the exercise of those functions.

It should be noted that since a European Protected Species has been recorded on site and is likely to be adversely affected by the proposed development, the planning authority must consider the three tests in respect of the Habitats Directive, i.e. (i) that there is no satisfactory alternative, (ii) that the development is of overriding public interest, and (iii) the favorable conservation status of the species will be maintained. Evidence of how the LPA has considered these issues will be required by Natural England prior to them issuing a protected species license.

Current case law instructs that if it is considered clear or very likely, that the requirements of the Directive cannot be met because there is a satisfactory alternative or because there are no conceivable “other imperative reasons of overriding public interest” then planning permission should be refused. Conversely if it seems that the requirements are likely to be met, then there would be no impediment to planning permission in this regard. If it is unclear whether the requirements would be met or not, a balanced view taking into account the particular circumstances of the application should be taken.

Alternatives

The alternative would be for the existing buildings to fall into disrepair to the detriment of the character of the area. It is likely that some intervention will be required in the future. The alternative of the future refurbishment of the building is likely to have a similar impact upon the protected species as the demolition.

Overriding public Interest

The proposals would bring about additional dwellings to the area.

Mitigation

To compensate for the loss of the existing roost the submitted report recommends the installation of bat boxes as a means of compensating for the loss of the pipistrelle roost and also recommends the timing and supervision of the works to reduce the risk posed to any bats that may be present when the works are completed. A condition will be included in any approval for the recommended mitigation.

On the basis of the above it is considered that requirements of the Habitats Directive would be met.

Hedgehog and nesting birds

If planning consent is granted a condition will be required to safeguard nesting birds and hedgehogs.

Education

Comments from the Education department in relation to the amount of any required contributions towards Education are yet to be received and will be confirmed in an update.

Public Open Space and Recreation

Policy SE6 of the Cheshire East Local Plan requires 65 square metres per dwelling for the provision of public open space (POS) and recreation / outdoor sport (ROS) facilities. It appears that this cannot be provided on site and therefore financial contributions will be required for off site provision in line with policy SE6 of the Cheshire East Local Plan.

Based on 10no. dwellings of two or more bedrooms the required contribution would equate to £33,000 for POS and £5,500 for ROS. The POS commuted sum would be required and would be used to make additions, enhancements and improvements to the play [including teenage play and recreation] and amenity facilities at Browns Lane [play] and Wilmslow Park [amenity].

The ROS com would be required on commencement of development and would be for use in line with CELPS SC1 and the councils Playing Pitch Strategy.

HEADS OF TERMS

If the application is approved a Section 106 Agreement will be required, and should include:

- Public Open space contribution of £33,000
- Recreation & outdoor sports contributions of £5,500

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations

In order to comply with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 it is now necessary for planning applications with legal agreements 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.

The provision of public open space is necessary, fair and reasonable to provide a sustainable form of development, to contribute towards sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities and to comply with local and national planning policy.

All elements are necessary, directly relate to the development and are fair and reasonable in relation to the scale and kind of the development

PLANNING BALANCE

The comments from the neighbours and town council are noted, however the site comprises previously developed land in a sustainable location, with access to a range of local services and facilities nearby and has good public transport links. It would add to the stock of housing and its construction and occupation would result in social and economic benefits, albeit relatively minor. The development would make effective use of a previously developed site.

The proposal also raises no significant design, amenity or highway safety issues.

The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to highways and education comments, conditions and s106 contributions.

In order to give proper effect to the Northern Planning Committee's intent and without changing the substance of its decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Planning 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

Application for Full Planning

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to a Section 106 Agreement and the following conditions

1. Commencement of development (3 years)
2. Development in accord with approved plans
3. Submission of samples of building materials
4. Pile Driving details to be submitted
5. Landscaping - submission of details
6. Landscaping (implementation)
7. Landscaping to include details of boundary treatment
8. Tree protection measures to be implemented
9. Nesting bird survey to be submitted
10. Incorporation of features for Breeding birds
11. Actions in the event of unforeseen contamination
12. Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems.
13. Travel information pack to be submitted
14. Surface water drainage details to be submitted
15. Travel information pack to be submitted
16. Electric vehicle infrastructure to be provided
17. Contaminated Land - phase II investigation to be submitted
18. Contaminated land - verification report to be submitted
19. Ecological Enhancement details to be submitted
20. Imported soil to be tested
21. Contaminated Land
22. Plans to show drainage relationship with trees to be submitted

