

Item No. 11

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/15/02657/FULL
LOCATION	Bridge Farm, Ivel Road, Shefford, SG17 5LB
PROPOSAL	Development to construct 49 no. dwellings, together with ancillary car parking, landscaping, and associated highway, access and infrastructure works. (Revised application to CB/14/03159/FULL)
PARISH	Shefford
WARD	Shefford
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs Birt & Brown
CASE OFFICER	Samantha Boyd
DATE REGISTERED	15 July 2015
EXPIRY DATE	14 October 2015
APPLICANT	Bovis Homes
AGENT	Optimis Consulting
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Major Development - Contrary to Policy
RECOMMENDED DECISION	To grant Full planning permission subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement securing Affordable Housing provision and other relevant contributions, and upon the expiry of the advertisement in the local press.

Reason for recommendation:

The proposed 49 dwellings is contrary to Policy MA6 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document, as the proposal would not provide employment uses on an allocated employment site. However the applicant has demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of the employment site being used for such purposes therefore an alternative use needs to be considered. The proposal would provide additional houses which would benefit the Councils 5 year housing supply and these benefits are considered to add significant weight in favour of the development and therefore the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of highway safety and neighbouring amenity and therefore accords with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document(2009)

Site Location:

The Bridge Farm site is located on the southern edge of Shefford. It lies to the north of the A507 and to the east of Ivel Road.

The site forms one part of a larger site allocated for mixed use development for residential and employment. The employment area forms the southern half of the site with the residential area to the north which is currently under construction and partly occupied.

To the west of the site is Ivel Road, one of the main routes into Shefford. On the opposite side of Ivel Road there is existing residential development. The front section of the site, facing Ivel Road, has been granted outline planning permission for a Care Home and on the junction with Ivel Road and the A507 there is a petrol filling station with a small Tesco convenience store.

Immediately to the south of the site is agricultural land separating the site from the A507 which runs in an east west direction around the perimeter of Shefford. To the east of the site is further agricultural land and woodland.

The Application:

The application for 49 dwellings on 1.34ha of land to the rear part of the site (to the east).

RELEVANT POLICIES:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012)

Core Strategy and Development Management Policies - North 2009

- CS1 Development strategy
- CS2 Developer Contributions
- CS3 Healthy and Sustainable Communities
- CS5 Providing Homes
- CS7 Affordable Housing
- CS6 Delivery and Timing of Housing Provision
- CS9 Providing Jobs
- CS10 Location of Employment Sites
- CS14 High Quality Development
- DM1 Renewable Energy
- DM3 High Quality Development
- DM4 Development Within & Beyond the Settlement Envelopes
- DM10 Housing Mix

Emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire 2014

The draft Development Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State on the 24th October 2014. After initial hearing sessions in 2015 the Inspector concluded that the Council had not complied with the Duty to Cooperate. The Council has launched a judicial review against the Inspectors findings and has not withdrawn the Development Strategy. The first phase of the legal challenge took place at a hearing on 16th June 2015. This was to consider whether the court would grant the Council leave to have a Judicial Review application heard in the High Court. The Judge did not support the Council's case. On the 22nd June 2015 the Council lodged an appeal against his judgement. The status of the Development Strategy currently remains as a submitted plan that has not been withdrawn. Its policies are consistent with the NPPF. Its preparation is based on substantial evidence gathered over a number of years. It is therefore regarded by the Council as a sustainable strategy which was fit for submission to the Secretary of State. Accordingly it is

considered that the emerging policies carry weight in this assessment.

