

Application No: 16/4861M

Location: 4, Little Meadow Close, Prestbury, SK10 4HA

Proposal: Demolition of existing 2 storey house to provide two new detached dwellings.

Applicant: Atherton

Expiry Date: 30-Nov-2016

SUMMARY

The proposals are in accordance with the NPPF, Macclesfield Borough Council Local Plan and Prestbury VDS and Prestbury SPD.

Highways have no objection to the proposal. The site can accommodate the 5 parking spaces required for 2 dwellinghouses of this size and the access to the site is not changing. Therefore there are no substantial highways concerns.

The Council's Forestry Officer has no objection to the proposals. All the trees identified for removal are considered to be low value inconsequential ornamental suburban garden trees, none of which are considered worthy of formal protection under a Tree Preservation Order.

Ecology have concluded the only potential impacts of the scheme relate to the presence of nesting birds. A condition is therefore to be included to safeguard nesting birds.

In addition Environmental Health, Flood Risk Team and United Utilities have no objection to the proposal.

The design is deemed acceptable and there are no substantial amenity issues to be caused. The plot division will result in two plots which are a similar sqm to surrounding sites with a similar density.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to conditions

REASON FOR REPORT

The application has been called into committee by Councillor J. Paul Findlow for the following reasons:

Widely expressed local concern, including a "strong objection" from the Parish Council, on the grounds of:

- 1.gross over-development.*
- 2.out of place and character for the area, together with inappropriate design.*
- 3.the un-neighbourly nature of the proposal, overlooking and invasion of privacy.*
- 4.loss of trees.*
- 5.contrary to the Village Design Statement.*

PROPOSAL

This application seeks full planning permission to demolish a 2 storey dwellinghouse and erect 2 new 2 storey detached dwellings with the same orientation as the existing dwellinghouse. The site will contain 5 parking spaces (3 spaces allocated to dwelling 4 and 2 spaces allocated to dwelling 4a).

The proposal will result in the removal of 10 trees. The access to the site is staying the same.

The proposed dwellings are to measure:

- Dwelling 4 – approx. 13m deep (maximum), 11.3m wide (maximum) 5m eaves and 6.8m to the ridge. 135sqm ground floor area (including area labelled garage) and 135sqm at first floor. Equating to approx. 270sqm in total.
- Dwelling 4a - 13.3m deep (maximum), 10.8m wide (maximum) 4.5m eaves and 6.8m to the ridge. 114sqm ground floor area (including area labelled garage) and 99sqm and first floor. Equating to approx. 213sqm in total.

SITE DESCRIPTION

4, Little Meadow Close is located within a predominantly residential area of Prestbury as defined in the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan.

Little Meadow Close is a quiet, two lane residential cul-de-sac which serves 9 dwellinghouses that all vary in design, scale and mass. The site is large and measures at it's widest point approximately 44m and deepest approximately 66m, the site is at its narrowest to the east/front of the dwellings. The current dwellinghouse is sited towards the eastern edge of the plot and is accessed via a private tarmac drive that leads to the property with double garage and driveway parking. The existing access is currently ungated.

The site is relatively flat, falling just 0.75m over 30m across it's width and 2m over 66m along its length. The front of the site is bounded by a low height stone wall with mature hedgerows and trees along the boundary. The remaining frontage to the house consists of lawns with various mature trees and is heavily planted with mature trees towards the rear and along the boundary.

The existing property is set back from the frontage by approximately 23m. The siting of the property and the extent of landscaping makes for a relatively private site, particularly at the rear.

The appearance of the existing house is an equal mix of Cheshire red brickwork, coloured cement render and dark grey roof tiles / flat roofing. The fenestration is predominantly softwood painted (white) with a mix of 1950s large fixed panes with side hung opening lights. These materials are typical of the surroundings with most properties nearby built from a mix of brickwork and render with an occasional use of timber cladding on the upper storeys. The forms are mainly traditional consisting of two storey, rectilinear properties with large pitched roofs often utilising dormer roofs but not exclusively.

