

## REPORT SUMMARY

<b>REFERENCE NO - 15/506021/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Erection of nine dwellings with associated landscaping and access via a private drive off Fishers Road, Staplehurst.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Fishers Oast Fishers Road Staplehurst Kent TN12 0DD		
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b> Permit		
<b>SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL</b>  -The site represents a sustainable location with accessible links to local settlements, in line with the NPPF.  -The application would not cause significant harm to highways safety, residential or visual amenity.  -The site is on land allocated for residential use in the Draft Local Plan. Notwithstanding the fact that the plan is yet to be examined the site is considered acceptable for residential development; and is in accordance with the NPPF and these are sufficient grounds to depart from the adopted Local Plan.		
<b>REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE</b> The proposal represents a departure from the provisions of the Development Plan.		
<b>WARD</b> Staplehurst Ward	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Staplehurst	<b>APPLICANT</b> Wright Holdings Ltd <b>AGENT</b> Peter Brett Associates
<b>DECISION DUE DATE</b> 17/09/15	<b>PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE</b> 17/09/15	<b>OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE</b> 28/9/15
<b>RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):</b>  14/500363/OUT - Outline - (Appearance, landscaping and layout reserved) residential development comprising 9no two-storey houses with access via a private drive off Fishers Road, Staplehurst - Withdrawn  MA/13/1580 - Demolition of motor vehicle body repair workshop and demolition of 2no. existing dwellings in converted farm buildings. Erection of 4no. two-bedroomed dwellings and 2no. three-bedroomed dwellings with associated garaging/parking and landscaping – Approved [this application relates to the adjacent site to the south east]		

## MAIN REPORT

### 1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 The application site is an irregularly shaped piece of rough grassland with an area of approx. 0.45ha. The site is located in the rural area, just beyond the defined village boundary to the north east of Staplehurst. The land is not the subject of any particular

designation. The public highway of Fishers Road ends at the defined village boundary and beyond that becomes a private road serving the application site (off its north west side) and the group of buildings at Fishers Farm (off its south east side). The Fishers Farm group has now become a small estate of houses following the redevelopment allowed under permission MA/13/1580. Public Right of Way (PROW) KM295 shares the line of the road before diverting off across the application site northwards to the railway line, whilst PROW KM296 leaves KM295 and continues around the north and east sides of the Fishers Farm built group.

- 1.02 The application site is bounded by the housing and gardens at the head of Fishers Road to the south west. To the west and north west is an area of grassland with trees separated from the site by a field boundary made up of an open drainage channel with a mature line of trees around it. To the north is the Staplehurst/Headcorn railway line. To the north east is a grassed paddock separated from the site by a line of mature conifers. To the east and south are the houses and gardens of the aforementioned Fishers Farm redevelopment.

## **2.0 PROPOSAL**

- 2.01 Full planning permission is sought to develop the site for 7 detached and a pair of semi-detached properties with garaging. Therefore a total of 9 houses is proposed.
- 2.02 Vehicular access would be via the existing private road off the head of the Fishers Road public highway with a new 'extension' of that access road northwards into the site to a new termination just to the south of the railway line. The houses essentially 'wrap around' the central access road and its various minor off-shoots. The site lies adjacent to the railway line and an acoustic fence (2.4m high) is proposed along the northern margins of the site as recommended by an acoustic report that has been submitted as part of the application. Hedging is proposed on either side of that fence.
- 2.03 Continuing the subject of access, the line of PROW KM295 is proposed to be amended so that it would shift eastwards to run down the length of the new access road (before crossing the railway line at its existing point). PROW KM296 would require more minor amendment but would essentially retain its current line.
- 2.04 The housing adopts a low density and generally spacious layout to reflect the village-edge location. Proposed housing is shown to be two storey and of a simple cottage style, featuring prominent gables and feature chimneys. A mix of materials is proposed: principally red stock brickwork and clay tile hanging under plain clay tile roofs. Garaging is integral for dwellings in the southern part of the site; whereas in the northern part it is detached and of a 'cart-lodge' style, either single or shared-double garages, with asymmetrical roofs. Each property would have at least two parking spaces.
- 2.05 A landscaping scheme is proposed that retains the existing main structural elements around the boundaries of the site, notably the ash and maple trees in the southern section, the stream-side trees and hedging along the western boundary and the mature leylandii hedge to the east. Ecological mitigation/enhancement works are also proposed and these are discussed in detail below.