Policy 6 Employment Land

Policy 7 Employment Sites and Uses

Policy 8 Changes of Use

Policy 19 Planning Obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy

Policy 27 Parking

Policy 29 Housing Provision

Policy 38 Within and Beyond Settlement Envelopes

Policy 43 High Quality Development

Policy 44 Protection from Environmental Pollution

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Other Documents

Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (March 2014)

Relevant Planning History:

CB/12/01123/OUT Outline Application: Commercial development for B1 office floor space up to 3, 247 sq. metres after demolition of existing buildings at the site with all matters reserved. Granted 29/11/12

CB/12/01125/Full Erection of 85 dwelling with associated garaging. Granted 29/11/12

CB/14/02182/OUT Outline: Outline: Proposed mixed-use development on 1.83ha of agricultural land to provide: - up to 49 dwellings, including 17 on-site affordable housing units, together with ancillary car parking, open space and landscaping on 1.34ha; and - a care home on 0.49ha. Refused 16/10/14

Reasons for refusal -

1 The application site is allocated for employment use under Policy MA6 of the Site Allocation Development Plan Document adopted April 2011. Policy MA6 seeks to safeguard the site for employment use therefore the proposal for 49 dwellings and a Care Home would result in the loss of an safeguarded employment site which is unacceptable. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy MA6 of the Site Allocations DPD. Furthermore the proposal is within the open countryside and outside of any defined Settlement Envelope therefore the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the open countryside and no material planning considerations would outweigh this harm. The proposal is therefore also contrary to Policy DM4 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2009.

2. The proposed development would result in an unacceptable impact on school places for the existing and proposed residents of Shefford, as well as school places

in the surrounding villages. As a result the proposal would be unsustainable and contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), particularly paragraph 72, and policy CS3 (Healthy and Sustainable Communities) of the Core Strategy and Development Management policies (2009).

3. In the absence of an agreement securing the provision of affordable housing and financial contributions, the development would fail to mitigate its impact on existing local infrastructure and would be contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policies CS2 (Developer Contributions) and CS7 (Affordable Housing) of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies.

4. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that appropriate access for refuse vehicles and collection arrangements can be provided within the site which would result in a detrimental impact on highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (2009).

CB/14/02182/OUT

Outline: Erection of Care Home and ancillary works: Granted April 2014.

CB/14/03159/Full

Full: 49 Dwellings including 17 Affordable Housing units together with ancillary car parking, open space, landscaping, highways works and access. Refused 18/11/14

Reasons for refusal:

1. The application site is allocated for employment use under Policy MA6 of the Site Allocation Development Plan Document adopted April 2011. Policy MA6 seeks to safeguard the site for employment use therefore the proposal for 49 dwellings would result in the loss of an safeguarded employment site which is unacceptable. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy MA6 of the Site Allocations DPD. Furthermore the proposal is within the open countryside and outside of any defined Settlement Envelope therefore the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the open countryside and no material planning considerations would outweigh this harm. The proposal is therefore also contrary to Policy DM4 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2009.

2. The proposed development would result in an unacceptable impact on school places for the existing and

proposed residents of Shefford, as well as school places in the surrounding villages. As a result the proposal would be unsustainable and contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), particularly paragraph 72, and policy CS3 (Healthy and Sustainable Communities) of the Core Strategy and Development Management policies (2009).

3. In the absence of an agreement securing the provision of affordable housing and financial contributions, the development would fail to mitigate its impact on existing local infrastructure and would be contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policies CS2 (Developer Contributions) and CS7 (Affordable Housing) of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies.

Consultees:

Shefford Town Council No comments received at time of preparing committee report

Other Representations:

1. Neighbours No comments received at time of preparing committee report
2. CBC Highways Whilst I have not had an opportunity to look at the proposals in detail I can confirm that there is no fundamental highway objection to the principle of residential development on this site previously allocated for employment uses.

The site is accessed from the recently constructed estate road and the volume of traffic can be accommodated on the existing highway network and the expectation is that the site layout will be compliant with the latest design guide requirements as far as highway elements are concerned.

However, key to the acceptability of the site for residential development and to safely accommodate pedestrian movement to the site is the provision of a controlled crossing of Shefford Road between the Churchill Way roundabout and the A507 south of the site. I would expect the crossing, and any footway linking the facility to the site to be secured by condition and implemented under a s278 agreement and be available for use prior to occupation of any new dwelling.

I will respond fully with recommended conditions and advice notes in due course

3. CBC LDF Team The principle of development on this site is already

established by the fact it has been allocated for mixed use. Therefore there can be no policy level debate about possible harm to the openness of the countryside.

