

ITEM NO:	<u>Location:</u>	Node Park, Hitchin, Codicote
12	<u>Applicant:</u>	Rowan Homes Ltd
	<u>Proposal:</u>	Demolition of partially constructed dwelling and associated garage and erection of 2 dwellings with associated access, parking, gardens and partial rebuilding of existing garden wall (as amended by drawings received 20th November 2017).
	<u>Ref. No:</u>	17/02025/1
	<u>Officer:</u>	Kate Poyser

Date of expiry of statutory period:

2 October 2017.

Reason for Delay

Delayed due to negotiations and committee cycle, but an extension of time has been agreed until 19th January.

Reason for Referral to Committee

The proposal is for residential development on an application site exceeding 0.5 hectares.

1.0 Relevant History

1.1 12/01189/1 and 13/01992/1 have granted planning permission for the conversion of the main house known as the Node and stable block to residential apartments, the construction of three detached houses and other work.

12/01223/1 and 12/01224/1LB planning permission and Listed Building Consent granted for the construction of 1 detached house following demolition of existing buildings and restoration of Grade II listed Peach House.

13/02021/1 planning permission granted for the construction of one detached house following demolition of existing buildings and pursuant to the restoration of Grade II Listed Peach House.

13/02022/1LB Listed Building consent granted for the restoration of Grade II Listed Peach House.

16/03173 and 16/03174/1LB withdrawn applications for demolition of partially constructed dwelling, garage and existing apple store. Erection of 2 x 4 bedroom detached dwellings with detached double garages, separate accesses, landscaping and partial rebuilding of existing garden wall.

17/01171/1PRE pre-application advice given for the demolition of partially built single dwelling, demolition of apple store and the erection of 2 x detached dwellings with garages, together with restoration of Grade II Listed Peach House.

2.0 Policies

2.1 North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No.2 with Alterations

- Policy 2 – Green Belt
- Policy 26 – Housing proposals
- Policy 30 – Replacement or extension of dwellings in the countryside
- Policy 55 – car parking standards
- Policy 57 – Residential guidelines and standards

2.2 National Planning Policy Framework

- Achieving sustainable development
- Core planning principles
- Section 4 – Promoting sustainable transport
- Section 6 – Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- Section 7 – Requiring good design
- Section 9 – Protecting Green Belt land
- Section 11 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- Section 12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

2.3 North Hertfordshire Draft Local Plan 2011-2031 'Preferred Options Consultation Paper' and Proposals Map

The North Hertfordshire Draft Local Plan 2011-2031 has been submitted to the Secretary of State for examination and the EiP is underway. The Policies of the submission Local Plan therefore carry limited weight at this stage however, the policies are to be afforded increased weight and consideration at each stage of the process up until full adoption. The policies of relevance in this instance are as follows:

- Policy SP5 – Countryside and Green Belt
- Policy T1 – Assessment of transport matters
- Policy T2 – Parking
- Policy D1 - Sustainable design
- Policy D2 - House extensions, replacement dwellings and outbuildings
- Policy D3 – Protecting living conditions
- Policy HE1 – Designated heritage assets

3.0 Representations

- 3.1 Hertfordshire Highway Authority – raise no objections, subject to the following condition “*Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted full details (in the form of scaled plans and written specifications) shall be submitted to illustrate the following, the details of which will need to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority: • Swept path analysis to demonstrate that the largest anticipated vehicles to access the properties are able to turn around and egress the site in forward gear. • Passing bay / point for vehicles half way along the proposed driveway on the north-east side.*”
- 3.2 Historic England – does not wish to offer any comments.
- 3.3 Conservation Officer – was involved in giving pre-application advice. He advises that the apple store is not of sufficient significance to merit retention. Suggestions are made to improve the architectural details and garage layout of Plot 4. Overall, no objections are raised and conditions are suggested.
- 3.4 Landscape Officer – “My main concern is to ensure that the new planting and hard landscaping proposed enhances the parkland setting and that future management retains its character.” It is suggested that the garage on Plot 4 is rotated to avoid the sight of cars parking outside the curtilage wall.