## **3.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Development Plan: Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000: Policies ENV6, ENV26, and ENV28.

Maidstone Borough Local Plan: Submission Version:

Policy SP10: Staplehurst Rural Service Centre  
Policy H1: Housing site allocations  
Policy H1(50): Fishers Farm, Staplehurst  
Policy DM1: Principles of good design  
Policy DM2: Sustainable design  
Policy DM11: Housing Mix  
Policy DM12: Density of housing development  
Policy DM24: Sustainable transport  
Policy DM25: Public transport  
Policy DM27: Parking standards

The Staplehurst Neighbourhood Plan has not yet been examined and therefore its policies cannot be given significant weight.

#### **4.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

4.1 Before the application was amended, Staplehurst Parish Council stated:

“Councillors voted to recommend APPROVAL and do not wish the application be referred to MBC Planning Committee.”

Following the receipt of amended details:

“Councillors noted that since their previous consideration of the application in August 2015 new information had come to light, particularly comments from the Medway Internal Drainage Board about drainage issues and a residents observations and photographic evidence which had been submitted to MBC. They recommended that the site layout should be reconsidered and modified to meet the concerns of the drainage board and to take an integrated view taking into account proposed development on neighbouring sites too. They expressed concern about the impact of tree clearance on drainage, the excessive height of the 2.4 metre fencing and the flawed assessment of railway noise which did not properly consider freight trains. Councillors agreed that the information was significant enough to recommend REFUSAL of the application until such time as the listed issues were addressed. Councillors did not request the application be reported to MBC Planning Committee.”

4.2 Letters of objection have been received from 4 local residents and the following (summarised) points are made:

- a) The railway noise assessment is insufficient to base a decision on. It does not sample the noisiest rail periods. Overnight freight trains have not been properly considered, nor has the removal of vegetation and the effect that would have on acoustics.
- b) The acoustic fence would be unsightly.
- c) Surface water is prevalent here and that would have an adverse impact on the occupants of the housing. This has not been adequately considered. The ditch is at capacity and there are doubts as to how that would be treated and managed.
- d) With regard to Great Crested Newts (GCN), the survey work was incomplete in that it failed to include all of the relevant ponds. A connectivity corridor is needed in the form of an uncultivated buffer strip adjacent to the railway.

- e) Inadequate attention has been paid to the presence of bats and reptiles and there is inadequate provision for the mitigation of impact on those creatures.
- f) There should be less development so as to allow all of these issues to be resolved.
- g) The scheme would cause a loss of residential amenity with additional traffic, noise, dust, overshadowing and surface water flooding.
- h) The public footways should remain accessible.
- i) The development would affect third party land ownership and easement rights.

4.3 Letters of support have been received from 2 local residents. Comments are made that the development would enhance the area; and that the acoustic fence would mute train sound and screen the sewage works. The site is dry, even after recent rainfall.

## **5.0 CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 KCC Highways and Transportation has no objection subject to conditions to secure parking and turning and control the construction phase.

5.2 The KCC West Kent PROW Manager states:

“I confirm that I have no objection to the proposed development in principle subject to a properly made diversion Order being completed under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Although such an order would be subject to its own consultation and specifications, as a broad guideline, we would be looking for a minimum width of 2m for the diverted route and a bound, metalled surface throughout.

Notwithstanding the granting of planning permission, a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order to close the path during construction work will not be granted until the permanent diversion order has been made and confirmed and Kent County Council will take any necessary enforcement action to prevent the stopping up of, or interference with, the public footpaths prior to this.”