It should be noted that the Policy Team originally objected to residential development on this site. However, since that time the planning policy context has changed. At the time of writing (31/07/15), the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing, and therefore policies with respect to the supply of housing (including Settlement Envelopes) are deemed out of date as per paragraph 49 of the NPPF. The Council's need for sustainable housing sites is therefore a fundamental factor which should not be overlooked when determining applications for residential development.

4. CBC Housing Strategy	Support this application as it provides for 17 affordable homes which reflects the current affordable housing policy requirement of 35%. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) indicates a required tenure split for sites meeting the affordable threshold as being 63% affordable rent and 37% intermediate tenure. From this proposed scheme that would make a requirement of 11 affordable rent units and 6 intermediate tenure units. The units should be well dispersed throughout the site and integrated with the market housing to promote community cohesion & tenure blindness and should meet all HCA Design and Quality Standards.
5. CBC Education Officer	The development will place pressure on the existing lower school places. Land secured from the Land at Campton Road Development would enable expansion of the school and would provide the additional places required.
6. CBC Tree and Landscape Officer	No comments received at time of preparing committee report
7. CBC Open Space Officer	No comments received at time of preparing committee report
8. Anglian Water	No comments received at time of preparing committee report
9. Internal Drainage Board	No comments received at time of preparing committee report
10 Public Protection (Noise)	No comments received at time of preparing committee report
11. Public Protection (Contamination)	No comments received at time of preparing committee report
12 CBC Waste Officer	If the shared surface is to be adopted it needs to be built

to adoptable standards in order to allow access for a 26 tonne refuse vehicle

Plots 1-4 with the communal bin store, the store is situated in a location that exceeds the maximum pull distance we can permit. The store will need to be moved to be within 10 metres pull distance from the store to the middle of the highway in order to permit collections.

BCP2,3,4 need to be moved to the edge of the shared surface and not set back as presently proposed

13. CBC Sustainability Officer	No comments received at time of preparing committee report
14. CBC SUDS Team	No comments received at time of preparing committee report
15. CBC Economic Development	With regard to the above after reviewing the application, I welcome the development of the care home on the site and recognise the valuable employment opportunities this will create. I would still raise concerns around the loss of employment land however, particularly given the potential loss of employment sites in the wider Stotfold development area ie the Pig Development unit. Despite our conversation regarding the marketing of the site not bringing forward a client, I remain concerned around the availability of commercial sites (particularly smaller no strategic employment sites) in the local area to meet existing local and future demand, which will increase as economic conditions continue to improve and as local population increases.
Site Notice	30/07/15
Application Advertised	07/08/15 (Major Development and Departure from Local Plan)

Determining Issues:

1. The principle of the development
2. The effect upon the character and appearance of the area
3. Affect on neighbouring amenity
4. Any other issues

Considerations

1. The principle of the development

- 1.1 Policy MA6 of the Council's Site Allocations Development Plan Document (adopted April 2011) allocated 5 hectares of land at Bridge Farm Shefford for a minimum of 70 dwellings and 2 hectares of employment land to be

developed for uses compatible with the neighbouring residential area.

- 1.2 In November 2012 the northern parcel of the site was granted planning permission for 85 residential dwellings, garages and associated works under reference number CB/12/01125/Full. The residential development is under construction and partly occupied.
- 1.3 Outline consent has also been granted for 1.82 hectares of commercial B1 Office space, approved under reference number CB/12/01123/OUT in November 2012 for the southern section of the site, part of which is the subject of this application. The Section 106 agreement for application CB/12/01123/OUT required a three year marketing strategy in order to bring forward occupiers for the site, the three years expiring in November 2015.
- 1.4 In 2014 a further application was submitted in outline for a proposal for 49 dwellings and a 60 bed Care Home. This application was refused on 16 October 2014 for the reasons set out above.
- 1.5 Two further applications were subsequently submitted; an outline application submitted for the Care Home (granted outline planning permission by the Development Management Committee on 24 April 2015) and a separate Full application for 49 dwellings under reference number CB/14/03159/Full (refused in November 2014 for the reasons set out above).
- 1.6 Similar to the previous applications for residential use, the proposal as set out does not offer any employment generation on land which has been allocated for employment uses, as such the proposal is contrary to Policy MA6 of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document Adopted April 2011. Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise and would outweigh the failure to accord with adopted policy.
- 1.7 Loss of employment land
The submitted marketing report advises that the employment land has been marketed for a period of over 4 years. It has been updated over the years and involved two individual agents and various marketing strategies. There has been a limited interest in the land however interested parties have not been willing to commit further.
- 1.8 The marketing information submitted by the applicant has been carefully considered and while there has been some interest in the site for employment purposes the submitted report would suggest there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for employment purposes. The marketing period required by the S106 agreement is due to lapse (November 2015) and no further positive interests in the site have materialised. It is accepted that the marketing period is not yet complete, however there are other benefits to the scheme which are outlined below.
- 1.9 Paragraph 22 of the NPPF advises that long term protection of sites allocated for employment uses where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose should be regularly reviewed and applications for alternative uses of land should be treated on their merits having regard to the

