

ITEM NO:

Location: **Blackett Ord Court
Stamford Avenue
Royston
Hertfordshire
SG8 7EB**

Applicant: **Mr Steve Hogben**

Proposal: **Extension to an existing sheltered housing/retirement
apartment block and construction of a new sheltered
housing/retirement apartment block to provide a total
of 17 number new apartments.**

Ref. No: 19/00950/FP

Officer: **Richard Tiffin**

Date of expiry of statutory period: 23.07.2019

Reason for referral to Committee

Cllr Green called the application as she considers that there would too many apartments for the site and this would exacerbate problems with car parking.

1.0 Relevant History

- 1.1 An application similar to this was submitted in 2018 under ref 18/01026/FP. This specified 18 new apartments as an extension to the existing Blackett Ord Court retirement/sheltered housing establishment. Following advice from officers around scale and impact on neighbours this scheme was withdrawn.
- 1.2 A second scheme was submitted and further amended during consideration by officers. This scheme has been subject to two rounds of neighbour and Town Council consultations. These are set out below.

2.2 **Highway Authority -**

2.3 **Environmental Health (noise and contamination) -** No objection subject to an informative regarding noise during construction.

2.4 **Archaeology -** No objection

2.5 **Local Lead Flood Authority-** No objection subject to conditions

2.6 **Environment Agency –** No objection subject to conditions

2.7 **Anglian Water –** No objection subject to informative

2.8 **Affinity Water –** No objection

2.9 **Local Residents (1st and second consultation) –** The occupiers of properties in the vicinity of the development have raised the following concerns by way of objection:

- Complete overdevelopment of the site
- Poor design adverse impact on street scene, particularly at 3 storey element fronting Mill Road.
- Adverse impact on street parking as this is permit controlled already.
- Increase congestion in the street.
- Loss of trees and historic wall fronting Mill Road
- Overlooking
- Loss of natural light to 15 Stamford Avenue and 45 Mill Road
- Concerns over construction disturbance

2.10 **Herts Ecology –** No objection subject to informative

3.0 **Planning Considerations**

3.1 **Site & Surroundings**

3.1.1 The application site is currently occupied by the existing sheltered housing scheme known as Blackett Ord Court. The proposed site is approximately 0.9 acres / 0.38ha and extends from Stamford Avenue to Mill Road. The site is currently occupied by a Retirement/Sheltered Housing Scheme containing 22 flats and operated by the provider Housing & Care 21.

3.2 **Proposal**

3.2.1 The application proposes two new blocks of accommodation. A two storey block fronting Stamford Avenue (Block B) would provide 2 x 1bed and 4 x 2 bed units making total **of 6** new units. A 3 storey block fronting Mill Road (Block A) would provide 3 x 1 bed and 8 x 2 bed units making a **total of 11** new units. Of these 17 new units 11 would be let at affordable rents and the remaining 6 would be shared ownership.

3.2.2 Block A is specified as a 2.5 storey structure fronting Mill Road employing the use of a crown roof to reduce the impact of a full three storey design. Within the site, and in particular adjacent to the garden boundary with 45 Mill Road, the design specifies a two storey element immediately opposite the garden boundary of 45 to reduce impact. A flat roof is specified to link this element to a partial three storey element along the western elevation. Windows in this two storey element are angled away from No 45 and high level lights are specified to avoid overlooking. The building is specified in a buff brick with slate roof to reflect the Victorian terraces in Mill Road. The existing old boundary wall to Mill Road is proposed to be replaced with a new retaining wall with native hedging atop.

3.2.3 Block B is specified at two storey only and is conventionally designed with a pitched roof. This element is set back from the boundary with No 15 Stamford Avenue and there are no first floor windows on the elevation facing this property. Block B would extend rearward of No 15 Stamford Avenue by some 9m set in from the boundary by 5m. Landscaping is specified in this space.

3.2.4 Car parking provision is set out below:

<u>Existing units</u>	<u>Spaces</u>	
22	9	
 <u>Proposed units</u>	 <u>Spaces</u>	
17	17	
 Total units	 Total spaces	 Space to unit ratio
39	26	0.66

3.3 **Key Issues**

3.3.1 The key issues in considering this amended scheme centre on the following:

- Principle of development
- Impact on reasonable living conditions of neighbours
- Design and street scene
- Parking provision, highway safety and convenience.
- Planning balance.
- Other matters

Principle of development

- 3.3.2 In terms of principle, the application site lies within the urban boundary of Royston and as such Saved Policy 8 (Development in Towns) of the adopted Local Plan and Policy SP2 (Settlement Hierarchy) of the emerging local plan (ELP) allow for general development subject to compliance with other relevant policies, supplementary guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 3.3.3 At the time of writing this report the ELP is well advanced. Accordingly, and given this advanced status, significant weight can be attributed to the ELP in determining planning applications. This acknowledged, the Council can not currently demonstrate a five year supply of housing land and this being the case the provisions of paragraph 11 of the NPPF require that permission be granted unless the harm of doing so would **significantly and demonstrably** outweigh the benefits of development. This tilted balance must be applied in the planning balance when assessing the relative weight of harm and benefit (see below).