5.3 Natural England has no objection.

5.4 The KCC Biodiversity Officer: latest views attached as an appendix to this report.

5.5 The Upper Medway Internal Drainage Board comments:

“Please note that although the site of the above proposal is outside of the Upper Medway IDB’s district it does drain via ordinary watercourses to Houndhurst Stream (U16), which is IDB managed and maintained, and on to the River Beult. The proposal therefore has the potential to affect IDB interests.

Should the Council be minded to approve this application it is requested that details of surface water drainage be made subject of a planning condition requiring runoff to be restricted to no more than that of the pre-developed site, with on-site storage provided to accommodate the 1 in 100 year storm event +CC. Maintenance of the drainage system must also be assured for the lifetime of the development.”

5.6 MIDKENT EHSS has reviewed the application and the acoustic report submitted: there is no objection provided the recommendations of that report are followed.

5.7 The MBC Landscape Officer comments:

“I have considered the tree survey and proposed landscaping scheme and raise no objection to the proposal on arboricultural or landscape grounds, subject to conditions requiring compliance with the approved details and (an amended version of the standard) landscaping condition detailing timing of the implementation of the landscaping and replacement of failed plants within 5 years.”

Further comments were submitted recommending conditions on the size of planting, implementation and management of the landscaping.

## 6.0 APPRAISAL

### Principle of Development

#### Local Plan Policy

- 6.01 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides that all planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the Development Plan comprises the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000, and as such the starting point for consideration of the proposal is Policy ENV28 which relates to development within the open countryside. The policy states that:
- 6.02 *“In the countryside planning permission will not be given for development which harms the character and appearance of the area or the amenities of surrounding occupiers, and development will be confined to:*
- (1) that which is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture and forestry; or*
- (2) the winning of minerals; or*
- (3) open air recreation and ancillary buildings providing operational uses only; or*
- (4) the provision of public or institutional uses for which a rural location is justified; or*
- (5) such other exceptions as indicated by policies elsewhere in this plan.”*
- 6.03 In this case, none of the exceptions against the general policy of restraint apply, and therefore the proposal represents a departure from the Development Plan. It then falls to be considered firstly whether there are any material considerations which indicate that a decision not in accordance with the Development Plan is justified in the circumstances of this case, and (if so) secondly whether a grant of planning permission would result in unacceptable harm, such that notwithstanding any material justification for a decision contrary to the Development Plan, the proposal is unacceptable.
- 6.04 The key material consideration outside of the Development Plan in the determination of applications for residential development in the open countryside is national planning policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF) and the Council’s position in respect of a five year housing land supply.

#### Five year housing land supply

- 6.05 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a key consideration, particularly with regard to housing land supply. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that Councils should;

*“identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirements with an*

*additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land;”*

- 6.06 The Council has undertaken a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which was completed in January 2014. This work was commissioned jointly with Ashford and Tonbridge and Malling Borough Councils. A key purpose of the SHMA is to quantify how many new homes are needed in the borough for the 20 year period of the emerging Local Plan (2011 -31). The SHMA (January 2014) found that there is the objectively assessed need (OAN) for some 19, 600 additional new homes over this period which was agreed by Cabinet in January 2014. Following the publication of updated population projections by the Office of National Statistics in May, the three authorities commissioned an addendum to the SHMA. The outcome of this focused update, dated August 2014, is a refined objectively assessed need figure of 18,600 dwellings. This revised figure was agreed by Cabinet in September 2014. Since that date revised household projection figures have been published by the Government and as a result the SHMA has been re-assessed. At the meeting of the Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transport Committee on 9 June 2015, Councillors agreed a new OAN figure of 18,560 dwellings.
- 6.07 The new Local Plan has advanced and was submitted to the Secretary of State for examination on the 20 May 2016. Examination is expected to follow in September. The Plan allocates housing sites considered to be in the most appropriate locations for the Borough to meet the OAN figure and allows the Council to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.
- 6.08 The yearly housing land supply monitoring carried out at 1 April 2016 calculated the supply of housing, assessed extant permissions, took account of existing under delivery and the expected delivery of housing. A 5% reduction from current housing supply was applied to account for permissions which expire without implementation. In conformity with the NPPF paragraph 47, a 5% buffer was applied to the OAN. The monitoring demonstrates the Council has a 5.12 year supply of housing assessed against the OAN of 18,560 dwellings.
- 6.09 The new Local Plan has been submitted and is considered to attract significant weight: it allocates this land for housing as part of a much larger allocation.