need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.

- 1.10 Further Policy 8: Change of Use, of the emerging Development Strategy supports proposals for non employment generating uses on employment land providing the site has been marketed for the employment use, where there is a local need for the proposed intended use and where there are no strong economic reasons why the proposed intended use would be inappropriate.
- 1.11 While the Council would not wish to see employment land lost, it would appear that there is no prospect of the land being used for this purpose in the future. However it should be noted that the approved care home would generate around 60 full time equivalent jobs on the remainder of the employment land which would significantly contribute towards job provision in the area and therefore an element of employment would be provided as part of MA6 site allocation. In addition, there is a demonstrable local need for additional housing and therefore the proposal accords with Policy 8 as outline above.

Sustainability of the proposal

- 1.12 In order for this development to be considered sustainable, the existing services and facilities of Shefford would need to be able to cope with the demands of the new unplanned residential development.

- 1.13 Shefford Lower School has been recently expanded to 450 places in order to cater for the expected housing growth in Shefford as a result of the allocated sites. The current population of the school catchment has therefore been planned for and adequate school place provision made. The proposed development will increase the number of children within the catchment and create a deficit of school places. This means that Shefford Lower School would need to be further expanded to cater for the additional children, or a new lower school within Shefford would need to be provided.

- 1.14 The planning application for the development of Land at Campton Road Shefford (CB/14/01726) provides land for the expansion of Shefford Lower School therefore the additional school places can be provided. However the application is awaiting a decision from the Planning Inspectorate. It is reasonable for the Council to proceed on this application based on the likelihood the appeal will be allowed, particularly as the Council did not contend the appeal. As land is provided for the expansion of the school as part of the Campton Road development it is recommended that a financial contribution is secured from this development to fund the additional school places.

- 1.15 With the additional land for the school expansion, the proposal is considered to be sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF.

Affordable housing

- 1.16 The proposal does comply with Policy CS7 (Affordable Housing) in that 35% of the residential units are to be affordable with a mix of tenures.

- 1.17 Conclusion

While the site is outside of the Settlement Envelope, where new development is restricted to protect the countryside, the provision of the employment land was considered to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the

countryside. As already stated the proposal is contrary to adopted policy however in this case there are material planning considerations which outweigh the non compliance with policy. The site has been marketed for several years and given the unlikelihood of employment development coming forward, the proposed 49 dwellings would add to the Councils 5 year housing supply which in this case is considered to a significant benefit which outweighs any harm to the character and appearance of the countryside.

- 1.18 The proposed development for housing is on land previously allocated for development, therefore taking into account the government advice in the NPPF and emerging DS Policy 8, the loss of the allocated non B uses employment generation is considered to be acceptable in principle subject the proposed intended use being compliant with all other relevant planning policies.