- 3.5 Planning Policy – no comments received.
- 3.6 Environmental Health (contamination) – recommends a full land contamination planning condition. An EV recharging infrastructure condition is also recommended.
- 3.7 Hertfordshire Ecology - recommends that a decision should not be made until a bat survey report is submitted with regard to the apple store; that the restoration of the orchard and consideration of the species-rich grassland is properly considered, which can be achieved as part of a landscaping condition.
- 3.8 Waste management – suggests a condition requiring details of the circulation route for refuse collection vehicles.
- 3.9 Hertfordshire Gardens Trust – welcome the demolition of the partially built house and reinstatement of the garden wall, but have some reservations. Concern is expressed should the land east of the wall be cultivated as garden, as it would detract from the orchard land and listed Peach House. Concern is specifically raised to the house on Plot 4 – “... sited in a very prominent part of its plot and will thus detract not only from the historic landscape and the Peach House, but from the small scale farm or stockyard to its southwest. and the line of house, wall and double garage doors would cause an unacceptable degree of harm to the significance of these. We would suggest that the house is sited further back on its plot and the garage resited so the doors are not in such a prominent position.” It is suggested that the apple store is retained and further orchard trees planted, as the Node is one of the historic orchards included in the Hertfordshire Orchards Initiative. They consider that two houses cause far more harm to the site than one, regardless of size and that, if permission is granted, permitted development rights should be removed.
- 3.10 Codicote Parish Council – make observations. Require conditions for the following: remove permitted development rights; to limit domestic clutter to preserve the parkland character; requiring restoration of Peach House; for the repair of the access road; to replant felled trees. They are also saddened at the loss of the apple store.
- 3.11 Local Residents – 3 letters of objection have been received and 1 in support. The objections are from the occupiers of Japanese Garden, Peach House and Randalls and can be viewed on the Council’s website. However, they can be summarised as follows:
- Plot 4 is not in keeping with or sympathetic to the character of the walled garden and the setting of the listed building – the building should be relocated further back.
 - Loss of the apple store;
 - Disrepair of the garden wall and apples store are due to the owner’s neglect;
 - Impact on tree root protection zone unnecessary as access road could be relocated.
 - The orchard should be replanted;
 - The curtilage of Plot 5 should not extend to east of the garden wall;
 - No special circumstances to justify the development in the Green Belt;
 - Unsustainable development;
 - Windows in the garden wall should be reduced in width;
 - Concern at damage to access road by construction traffic.

The occupier of Bradley Springs supports the proposal, but makes suggestions relating to widening the access road or providing passing bays; moving garage to Plot 4 further from boundary and prefers hedge to fence along the boundary.

4.0 Planning Considerations

4.1 Site & Surroundings

- 4.1.1 The application site forms part of the wider parkland setting of the Node and was originally the walled kitchen garden and orchard serving the Node, but is now largely unused. Although it was built as a large residential property in single occupation, the Node was subsequently converted into a hotel and training/conference centre and more recently into residential apartments. There are also several detached houses within the Node park, 3 of which have been built within the last 4 years.
- 4.1.2 The site is 2.7 hectares in area and is mostly grassland, with some trees. The original 3.4 metres high garden wall runs north-south through the site, with a gap where it has fallen down. A large round house, granted planning permission in 2012/13, is partly built and has remained incomplete for sometime. A glass peach house occupies the centre of the site and is a grade II listed building. It has been in a state of disrepair for sometime, but the applicant is currently repairing it under an earlier listed building consent.
- 4.1.3 The site lies within the Green Belt and is located off the B656 Hitchin Road between Langley and Codicote. A gated access road leads into the Node park from the B656 and to where the site occupies the northwest corner of the park. Barns belonging to “Bradley Springs” lies to the south, a residential property called “Peach House” to the east and “Japanese Garden” is to the northeast.