RELEVANT HISTORY

None

NATIONAL & LOCAL POLICY

National Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework establishes a presumption in favour of good design. Of particular relevance are paragraphs: 56-67

Development Plan

The relevant Saved Policies of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan are:

BE1 (Design principles for new developments)
DC1 (High quality design for new build)
DC2 (Extensions and alterations)
DC3 (Protection of the amenities of nearby residential properties)
DC5 (Design out crime)
DC6 (Circulation and Access)
DC8 & DC37 (Landscaping)
DC9 (Tree Protection)
DC38 (Guidelines for space, light and privacy for housing development)
DC35 (Materials)
DC41 (Infill housing development or redevelopment)
DC46 (Demolition)
H5 (Windfall housing)
H13 (Predominantly residential)
NE11 (Nature Conservation)

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

Other Material consideration

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version (CELP)
Prestbury Village Design Statement
Prestbury Supplementary Planning Document

CONSULTATIONS

Highways – No objections however informative requested

Forestry – No objection subject to conditions relating to submission of an Arboricultural Implications Assessment and method statement.

Environmental Health – No objection however conditions relating to pile foundations (if required) and dust suppression measures are recommended

United Utilities – No objection

Flood Risk – No objection

Ecology – No objection however condition relating to the protection of nesting birds recommended

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL

Prestbury Parish Council - The Committee strongly object to this application as it is a gross over development in a cul-de-sac. It does not comply with the Village Design Statement and the design is out of character with the area. They are also concerned about the loss of trees.

REPRESENTATIONS

21 objections have been received. The objections in full can be located on file. A summary of the objections can be located below.

- Overdevelopment and cramped appearance
- Design and appearance is completely out of context and cedar board is out of keeping
- Streetscape Elevation is misleading – does not show how close the properties are to the boundaries and trees which are to be felled are on the streetscape elevation
- overshadow the adjoining properties and gardens. Loss of sunlight/daylight
- a substantial loss of garden land and shared open aspect of the adjoining back gardens
- Proposed landscaping not acceptable
- Intrusion of privacy of adjoining dwellings including to dwelling behind 4, Little Meadow Close due to large proposed windows and balcony
- The plot sits at a higher elevation than the houses directly behind it, which are dormer type bungalows
- Poor access to the site
- Increase Pollution - car fumes/carbon monoxide
- Increase in traffic/vehicular movement
- Only two parking spaces per property
- Believe the practice of garden division to be contrary to the National Policy Planning framework
- Footprint of 4a is encroaching forward from the existing sightline
- Loss of approx. 15 trees
- Loss of natural habitat for wildlife
- Concerns over waterlogging of site and drainage
- Concerns over bin storage

APPRAISAL

The key issues relate to 1) design/impact on the character and appearance of the area and relationship with the street-scene; 2) impact on neighbour amenity; 3) trees; 4) highway safety; 5) flood risk / waterlogging; 6) ecology

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Design / character

Paragraph 56 of the NPPF notes that “the Government attach great importance to the design of the built environment. Good Design is a key aspect of sustainable development, indivisible from good planning”.

Policy BE1 of the local plan requires new development to achieve the following design principles:

- Reflect local character
- Respect form, layout, siting, scale and design of surrounding buildings and their setting
- Contribute to a rich environment and add to the vitality of the area
- Be human in scale and not normally exceed 3 storeys
- Use appropriate facilities

The Prestbury Village Design Statement (VDS) was adopted by Macclesfield Borough Council in 2007. The VDS states any new development should:

- Have regard to the different densities within the different parts of the parish - This has been considered and the proposal is deemed acceptable as outlined further below
- Respect the settlement pattern of the parish, particularly open spaces and avoid inappropriate development in the Green Belt – Site is not in the Green Belt and respects the pattern, as acceptable distances between properties have been retained and the sub-division of the plot is in keeping as outlined further below
- Respect local heritage and distinctiveness and the historic part played by the Rivers Bollin and Dean in defining the settlement pattern- Site is not in the historic areas
- Take account of flood risk and not develop or re-develop parts of the river valleys susceptible to flooding other wildlife habitats should be preserved and retained, and enhanced where appropriate- The site is not near the river and Cheshire East Council’s flood risk department and United Utilities have no objection
- Have regard to any relevant planning policies for restricting the supply of housing land – CEC cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply and so the one additional dwelling would have a positive effect. Any policies restricting the supply of housing are out of date in the absence of a five year housing supply.
- Have regard to the impact it would have when viewed from outside the immediate location and/or from the Bollin Valley and the impact it would have on the settlement as a whole – Deemed no negative impact as the site is in a residential cul-de-sac
- Include appropriate tree and/or hedge planting in keeping with the established character of the area.- 13 trees are to be retained on site and as outlined further below is deemed to be acceptable
- Consider the relationship between the size, form and mass of a building, as well as the space surrounding it - This has been done and deemed acceptable as outlined further below