2. The effect upon the character and appearance of the area

- 2.1 The proposed layout of the site is dictated by its rectangular shape. The front part of the site has outline consent for a care home, but this element does not form part of this application. In general the layout of the site is similar to the adjacent Bovis Homes development and house designs take the same form.
- 2.2 The proposed house types vary from 1 bedroom apartments up to 5 bedroom dwellings across a range of tenures. The properties have garden sizes which are compliant with the Design Guide together with the relevant level of parking spaces per dwelling.
- 2.3 Access to the site would be via the existing access known as Harvest Rise, off Ivel Road.
- 2.4 Taking into account the residential development adjacent together with the site allocation and previously granted planning permission for commercial use of the site, overall the current proposal is not considered to result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It is important to note the allocated use of the site would contain built development in the form of commercial units therefore the proposal for housing is not considered to result in any greater visual harm to the area. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (2009)

3. Impact on neighbouring amenity

- 3.1 In terms of future occupiers of the proposed housing, each property is sited so as to avoid any adverse overlooking into neighbouring properties and the existing nearby dwellings opposite the access road.
- 3.2 Given the separation distance between the existing dwellings in the opposite Bovis development and those in Ivel Road, there would be no material loss of amenity in terms of loss of privacy, overbearing impact and loss of light.
- 3.3 There are to be dwellings located close to the approved care home,

particularly Plot 16 which is adjacent to the service area. Details of how the dwellings adjacent to the boundary shared with the care home are to be protected from noise should be included as a condition if permission is granted.

3.4

Overall the proposal is not considered to result in an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity.

3.5

The proposal is not considered to result in unacceptable harm to the amenities of the neighbouring properties and as such would be compliant with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009).

4. Other Considerations

4.1

Highways

The proposal will use the existing access that serves the new development already under construction. There are no objections to the use of this access. Highway Officers have confirmed that the development will be required to provide a controlled crossing on the southern side of the Ivel Road roundabout at the junction of Harvest Rise.

4.2

A financial contribution towards a raised table crossing was secured from the approved Care Home development however there is no guarantee that the care home would be implemented. Given that residential use of the site would increase the use of the crossing in this location, in this case it is appropriate to secure a signal controlled crossing on Ivel Road as part of the Section 106 Agreement.

4.3

Garage and parking provision is considered to be acceptable and complies with the Design Guide.

4.5

Archaeology

On previous applications there were no objections to the development from an archaeology point of view subject to the requirement for a Written Scheme of Investigation as a condition.

4.6

Tree and Landscape

The area to be developed is at present unused arable land. The west boundary with Bridge Farm incorporates an existing 2 metre high native hedgeline and three mature Yew trees. South boundary is again a mature maintained native hedgeline.

4.7

A Landscaping scheme would be required as a condition should the application be considered acceptable and permission granted. The southern boundary hedge should be retained if possible. These trees are to be protected throughout the development using tree protection fencing at a distance and form as indicated in BS5837 2012 Trees in relation to Design, Demolition and Construction Recommendations.

4.8

Noise

Road traffic noise is likely to be the dominant noise source with some possible noise from any development on the adjacent parcel of land to the front of the site. There are no objections to the development with regard to noise impacts, however a condition is recommended requiring the developer to set out noise attenuation measures particularly for the dwellings adjacent to the approved Care Home.

4.9 Planning Obligations

Policy CS2 (Developer Contributions) sets out that developer contributions will be expected from any development which would individually or cumulatively necessitate additional or improved infrastructure, or exacerbate an existing deficiency.

4.10 The applicant has submitted a draft S106 agreement however should the Committee be minded to approve the application a completed S106 Agreement will need to be agreed prior to the decision be issued in order secure the above contributions and the affordable housing provisions.

4.11 Human Rights/Equalities Act

Based on the information submitted there are no known issues raised in the context of the Human Rights and the Equalities Act and as such there would be no relevant implications

Recommendation:

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement and the following conditions:

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS / REASONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.