#### Sustainable development

- 6.10 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that the “...presumption is favour of sustainable development...should be seen as a golden thread running through...decision making”.
- 6.11 The application site is located adjacent to an existing settlement boundary and there is good access to the basic services and public transport opportunities available within Staplehurst village. Staplehurst is considered as a rural service centre under Policy SP10 within the Draft Local Plan; and considered a sustainable location for significant new housing allocations, of which the application site forms (a very small) part. Development such as this would lead to an increase in population that would help to support village services and facilities. The policy allows for new housing on allocated sites. The policy is yet to be adopted; however it is considered that the site meets sustainability credentials.

- 6.12 Paragraph 55 of the NPPF states: “To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.” Although outside the settlement boundary, the scheme adjoins it and due to the numerous houses and buildings close by it is not considered that the proposed dwellings would be ‘isolated’ as defined by Paragraph 55 of the NPPF.

Draft housing allocation

- 6.13 Policy H1(50) of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan: Submission Version seeks to allocate the application site for residential development. The application site forms a very small part of the much larger Fishers Farm allocation. The policy is yet to be adopted but carries significant weight; therefore consideration of the policy in respect to the application is appropriate.
- 6.14 This is a small site at the northern extremity of the allocation that is somewhat distinct from the much larger blocks of land to the east and south that form the vast majority of the overall allocation. This small parcel of land is effectively separated from the remainder of the allocation by the physical barriers formed by the existing Fishers Farm buildings and the strong leylandii hedge on the eastern boundary. The only connection being the link to the east provided by PROW KM296. The application is, in practice, a separate physical entity to those blocks of land to the east which are the subject of major applications as yet undetermined. This, together with the fact that the size of development proposed here means that it does not qualify for the normal range of infrastructure and community facility requirements faced by major developments, leads me to conclude that it is not appropriate to rigidly apply all of the criteria in H1(50). Those more strategic policy requirements are being addressed in those other applications. Having said that it is my view that the development proposed here does broadly comply with the density, design and landscaping requirements referred to in the policy.
- 6.15 It is considered that the development of the site for housing would represent a sustainable form of development and in principle the scheme would be acceptable subject to an assessment of whether the impacts of development would demonstrably outweigh the benefits in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. Further consideration in this respect is discussed below.

**Visual Impact (including landscaping)**

- 6.16 The site is outside a settlement boundary and as such is defined as being within the countryside. Guidance and Development Plan policy generally seek to protect the character of the countryside. Policy ENV28 of the Local plan states: *‘In the countryside planning permission will not be given for development which harms the character and appearance of the area.’*
- 6.17 The development would effectively represent an extension of Staplehurst Village; however, as referred to above, this is a somewhat self-contained parcel of land with a strong physical barrier to the north provided by the railway line. In these circumstances I consider that harm from long and medium range views of the development would be very limited.
- 6.18 Short range views are much more available from the railway line and the PROWS that cross the site. However, if housing is acceptable on this site, I consider that the

low density put forward here to be appropriate to this edge of settlement location and I consider the layout, design and materials to be appropriate.

- 6.19 In terms of landscaping, the site is currently a rather uninspiring piece of managed grassland that has no landscape merit other than its vegetated boundaries. Landscaped boundary features are to be retained as a part of the scheme and the interior is to be landscaped with hedging and new tree and shrub planting. A 5 metre wide landscape buffer is to be put in place at the northern boundary of the site with the railway. I note that the Landscape Officer has no objection and I agree that there is no reason to object here on landscaping grounds.
- 6.20 In all, clearly the negative impacts of new residential development need to be balanced against the emerging housing allocation and the need to boost housing land supply. In summary, whilst the loss of open green space is always regrettable, in this case I do not consider this to be so significant as to withhold permission.