4.2 Proposal

- 4.2.1 The proposal is to demolish the partly built round house and replace it with a smaller dwelling (Plot 5), repairing and using the garden wall as the east façade. Also to demolish an apple store and provide a second, small one and a half storey house (Plot 4) adjacent to the barns at “Bradley Spring”. An existing access road winds through the Node and a new access drive is proposed that would serve the two dwellings. The curtilage of Plot 4 would be defined by a 2.1 meter high brick wall and 1.8 metre high close boarded fence. The remainder and much larger part of the site would form the curtilage of Plot 5, which includes the glass peach house.
- 4.2.2 The applicant’s justification for allowing the development within the Green Belt is that the two new dwellings would have a smaller footprint and volume than the existing buildings to be demolished, namely the round house and apple store. As such they would not have a materially greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the current situation. An Ecology Report, Design and Access Statement, Tree Survey, Planning Statement and Heritage Statement have been submitted as part of the application.

4.3 Key Issues

- 4.3.1 The key planning considerations relate to:
- The principle of the development in the Green Belt and its effect upon the openness of the Green Belt;
 - Sustainability;
 - Effect upon heritage assets;
 - Effect upon neighbouring residential amenity;
 - Highway considerations;
 - Impact on the natural environment;

4.3.2 Principle of the development in the Green Belt

National Green Belt Policy in the NPPF and supported by policies in the DLPNo.2 and emerging local plan, advise that the construction of new buildings is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Inappropriate development, by definition is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. There are exceptions to this listed in paragraph 89 of the NPPF. One such exception is "*the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.*" This is supported by policies 30 of NHDLPNo.2 and D2 of the emerging local plan. Planning case law has established at appeal that this can be interpreted to mean more than one building. It is, therefore, relevant to consider whether the proposed two new houses would be materially larger or have a materially greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the round house and apple store.

4.3.3 The partially built Round House has the main framework of the building constructed, including the roof, but is lacking most of the walls. Under planning law, the work has commenced and could be completed at any time. I believe it was due to financial reasons that prevented completion by the previous owner. The combined volume of the Round House, its garage and the apple store would be 1.977 cu metres. The combined volume of the proposed two new houses and their garages would be 1,525 cu metres. This would be a 23% reduction in volume.

4.3.4 Plot 5 is the larger of the two proposed houses. It would be mostly single storey with just the lounge at first floor level. The house incorporates the existing garden wall that runs through the site, as its east elevation, repairing the wall where it has collapsed. I consider this house would have relatively little impact on the appearance of the site, as seen from the access road and certainly less impact than the approved Round House.

4.3.5 Plot 4 is a 3 bedroom, one and a half storey building designed in a similar architectural style to a traditional gatehouse. This is the smaller of the two proposed dwellings. It would have a footprint of 82 sq metres, 3.6 metres to the eaves and 8 metres to the ridge. However, I consider this would be the more visible of the two buildings due to its forward position on the site. It would be approximately 60 metres into the site, from the existing access road. Its front elevation would run parallel with the gable end elevations of the 'U-shaped' barns at Bradley Springs. The proposed double garage and 2.1 metre high brick wall would continue the line of the front elevation.

4.3.6 Negotiations have taken place in an attempt to reduce the visual impact of this dwelling, by pushing it back towards the east by a few metres and to locate the garage doors within the site to avoid cars parked in front being visible beyond the curtilage of the site. The applicant has considered this matter and feels that this would create an awkward parking arrangement within the site to the detriment of the future occupiers' residential amenity. However, overall, as the application stands, I feel it would be difficult to demonstrate that the proposed scheme would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the current situation. **For this reason, I consider the development could be justified as being an exception to Green Belt policy, as not been materially larger or having a materially greater impact on the Green Belt than the existing buildings.**

4.3.7 Sustainability and heritage assets

The Node is located in the countryside, between the villages of Codicote and Langley with no significant services or facilities or employment within walking distance of the proposed houses. The applicant accepts that the occupiers of the two houses would heavily rely upon the private car to access day to day services and facilities. The site is not in a sustainable location.