- Consider its impact on neighbours to maintain the quality of a particular environment - Amenity assessed and meets all amenity policies as outlined further below
- Avoid over-development of the site, which contrasts poorly with the characteristics of the area and is out of proportion with nearby properties – deemed in keeping and is not classed as overdevelopment of the site as detailed below
- Respect and retain the limited number of open spaces within the village which contribute to the feeling of space, openness and rural quality of the parish – The site is situated at the top of a residential cul-de-sac and so is deemed to have no negative impact to the feeling of space, openness and rural quality. The plots are to remain large
- Consider existing infrastructure and local services, including utilities, sewage and drainage systems, and the implications of the proposal – Deemed to have no negative effect. United utilities and flood risk have no objection to the proposal. A condition is to be inserted to ensure broadband services are installed and drainage will be assessed further when an application is submitted to Building Control

The proposal is therefore deemed to be in accordance with Prestburys VDS, and specific details are expanded upon below.

The following table assesses the dimensions of the proposal. It concluded the maximum height at 6.8ms is only a 300mm increase above the existing dwellinghouse. To reduce any impact this increase may cause, flat roofs have been utilised. Therefore 4a has flat roof to the northeast of the dwelling to reduce the impact on number 2 Little Meadow Close which is set lower than number 4 Little Meadow Close. The existing dormers, current carport and nearby properties all contain flat roof aspects and so this design approach is considered to be in keeping with the character of the area.

In addition the width of the front elevation of the existing dwellinghouse and attached carport is approx. 18.8m at ground floor. The proposed 2 dwellings will result in a combined front elevation of approx. 22.1m at ground floor. Whilst it is noted the proposed dwellings will result in an approx. 3.3m increase in building width overall, it is also noted the plot is wide and can accommodate the increase. The proposed dwellings have also been staggered at both ground and first floor which helps to minimise their impact. In addition the dwellings are set back from the highway by a distance which is commensurate with other properties on the street .

Dwelling	Ground floor sqm	First floor Sqm	Total floor area	Depth (max.)	Width (max.)	Ridge Height (max.)
Existing	130 (147 Inc. carport)	84	214sqm	10.2m	15.9m (18.8 Inc. carport)	6.3m
4	135	135	270sqm	13m	11.3m	6.8m
4a	114	99	213sqm	13.3m	10.8m	6.8m

It is noted objections have been raised stating the site is situated in a low density area and in a semi rural area. However, as noted above the site is located within a predominantly residential area, which is not an identified low density housing area in the local plan.

Concerns have also been raised with regard to setting a precedent. However it is confirmed that each application would be assessed on its own merits at the appropriate time.

It is also noted concerns were raised with regard to a substantial loss of garden land and shared open aspect of the adjoining back gardens. All 9 sites have been assessed on Little Meadow Close (see below table) and number 4 Little Meadow Close currently comprises the largest plot. The sub-division of the application site would result in two plots of approximately 984sqm. Due to the fact that the area is classed as predominantly residential (not low density) a plot size of 984sqm is still a large plot which can easily accommodate a dwelling without resulting in undue harm to the character of the area.

In terms of the wider area the property directly behind 4 Little Meadow Close (Number 32 Meadow Drive) has been assessed. The site is approx. 1055sqm with the footprint of the dwelling equating to approx. 145sqm. Therefore the proposed 4 and 4a Little Meadow Close sites would contain a slightly smaller site area per dwelling compared to the neighbour to the rear (984sqm in comparison to 1055), however the proposed dwellings have a smaller footprint (135sqm and 114sqm. respectively) than number 32 Meadow Drive and so are consistent with local character.