### **Residential Amenity**

- 6.21 The design and layout proposed here is such that there would be no significant impact on neighbouring residential property in terms of loss of light, outlook and privacy. I do not believe that noise and disturbance from vehicular and pedestrian 'comings and goings' would be harmful to amenity. Given the layout, the occupants of the prospective dwellings should enjoy at least a reasonable standard of amenity.
- 6.22 In terms of rail noise, an acoustic report has been submitted with the application that has been examined and found to be satisfactory by the Environmental Health Officer. That report recommends the erection of an acoustic fence on the northern edge of the development and acoustic glazing to the houses nearest the railway line. One objector is critical of the adequacy of the acoustic report but there is no firm evidence to consider it so. I have no doubt that prospective occupants of the housing (particularly at the northern end of the site) would endure some disturbance in house and garden from railway noise but I do not consider this would be so bad as to withhold permission.

### **Highways and PROWs**

- 6.23 The Highways Officer raises no objection and I agree that access, parking and turning arrangements are such that there is no justifiable reason to object. The layout shows at least 2 parking spaces per dwelling which is appropriate for this locality.
- 6.24 The PROWs that cross the site would need some minor realignment but, having sought the advice of the KCC West Kent PROW Manager, I am satisfied that the new routes would not be significantly less attractive, safe or convenient. Obviously the diversions would need to go through the separate legal process of diversion.

### **Surface Water Drainage**

- 6.25 The Parish Council and local residents are concerned on this issue but this site is not within the significant flood zones (2 and 3) designated by the Environment Agency. I note the presence of the open ditch along the western boundary of the site and the intention to discharge surface water (via a controlling system) into that drain: the presence of such a feature is not unusual and its use would not necessarily lead to flooding given proper management. I note the concerns raised but there is no objection from The Upper Medway Internal Drainage Board and I am satisfied that



this matter can be dealt with by way of a condition requiring details of the proposed methodology for dealing with surface water drainage.

### **Ecology**

- 6.26 This issue has been the subject of significant discussion between the applicant's agents and the KCC Biodiversity Officer including a meeting on site to examine the situation 'on the ground'. In her initial comments the Biodiversity Officer expressed concerns as to adequacy of the survey work for Great Crested Newts (GCN) and the interpretation of it; including concern that it was not intended to apply for a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence (EPSML). The site does not provide optimal habitat but GCN had been recorded in ponds to the west and east of the site and the Biodiversity Officer is of the view that GCN would be likely to be crossing the site between the water bodies: with that in mind the development, including the intention to discharge surface water to the drain, would require an EPSML. She also expressed a concern that mitigation was inadequate for GCN and reptiles; that the impact on bats had not been properly addressed; and that the scheme displayed poor connectivity between habitats to east and west.
- 6.27 After various meetings and discussions the plans were amended and new reports submitted to overcome these concerns. The plans now show various mitigation measures and ecological enhancement works: the principal features of which are a 5m wide wildlife corridor at the northern extremity of the site (including a hibernaculum) to supplement the existing undeveloped land to the side of the railway line so as to provide a connectivity corridor across the northern part of the land. Further connectivity would be provided by wildlife culverts under the access road/footpath and 'animal access points' around the site to allow access across fences/plot boundaries. Bird boxes and bat ridge tiles are shown on each of the plots. The landscaping proposals described above provide further enhancement for wildlife.
- 6.28 The latest comments of the Biodiversity Officer are copied in full at the appendix to this report. Clearly there is still some difference of opinion here on the interpretation of the GCN survey results and she expresses concern that there is ambiguity as to the intention to apply for an EPSML. I have since taken this up with the agents who have written to confirm that an EPSML will be applied for. Aside from the EPSML issue, the Biodiversity Officer considers the corridor and the other connectivity measures to be acceptable; and endorses the bat/bird box and landscaping enhancement measures. Whilst there have been differences of opinion on the approach taken, I am now of the view that the submitted reports and mitigation/enhancement works are such that there should now be no objection raised on the issue of ecology.