- 4.3.8 There is, however, a balance of consideration relevant here. The Node has been used as a hotel, training and conference centre before its conversion into residential apartments, which would have generated a considerable amount of car trips. The Node site, used for residential purposes, as existing and proposed, would generate fewer vehicular trips/miles than the hotel/training use, and is therefore less environmentally unsustainable than the former use. This, however, is part of the wider site history and has limited significance today.
- 4.3.9 The balance of consideration perhaps lies more with the benefits to the heritage assets of the site. Currently, the original garden wall is in a state of partial collapse and without repair this state of dilapidation will continue. The outstanding planning permission for the Round House has been unsuccessful in achieving the repair, due to financial circumstances. The implementation of the proposed Plot 5 would include the repair of the wall and would likely ensure its continued maintenance.
- 4.3.10 The current applicant is repairing the listed glass peach house, which is possibly the only peach house in the country. This is near to completion. The applicant presents this as part of the balance of considerations in support of the scheme. It could be argued that as the glass peach house is being repaired now, it is not necessary to grant permission for the scheme to ensure it is repaired. However, it needs a use to ensure it remains in good repair for the future and this scheme is far more likely to provide that than the current situation.
- 4.3.11 Following on from the original use of this land as the kitchen garden and orchard, there are still some orchard trees here and there is an initiative to preserve historic orchards nationally and locally by the UK traditional Orchards Habitat Action Plan and Hertfordshire Orchards Initiative. There are also some large mature trees including Oak, turkey Oak, Horse Chestnut and Sycamore. Whilst the occupier of 'Japanese Garden' and the Hertfordshire Gardens Trust have raised concerns about the impact of the development on this land and trees, which I shall consider later, also relevant is the greater likelihood of the trees being maintained by a private residential occupier, with appropriate planning conditions, against the current situation of neglect.
- 4.3.12 There is to take into account, as mentioned earlier, the existing approved volume of building on site against the reduced volume proposed by this scheme. **Overall, I consider the likely benefits of the scheme to balance out the disbenefits of unsustainable development.**
- 4.3.13 Heritage Assets
Hertfordshire Gardens Trust have reservations about the proposed development. They welcome the demolition of the round house and re-instatement of the garden wall, but are concerned about the inclusion of the historic orchard ground east of the wall being included within the grounds of the Plot 5. This is due to any inappropriately fenced, hedged and cultivated garden that may detract from the listed glass peach house. It is noted that Historic England raise no objections. Whilst the Node was originally in a parkland setting, this part of the estate was historically a cultivated kitchen garden. There is no designation on the former kitchen garden or orchard to specifically protect it – i.e. it is not listed as a Historic Park or Garden and the trees do not have a Tree Preservation Order. There is currently nothing to prevent the removal of trees or cultivation of the land. The Local Planning Authority could, however, ensure the maintenance of the site, by appropriately worded conditions necessary to a planning permission, such as requiring a landscape maintenance plan to be approved and implemented. Whilst the proposed development may have some impact on the character of this part of the park it can also help preserve what is left. Although it could be argued that the

land is in its current condition due to neglect by previous owners, in practical terms, land and buildings need to have a strong sense of ownership to be maintained, which it currently does not have. There is a balance between the harm and improvement the scheme would bring to this land. Overall, I consider the development would provide a slightly greater advantage to the character and appearance of the site, subject to conditions for its maintenance and the removal of permitted development rights.

4.3.14 Residential amenity

The residential property known as “Peach House” (not to be confused with the glass peach house) lies to the east of the site. Between the two lies a strip of land containing a cess pit and underground reservoir, which appears as grassed over with trees. The proposed house on Plot 4 would be 100 metres away and Plot 5, 150 metres away. The new access drive would be 75 metres away. Due to these distances, I consider the proposed development would not have a significant effect on the living conditions of “Peach House”.

4.3.15 “Bradley Springs” would be 70 metres from Plot 4 with agricultural barns lying between the two. Plot 5 would be 105 metres away. I consider the distance is such that the development would not have a significant effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers. “The Japanese House” lies to the north of the site and would be even further away than “Peach House”. The development would not have a significant effect on the living conditions of this property either.

4.3.16 Highway considerations

Access to the site would be via an existing private and gated access road leading off the B656. A new driveway from the access road is proposed to serve the two dwellings. The scheme would meet the current car parking standards. The Highway Authority raises no objections to the proposal, subject to a condition which is copied into paragraph 3.1 above. There is a requirement for a passing-bay midway along the access drive. However, I am concerned that no more hard surfaces should be provided than necessary, as it would be contrary to the verdant character of the site. With just two houses here, I do not consider a passing-bay essential. It would be possible to overrun the grass on the rare occasions two vehicles need to pass. For this reason the recommendation does not include this request.