Plot size	
Site	Plot size
4 Little Meadow Close	1968sqm
1 Little Meadow Close	1417sqm
2 Little Meadow Close	1409sqm
3 Little Meadow Close	1367sqm
5 Little Meadow Close	1624 sqm
6 Little Meadow Close	1719sqm
7 Little Meadow Close	1126 sqm
8 Little Meadow Close	1182sqm
9 Little Meadow Close	1114 sqm

The existing dwelling occupies 7% of its plot by area. When assessing the wider area dwellings occupy between 8% and 20% of their plots, with the average being 13% for those measured. The proposed dwellings will occupy 11% of the site for No 4 and 13% of the site for No 4a. These figures are considered to demonstrate that the dwellings and plot sizes are commensurate with the established character of the area.

Some of the letters of representation refer to the proposal being contrary to the NPPF due to the division of garden land. It is acknowledged that paragraph 53 of the NPPF states Local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area'. However, in this case the development would not cause harm to the local area. Furthermore, there are no adopted local plan policies that seek to impose such restrictions.

As you enter Little Meadow close, due to the location of the site which is situated at the top right of the cul-de-sac and the fact that the dwellings are to be set back within the plots, the proposed dwellings will not be instantly in view and therefore the visual impact is reduced.

Any reduction in plot width can also be accommodated within Little Meadow Close due to the varying width of all the plots. Many of the existing plots are at their narrowest at the front.

The proposed red Cheshire brickwork for the main elevations, dark grey slate-like roof tile, dark grey aluminium windows, smooth through colour render, dark grey stone-like cladding to the dormer windows to merge with the roof scape, large glazed areas to the garden elevation, vertical western red cedar boarding are all considered to be acceptable materials in this area. Little Meadow Close currently contains a varied mix of materials including render and timber cladding and varying window frame and door materials and colours. A mix of materials is considered to be acceptable and in this case it is believed the mix in materials will help reduce any massing that may be evident.

It is therefore considered that the sub division of the existing plot and the 2 proposed dwellings are in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore in accordance with the requirements in policies BE1, DC1, and DC2 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan.

Residential Amenity

Policies DC3, DC38 and H13 seek to protect the residential amenity of nearby properties having regard to space, light and privacy etc.

Plot 4

The proposed dwellinghouse is to contain three side windows on the south west elevation. At ground floor these serve a study and WC and an en-suite at first floor. boundary treatment and the first floor window is recommended to be obscurely glazed. In addition due to the orientation of number 4 and number 6 its deemed there to be no further significant amenity issues caused.

On the proposed north east side elevation there is to be one utility window at ground floor and glazed doors that serve the living room and enter onto the patio area. There are no windows at first floor. Again the utility is a non-habitable room and the lounge window is approx. 7.8m to the boundary line and due to the staggered effect of the two proposed properties it is deemed there are no significant privacy issues

The front of the proposed dwelling at first floor is to contain an approx. 60cm deep balcony. The balcony is set into the front elevation and so appears flush to the front elevation, and will therefore have a similar impact to a window. The two additional windows to this elevation at first floor are to serve a gallery and stairs and so again there is no substantial amenity concerns caused. The ground floor is to contain the front door and a window to serve the garage and again will not result in any substantial amenity issues. The dwelling opposite (3 Little Meadow Close) is at the closest point approx. 72m away and therefore well within the suggested 21m guideline as detailed in policy DC38.

Number 30 Meadow Drive is approx. 48ms away from the proposed rear elevation and so well within the suggested guideline of 25m as stated under policy DC38. The proposed rear elevation is to contain two rear first floor windows which serve two bedrooms and a balcony which is approx. 1.5m deep. The balcony is set into the rear elevation and so appears flush to

the rear elevation, and will again have a similar impact to a window, which raises no significant overlooking concerns.

Plot 4a

The proposed south west side elevation contains one window at ground floor which serves a dining room. This looks at a blank gable approx. 2.5ms away and so will not overlook the adjoining property. The dining room is a through room so contains light from the front and back windows also and so is deemed acceptable in amenity terms with an acceptable amount of light. The proposed north east side elevation contains two windows at ground floor, one is to serve a garage and the other serves a kitchen / sitting area. The kitchen / sitting area is approx. 6.9m from the boundary line and due to the staggered rear boundary of number 4a in comparison to number 2 and, there is to be no substantial amenity issues caused.