Impact on the reasonable living condition of neighbours

- 3.3.4 One of the key concerns in this case is the impact the proposal would have on the reasonable living condition of neighbouring residential properties. A development of this scale has the potential to occasion harm in terms of the restriction of natural light, both direct (sun path) and indirect (skylight). Further, the scale of the proposal has the potential to dominate adjoining properties such that neighbouring residents may feel oppressed or dominated by the scale of development on their boundary. Further, the ill considered placement of windows may give rise to overlooking. These are matters which need to be carefully evaluated. Other issues such as the adequacy of car parking and the impact the design might have in the street scene generally, may also adversely affect living conditions. However, these issues are considered separately below.
- 3.3.5 In terms of daylight and sunlight, the applicant was asked to commission a study based on the BRE industry recognised publication *Daylight and Sunlight a Guide to Good Practice (Littlefair, P 1991)*. The applicant commissioned a study using this guidance in respect of the original application (withdrawn). As this withdrawn scheme was greater in scale than that now being considered it is reasonable to assume that the results of the study would still be valid for the truncated proposal (on a worst case basis). The study considered daylight and sunlight at the following neighbouring properties:

41 Mill Road
45-51 Mill Road
44-46 Mill Road
48 Mill Road
10 Stamford Avenue
12 Stamford Avenue
12a Stamford Avenue
15 Stamford Avenue
27-31 Stamford Avenue
68 Queens Road
70 Queens Road

72 Queens Road
74 Queens Road
95 Queens Road

- 3.3.6 The study is comprehensive and concludes that the originally submitted scheme would not occasion a material degradation in either daylight or sunlight levels. Given that the scheme now before the Council is substantially smaller than that tested, I have no concerns that the amended proposal would occasion a material loss of daylight or sunlight to adjacent residential properties as defined by the BRE guidance.
- 3.3.7 The application proposal would introduce additional built mass into the rear aspect of both 15 Stamford Avenue and 45 Mill Road. Both properties have been visited and the proposals assessed from the rear gardens with the occupiers present. In terms of 45 Mill Road, the presence of the proposed two storey element of Block B would be some 8m from the boundary with the three storey element some 14m to 16m distant. The architect has re-designed the block such that the two storey element of the scheme would not present first floor windows overlooking the rear garden of the No 45. This is achieved by specifying angled windows with high level openings only facing the adjacent property. The presence of some mature boundary landscaping would also assist in reducing overall impact. In my view this renders the impact on No 45 acceptable in terms of perceived dominance and overlooking. The three storey element of the building which fronts Mill Road itself, while level with the No 45, would intrude somewhat into the aspect of that property by the specification of a second floor side window in the crown roof. The architect has been asked to amend this detail (remove the window) and this being the case I can see no material grounds for objection in relation to No 45.
- 3.3.8 In terms of the impact of the scheme (Block B) on 15 Stamford Avenue, the revised scheme is much improved over the original submission in that its depth has been reduced and it contains no first floor windows facing that dwelling. The removal of an entire block from the original scheme and its replacement with a car park, would act to retain the current open feel of the land which runs along the boundary with No 15. The specification of mature trees in the gap between Block B and No 15 would assist further in softening the impact of the new building. However, following discussions with the occupier of No 15 it is clear that what they value most is light. In this regard, I am of the view that two of the three specified trees can be omitted in favour of just one substantial tree at the northern end of the block.
- 3.3.9 Overall I am of the view that, subject to the agreed minor changes, the re-designed scheme would not adversely impact on the reasonable living conditions of either No 45 Mill Lane or No 15 Stamford Avenue.

Design and Street Scene

- 3.3.10 There are two principal street scene elevations associated with this proposal – that fronting Mill Road and that addressing Stamford Avenue. In the terms of the latter, the proposed two storey design would not in my view strike a discordant note. The scale of the proposal is not out of kilter with the domestic scale of existing buildings. Moreover, the varied nature of the Stamford Avenue street scene allows for a wider range of building styles and the proposal's well mannered proportions and the specification of vernacular materials would sit comfortably within this range of aesthetic tolerance in my view.

- 3.3.11 This concluded, I consider the range of acceptable design solutions to be narrower in Mill Road. I reach this conclusion because the Mill Road street scene in the area of the application site is less varied, comprised as it is of modest Victorian terraces and buildings of a similar scale and type. This said, it is not a wholly homogenous street scene and some interpretation is possible in my view without compromising sense of place. The proposal fronting Mill Road is three storey and while this scale of building is somewhat at variance with existing properties, especially the adjacent terrace of modest Victorian dwellings, the specified slate crown roof and the considered specification of window form does act to link new with old in my opinion. Eaves heights between the existing terrace commencing No 45 and the proposed building are broadly similar and this equivalence, coupled with the pastiche design approach, renders the proposal acceptable in the wider street scene in my estimation.
- 3.3.12 The Mill Road frontage at the application site is currently defined by a wall of some age behind which a small but prominent area of self sown trees undoubtedly adds something to the general quality of the street scene. The implementation of the proposal would involve the loss of both wall and the self set area beyond. In its place the scheme specifies a new wall, hedge and the planting of a specimen tree to compensate for the loss of exiting established landscaping. While the replacement landscaping would in no way compensate for the loss of the existing vegetation I am of the view that the proposal would retain a sufficiently verdant frontage in what is clearly an urban street scene. This acknowledged I would recommend a condition requiring further landscaping detail such that would enhance that specified in the application and better address the issues raised above in relation to boundary treatments adjacent No 45 Mill Road and 15 Stamford Avenue. In summary and subject to such a condition I conclude that the amended scheme is now acceptable in design terms and will deliver