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

- 2 **No development shall take place, notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, until details of the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs of the development hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: Required prior to the commencement of the development to control the appearance of the building in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality. (Policy DM3, CSDMP)

- 3 **No development shall take place until details of the existing and final ground and slab levels of the buildings hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include sections through both the site and the**

adjoining properties, the location of which shall first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the site shall be developed in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Required prior to the commencement of the development to ensure that an acceptable relationship results between the new development and adjacent buildings and public areas. (Policy DM3 CSDMP)

- 4 Prior to the commencement of construction works a landscaping scheme to include all hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented by the end of the full planting season immediately following completion and/or first use of any building (a full planting season means the period from October to March). The trees, shrubs and grass shall subsequently be maintained for a period of five years from the date of planting and any which die or are destroyed during this period shall be replaced during the next planting season with others of a similar size and species.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable standard of landscaping in the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity in accordance with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (2009)

- 5 **No development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological investigation for an open area excavation followed by post excavation analysis and publication, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The said development shall only be implemented in full accordance with the approved archaeological scheme.**

Reason: Required prior to the commencement of the development to record and advance understanding of the heritage assets with archaeological interest which will be unavoidably affected as a consequence of the development. (Policy DM13 CSDMP)

- 6 No construction works shall begin until the applicant has submitted in writing for the approval of the local planning authority a scheme of noise attenuation measures which will ensure that internal noise levels from external road traffic noise sources shall not exceed 35dB(A)eq, 0700-2300 in any habitable room or 30dB(A)eq 2300-0700 inside any bedroom, and that external noise levels from external road traffic noise sources shall not exceed 55dB(A)eq 1hr in any outdoor amenity areas. Any works which form part of the scheme approved by the local authority shall be completed and the effectiveness of the scheme shall be demonstrated through validation noise monitoring, with the results reported to the local planning authority in writing, before any permitted dwelling is occupied, unless an alternative period is approved in writing by the authority

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants of the buildings. (Policy

DM3 CSDMP)

- 7 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbered SHEF2-02-210 rev B, SHEF2-02-215/1 A, SHEF2-02-215/2 A, SHEF2-02-220 (SHEET 1), SHEF2-02-220 (SHEET 2), SHEF2-02-220 (SHEET 3), SHEF2-02-230 B, SHEF2-02-270 A, SHEF2_02_101 B, SHEF2_02_103 A, SHEF2_02_105 A, SHEF2_02_280 A, SHEF2-02-300 E, SHEF2-02-850 A, JKK7191_FIGURE 4, SHEF2-03-100 B, SHEF2-03-081 B, SHEF2-03-101 B, 17272/SHEF/5/302, 17272/SHEF/5/501 D, HTPD_SA1000 HT S1, HTPD_S241 HT S2, HTPD_S351 HT S3 rev A, HTPD_P303 HT A, HTPD_P303 HT B, HTPD_P401 HT C (Brick) - Rev A, HTPD_P401 HT C (Render), HTPD_P402 HT D, HTPD_P403 HT E 1/2 Rev A, HTPD_P403 HT E 2/2 Rev A, HTPD_P404 01 HT F, HTPD_P404 02 HT F, HTPD_P404 03 HT F, HTPD_P502 01 HT H Rev A, HTPD_C525_HT G, SHEF2_02_AGT-1 VT Rev A (TANDEM STORE GARAGE), SHEF2_02_AGD-1 VT (DOUBLE GARAGE), SHEF2-02-260, SHEF2-02-900, SHEF2_02_BSCS Rev A (BIN STORE/CYCLE STORE), SHEF2_02_AGS2-1 VT Rev B (SINGLE GARAGE), LE1812/1300/01, Environmental Noise Assessment 15130-1 July 14, FRA Compliance Note v 1.0 Sept 14, Flood Risk and Run-off Assessment J-B0348-R03, Archaeological Evaluation Report 12/82 April 12, Archaeological Impact Assessment May 2012, `Archaeological Investigation Recording and Analysis January 2013, Geo-Environmental Investigation Report March 2012, Ecological Appraisal 2012, Bat Surveys J005527 July 2014, Construction Waste and Materials Recycling Statement, Transport Assessment J-D1719.00-R001, Statement of Community Involvement, Pre-Development Tree Survey & Arboricultural Implications Assessment, Marketing Report P364 v 3. 27 July 2015, Planning Statement, Design and Access Statement.

Reason: To identify the approved plan/s and to avoid doubt.

Notes to Applicant

1. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.
2. In accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the reason for any condition above relates to the Policies within the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (2009).
3. The applicant and the developer are advised that this permission is subject to a legal obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 5, Article 35

Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

DECISION

.....
.....
.....
.....