At first floor the proposed south west side elevation contains 2 windows. One is a secondary window to a bedroom and the other serves a study. It is noted the proposed study does result in a shortfall in the distances outlined in policy DC38 and this matter has been raised with the applicant's agent. Further details will be provided as an update. The proposed north east side elevation is to contain one window at first floor which is to serve the entrance to a bedroom facing a bedroom storage area (this is the secondary window to the bedroom). It is recommended that this window is obscurely glazed to prevent overlooking of neighbouring property.

The dwellinghouse opposite (3 Little Meadow Close) is at the closest point approx. 68m away and therefore well within the suggested 21m guideline as detailed in policy DC38. The proposed front elevation is to contain two windows at ground floor which serve a living room and WC. At first floor there are to be three windows that serve two bedrooms and the stairs. All proposed windows are deemed acceptable and not to cause a substantial amenity issue. It is noted a full length bedroom window faces the flat roof garage. This flat roof is to be conditioned so that it is not used at any point without permission from the LPA to be used as a balcony.

Number 32 Meadow Drive is approx. 59m away from the proposed rear elevation and so well within the suggested guideline of 25m as stated under policy DC38. The proposed rear elevation is to contain two doors and one window at ground floor all of which are deemed acceptable. The first floor is to contain one bedroom balcony which again will not cause any substantial amenity issues.

General Amenity

The proposed dwellings have been specifically positioned with staggered elevations to ensure the 45 degree line of site is not compromised from number 2, 4a, 4 and 6 Little Meadow close and therefore again the proposal is acceptable in terms of impact upon outlook and light.

Policy DC38 states 'each dwelling should be set back at least 1 metre from the site boundary'. The proposed dwelling on plot 4 is at its closest point approx. 2.5m from the boundary line to the south and approx. 1.7m to its north boundary line. The on plot 4a is approx. 1m from its south boundary line and approx. 1.2m from its north boundary line. Therefore both proposed

dwelling meet the suggested criteria in policy DC38. It is noted other sites on Little Meadow close do not adhere to this 1m guideline.

Given the nature of the proposed dwellings and the immediate neighbouring properties, overall the proposal would not significantly impact on neighbouring amenities. Bearing the above points in mind the proposal is in accordance with policies DC3, DC38 and H13 of the Macclesfield Borough Council Local Plan

Trees

The Council's Forestry Officer has no objection to the proposal. The application is supported by an Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement.

All the trees identified for removal are considered to be low value inconsequential ornamental suburban garden trees, none of which are considered worthy of formal protection under a Tree Preservation Order. The moderate value trees identified for retention including those forming the rear boundary of the site can all be protected in accordance with current best practice.

It is noted that the Arboricultural Method Statement confirmed 15 trees on site are to be removed. The agent has since confirmed in writing this is not the case and only 10 trees are to be removed. Revised plans and streetscape elevations have therefore been received to clearly evidence the removal of the correct trees. 5 trees on the front elevation were initially labelled to be removed which would have an effect on the streetscene, however this was incorrect and only one tree on the front elevation is to be removed resulting in 5 trees being retained resulting in a minimal impact on the streetscene.

13 trees will therefore be retained on site but again as mentioned above all trees on site are considered to be low value. In addition the site is not in a conservation area nor are there any tree preservation orders on the site.

The proposal is therefore in accordance with the requirements in policies DC9 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan and the loss of the trees are deemed acceptable and will not have any substantial affect on the streetscene.

Highways

A 4 bed dwellinghouse requires 3 parking spaces and a 3 bed dwellinghouse requires 2 parking spaces. Each space should measure a minimum 4.8m x 2.5m per space if on a drive or 2.7m x 5.5m per space if within a garage. It is noted there is a shortfall in the integral garage dimensions, however as each site can accommodate the spaces externally the parking requirements are met.

The Strategic Infrastructure Manager has been consulted on the proposal and has no objection to the planning application. There are no material highway implications associated with this proposal; the proposal for access is satisfactory and off-street parking provision is in accordance with CEC minimum parking standards for residential dwellings.

It is noted an objection has been made regarding poor access to the site. However, the site entrance is not changing and as mentioned above the Strategic Infrastructure Manager has no objections and therefore the access and egress to the site is deemed acceptable.