4.3.17 Impact on natural environment

Hertfordshire Ecology has been consulted. A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment was requested for the apple store, which has been carried out. A survey of the apple store and nearby trees show no evidence of bats being found, internally or externally.

4.3.18 the application makes reference to species-rich grassland in the centre of the site and a smaller patch within the curtilage of Plot 4. The submitted Arboricultural Report recommends that the historic orchard would require specialist work to renovate it and preserve it for the future. I consider that the species-rich grassland and historic orchard contribute to the character of the site and the wider Node parkland. As the preservation of these are desirable and form part of the balance of planning considerations for the development, I consider it appropriate to request further information and a maintenance program to be submitted for approval by condition.

4.3.19 Some concern has been expressed about the size of the curtilage to Plot 5, particularly that it would include land to the east of the wall, in which the glass peach house sits. The applicant has expressed an unwillingness to redraw the residential curtilage of Plot 5. The main concern with a curtilage of this size relates to residential paraphernalia associated with a garden, which would have an adverse effect on the character of this site. However, there is a 'trade-off' between adverse changes that a garden use may bring to the site and the desirability to have an owner willing to incur the cost of maintaining the trees and species-rich grassland, which contribute to its character. Appropriate conditions can help to achieve a good balance between the two. These should include the removal of permitted development rights for hard surfaces, buildings and other structures and the requirement for a landscape improvement and maintenance plan.

4.3.20 Other matters

Successful negotiations have taken place to achieve amendments to architectural details of Plot 4 and the reduction of the width of the windows in the garden wall of Plot 5.

4.3.21 Concern has been expressed by Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, the Parish Council and some residents to the loss of the apple store. However, the Conservation Officer has inspected the building and considers it to have no historic or architectural merit and was probably built in the latter half of the twentieth century. I can, therefore, see no objections to its loss.

4.4 Conclusion

4.4.1 On balance, the proposed development would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and whilst environmentally unsustainable, the balance of planning considerations would be in favour of granting planning permission, subject to the conditions below.

5.0 Legal Implications

5.1 In making decisions on applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning legislation, the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of the development plan and to any other material considerations. The decision must be in accordance with the plan unless the material considerations indicate otherwise. Where the decision is to refuse or restrictive conditions are attached, the applicant has a right of appeal against the decision.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply 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. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the details specified in the application and supporting approved documents and plans listed above.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with details which form the basis of this grant of permission.

3. Details and/or samples of materials, including brick bond and mortar mix, to be used on all external elevations and the roof of the development and boundary walls, hereby permitted, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced and the approved details shall be implemented on site.

Reason: To ensure that the development will have an acceptable appearance which does not detract from the appearance and character of the surrounding area.

4. Before any development commences on site, a Landscape Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include:

- (a) details of how the land east of the original garden wall shall be managed, including a timescale which will last in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority;**
- (b) an Ecological Schedule of Works;**
- (c) the maintenance and re-instatement of the orchard;**
- (d) how the Species Rich Grassland will be maintained and enhanced.**

Reason: In the interest of preserving the setting of the listed glass peach house, maintaining and improving the historic orchard; the ecological value of the site and the overall appearance of the completed development of the site.

5. The approved details of landscaping shall be carried out before the end of the first planting season following either the first occupation of any of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced during the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority agrees in writing to vary or dispense with this requirement.

Reason: To safeguard and enhance the appearance of the completed development and the visual amenity of the locality.

6. The approved details of landscaping shall be carried out before the end of the first planting season following either the first occupation of any of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced during the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority agrees in writing to vary or dispense with this requirement.

Reason: To safeguard and enhance the appearance of the completed development and the visual amenity of the locality.

7. None of the trees to be retained on the application site shall be felled, lopped, topped, uprooted, removed or otherwise destroyed or killed without the prior written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard and enhance the appearance of the completed development and the visual amenity of the locality.