## **7.0 CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 The proposed development does not conform with Policy ENV28 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000; however, it does form part of a wider housing allocation in the emerging Local Plan and this should be given significant weight. The development is at a sustainable location, and is not considered to result in significant planning harm. Due to the low adverse impacts of the development it is considered that there are sufficient grounds to depart from the adopted Local Plan as it would represent a sustainable form of development and be in accordance with the NPPF.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to the following conditions:**

- (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission;

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- (2) Prior to the development reaching damp proof course level details of all external materials (including wearing surfaces for the roads, turning and parking areas), shall have been submitted in writing for the approval of the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

- (3) The approved details of the parking/turning areas shall be completed before the commencement of the use of the land or buildings hereby permitted and shall thereafter be kept available for such use. No development, whether permitted by The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order, with or without modification) or vehicular access to them;

Reason: Development without adequate parking/turning provision is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and in the interests of road safety.

- (4) Before development commences, full details of all proposed measures to safeguard the well-being of Great Crested Newts and other protected species during the construction phase; and full details (including the timing of implementation and future management) of all ecological mitigation/enhancement works shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. These measures/works shall be based on the proposals shown on approved drawing Ecology J received 18/3/16;

Reason: To protect and enhance existing species and habitat on the site in the future and to ensure that the enhancement methods can be successfully implemented prior, during or post development. This information is required prior to commencement as any site works have the potential to harm any protected species that may be present.

- (5) Prior to the development reaching damp proof course level, full details of the proposed external lighting and the methods to prevent light spillage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

Reason: In the interests of ecology and to prevent light pollution.

- (6) Prior to development commencing the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- details of facilities, by which vehicles will have their wheels, chassis and bodywork effectively cleaned and washed free of mud and similar substances at the application site. The approved facilities shall then be provided prior to the works commencing on site and thereafter shall be maintained in an effective working condition and used before vehicles exit the site and enter onto the adopted highway for the duration of the construction works.
- details of construction vehicle loading/unloading and turning facilities.

- details of parking facilities for site personnel and visitors during construction phase.

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained for the duration of the construction works;

Reason: To ensure that no mud or other material is taken from the site on to the neighbouring highway by wheels of vehicles leaving the site to the detriment of highway safety and the amenities of local residents and to ensure that adequate space is available on site to ensure construction phase can be carried out without a detrimental impact on highway safety and local amenities. This information is required prior to commencement as any works may result in the nuisance that this condition seeks to prevent.

- (7) The houses on Plots 6, 7 and 8 shall not be occupied until the acoustic attenuation measures (including the erection of the acoustic fence) described within the submitted Railway Noise Impact Assessment and approved drawings have been fully implemented;

Reason: In order to ensure that the occupants of the housing enjoy a reasonable standard of amenity.

- (8) Development shall not begin until a sustainable surface water drainage scheme, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water strategy should be compliant with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage (March 2015). The strategy should also include details for the provision of long term maintenance of all surface water drainage infrastructure on the site.

The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed;

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage and disposal of surface water from the site. This information is required prior to commencement as any construction work may restrict the extent of a drainage scheme.

- (9) Prior to the development reaching damp proof course level, a scheme of hard and soft landscaping, using indigenous species which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development and a programme for the approved scheme's implementation and long term management shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be designed using the principles established in the Council's adopted Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Guidelines and shall include full details of proposed means of surfacing and boundary treatments. Notwithstanding the notation on the submitted drawings, the requirement for the size of new trees shall be nursery standard size, 8-10cm girth, 2.7-3m high;

Reason: No such details have been submitted.

- (10) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be

replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory setting and external appearance to the development.

- (11) Prior to the development reaching damp proof course level, details of how decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources of energy will be incorporated into the development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be maintained thereafter;

Reason: To ensure an energy efficient form of development.

- (12) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing numbers:

15/10/02, 04A, 06, 08 received 23/7/15

15/10/03B, 09E, 10B, received 14/10/15

Landscape J received 11/3/16

15/10/05E and Ecology J received 18/3/16

Reason: To clarify which plans have been approved.

Case Officer: Geoff Brown

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.