Furthermore, as the site is to only accommodate one additional dwelling, it is not considered the proposal will result in any significant increase in pollution, carbon monoxide levels or traffic/vehicular movement.

The proposal is therefore in accordance with the requirements in policy DC6 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan and Cheshire East Local Plan parking standards.

Flood Risk

Concerns over drainage and waterlogging have been noted. As detailed above United Utilities and Cheshire East Council's Flood Risk team have been consulted and both have confirmed they have no objection. Therefore the removal of the trees and any increase in hardstanding is deemed acceptable and will not cause any substantial issues in this area. In addition drainage for the dwellings will also be assessed by Building Control at the appropriate time. The proposals are therefore considered to be acceptable and there are no substantial concerns with regards to waterlogging or flooding on the site or surrounding area.

Ecology

An Ecological Assessment has been conducted (dated 26 October 2016) by a suitable qualified Ecologist.

The Ecologist has concluded the only potential impacts of the scheme relate to the presence of nesting birds. In addition Cheshire East Council's Ecologist has also assessed the proposals and concluded the same. An appropriate condition is therefore recommended. Subject to this condition the proposal is in accordance with policy NE11 of the Macclesfield Borough Council Local Plan.

Other matters

Comments have been noted with regards to wheelie bin storage. A revised plan has therefore been received to evidence the wheelie bins can be safely stored on site at the side and rear of the proposed dwellings.

Objections are also noted with regards to the misleading streetscape elevation as it does not show the close proximity the properties are to the boundaries and trees which are to be felled are on the streetscape elevation. As the proximity is evidenced on the proposed site plan there is no need to also evidence this aspect on the streetscape elevation. In addition a revised streetscape plan has been submitted to taken into account the removal of the trees.

A comment has been made with regards to consulting Adlington Hall Properties due to covenants on the dwellings. These covenants are not taken into consideration by the planning authority as part of this process, this will need to be addressed as a separate matter.

An objection received states the neighbours have not been consulted. The Council has followed the relevant consultation process. A Site Notice was erected on the 20/10/16 and letters to neighbours who fall within the designated consultee area were sent on 10/10/2016.

PLANNING BALANCE

The proposals are in accordance with the NPPF, Macclesfield Borough Council Local Plan and Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version (CELP) and Prestbury VDS and Prestbury SPD.

Highways have no objection to the proposal. The site can accommodate the 5 parking spaces required for 2 dwellinghouses of this size and the access to the site is not changing. Therefore there are no substantial highways concerns.

The Council's forestry officer has no objection to the proposals. All the trees identified for removal are considered to be low value inconsequential ornamental suburban garden trees, none of which are considered worthy of formal protection under a Tree Preservation Order.

The nature conservation officer advises that the only potential impacts of the scheme relate to the presence of nesting birds. A condition is therefore to be included to safeguard nesting birds.

In addition Environmental Health, Flood Risk Team and United Utilities have no objection to the proposal.

The design is deemed acceptable and there are no substantial amenity issues to be caused.

The plot division will result in two plots which are a similar size to surrounding sites with a similar density.

Officers are aware that members have previously raised concerns and refused planning permission on other sites where the sub-division of a plot has been proposed. However this proposal has been assessed on its merits and it has been concluded that the proposed development has an acceptable impact on the character of the area, living conditions of neighbouring properties and all other matters of public interest.

The proposal is therefore considered to be a sustainable form of development and a recommendation of approval is made.

Application for Full Planning

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to following conditions

1. Commencement of development (3 years)
2. Details of materials to be submitted
3. Development in accord with approved plans
4. Provision of car parking
5. Prevention of use of flat roof as balcony
6. Details of ground levels to be submitted
7. Obscure glazing requirement
8. Arboricultural works
9. Pile Foundations
10. Dust suppression measures to be submitted
11. Broadband
12. Nesting Birds
13. watercourses
14. Hours for piling operation
15. Land Contamination
16. Hours of Operation
17. Drainage
18. Water Mains
19. United Utilities
20. New vehicular crossing

In order to give proper effect to the Committee's intentions and without changing the substance of the decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Planning (Regulation) in consultation with the Chairman (or in their absence the Vice Chairman) of the Northern Planning Committee, to correct any technical slip or omission in the wording of the resolution, between approval of the minutes and issue of the decision notice.