8. Before the commencement of any other works on the site, trees to be retained shall be protected by the erection of temporary chestnut paling or chain link fencing of a minimum height of 1.2 metres on a scaffolding framework, located at the appropriate minimum distance from the tree trunk in accordance with Section 4.6 of BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations, unless in any particular case the Local Planning Authority agrees to dispense with this requirement. The fencing shall be maintained intact for the duration of all engineering and building works. No building materials shall be stacked or mixed within 10 metres of the tree. No fires shall be lit where flames could extend to within 5 metres of the foliage, and no notices shall be attached to trees.

Reason: To prevent damage to or destruction of trees to be retained on the site in the interests of the appearance of the completed development and the visual amenity of the locality.

9. A sample of the plain, bullnose, bonnet and decorative ridge tiles for the roof of the dwellinghouse at Plot 4 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the completed scheme and the setting of the listed glass peach house.

10. All new windows pursuant to the dwellinghouse at Plot 4 shall be constructed in timber, externally white finished and shall incorporate flush casements unless otherwise agreed and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Furthermore, the glazing system and profile of the glazing bars for these new windows shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of that part of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the completed scheme and the setting of the listed glass peach house.

11. A sample of the reconstituted stone for cills and heads to the window/door openings at Plot 4 and for the coping detail to boundary walls, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of that part of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the completed scheme and the setting of the listed glass peach house.

12. Details of the rainwater goods for the dwellinghouse and garage at Plot 4 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of that part of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the completed scheme and the setting of the listed glass peach house.

13. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 as amended no development as set out in Classes A - H of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Order, (or any subsequent Statutory Instrument which revokes, amends and/or replaces those provisions) shall be carried out without first obtaining a specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Given the nature of this development, the Local Planning Authority considers that development which would normally be "permitted development" should be retained within planning control in the interests of the character and amenities of the area.

14.

- (a) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to the submission to, and agreement of the Local Planning Authority of a written preliminary environmental risk assessment (Phase I) report containing a Conceptual Site Model that indicates sources, pathways and receptors. It should identify the current and past land uses of this site (and adjacent sites) with view to determining the presence of contamination likely to be harmful to human health and the built and natural environment.
- (b) If the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the report which discharges condition (a), above, indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination then no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:

 - (i) A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;
 - (ii) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology
- (c) No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report; if required as a result of (b), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- (d) This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:

 - (i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (c) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.
 - (ii) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.
- (e) Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of condition (a) and (b), encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority as soon as practically possible; a scheme to render this contamination harmless shall be submitted to and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority and subsequently fully implemented prior to the occupation of this site.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination affecting the site is dealt with in a manner that safeguards human health, the built and natural environment and controlled waters.

15. Prior to occupation, each residential property shall incorporate an Electric Vehicle (EV) ready domestic charging point.

Reason: To contribute to the objective of providing a sustainable transport network and to provide the necessary infrastructure to help off-set the adverse impact of the operational phase of the development on local air quality.

16. No development shall commence on site until the existing partially built dwelling and apple store have been demolished.

Reason: In the interest of maintaining the openness of the Green Belt.

INFORMATIVES

1) EV Charging Point Specification:

Each charging point shall be installed by an appropriately certified electrician/electrical contractor in accordance with the following specification. The necessary certification of electrical installation should be submitted as evidence of appropriate installation to meet the requirements of Part P of the most current Building Regulations.

Cable and circuitry ratings should be of adequate size to ensure a minimum continuous current demand for the vehicle of 16A and a maximum demand of 32A (which is recommended for Eco developments)

- A separate dedicated circuit protected by an RBCO should be provided from the main distribution board, to a suitably enclosed termination point within a garage or an accessible enclosed termination point for future connection to an external charge point.
- The electrical circuit shall comply with the Electrical requirements of BS7671: 2008 as well as conform to the IET code of practice on Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment installation 2012 ISBN 978-1-84919-515-7 (PDF).
- If installed in a garage all conductive surfaces should be protected by supplementary protective equipotential bonding. For vehicle connecting points installed such that the vehicle can only be charged within the building, e.g. in a garage with a (non-extended) tethered lead, the PME earth may be used. For external installations the risk assessment outlined in the IET code of practice must be adopted, and may require additional earth stake or mat for the EV charging circuit. This should be installed as part of the EV ready installation to avoid significant on cost later.

Proactive Statement

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted proactively through positive engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage and during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted proactively 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.