Parking provision, highway safety and convenience.

- 3.3.13 The submitted transport statement accurately summarises the Council's parking SPD requirement as follows:

Provision for 39 retirement units at 1 space per unit = 39 spaces
Provision for visitors at 0.25 spaces per unit = 10 spaces

TOTAL: 49 spaces

The revised scheme proposes an additional 17 spaces to current provision making a total of 26 spaces overall, somewhat short of the number required by the standard. This said the SPD qualifies this requirement by advising that a reduction may be possible:

(For the above two standards reduction considered where)

- 1. Alternative publicly available off-street parking is available within 2 minutes walk of site***
- 2. Where visitor parking arising from small scale (i.e. infill) development can be accommodated on street without compromising highway safety, the amenity of existing residents or the ability for businesses to operate.***
- 3. Relevant evidence is submitted by the applicant that supports a reduction in standard which considers existing and future car ownership and likely visitor demand).***

3.3.14 In this case the applicant has commissioned a transport assessment. This assessment acknowledges the shortfall against the standard:

“It is apparent, therefore that the proposed level of overall provision (26 spaces) would be below the level required by the standards. However, it should be noted that this level of provision would provide a parking space: residential unit ratio of 0.66 spaces per unit, compared to the existing situation whereby there are 0.4 spaces: unit. Furthermore, in terms of the additional development proposed, this will be provided with the equivalent of 1 space per unit. 2 of the spaces will be allocated for people with disabilities and 1 an electric car charging point. Nonetheless, as summarised in Section 3 of this report, at Page 17 of the District Council’s Parking SPD it is noted that a reduction in provision would be considered in situations where, among others:

Alternative publicly available off-street parking is available within 2 minutes’ walk of the site;

Relevant evidence is submitted by the applicant that supports a reduction in standard which considers existing and future car ownership and likely visitor demand.

It is therefore appropriate to assess the location of the site and the current demand for parking, when considering the suitability of the site and proposed car parking provision to serve the additional accommodation.”

3.3.15 The applicant operates a similar facility at another site in Cornwall and they site this by way of comparison with the post – development situation here:

“As stated above, a study of a similar type of senior living accommodation operated by the applicant, Housing & Care 21, at Trennick Villas in Cornwall, determined that for a development of 26 ‘assisted living’ units, equivalent to that available and proposed at Blakett-Ord Court, served by a 12-space car park, the maximum demand in that car park was 9 cars between 07:00 – 10:00 and thereafter demand peaked at 8 cars at noon and thereafter trailed off to only 2 cars by late afternoon before increasing again to 8 cars overnight. On this basis, the maximum demand for parking was only some 0.35 spaces per unit.”

On this issue, in a recently determined appeal for retirement living accommodation in Mill Road, Royston the inspector accept the applicant’s expert analysis on car parking demand and provision:

“The development would provide 20 parking spaces within the site, which would fail to comply with the requirements of the North Hertfordshire District Council Vehicle Parking at New Development Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (the SPD) which requires a minimum of “1 space per dwelling” to be provided. The appellant, however, is an experienced provider of retirement accommodation and within its Transport Statement (TS), sought to demonstrate that such accommodation generates an average parking demand of some 0.28 spaces per residential unit. Thus, as the development would provide some 0.49 spaces per unit, there wouldn’t be a requirement to provide one space per unit as it would not generate a demand for such levels of parking provision.”

3.3.16 Notwithstanding the assurance of the applicant's comparison site in Cornwall, the transport assessment addresses the requirement of the Council's parking SPD:

“Nonetheless, and with due regards to, for example, the supporting notes in the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan 1996 which state that a reduction in provision would be considered in situations where, among others:

Alternative publicly available off-street parking is available within 2 minutes' walk of the site;

Relevant evidence is submitted by the applicant that supports a reduction in standard which considers existing and future car ownership and likely visitor demand.

It is determined that the current parking demand by local residents within a 2-minute walking distance of the site leaves capacity for at least a further 40 cars to be legally parked on-street within the area. The evidence provided by the operator as set out above concludes that the proposed on-site provision is totally appropriate to cater for the forecast use, but any additional demand from, for example, family visitors, can easily, legally and appropriately be accommodated on-street nearby without any highway safety issues arising. On this basis, the proposed on-site car parking is forecast to be totally adequate to accommodate the general needs of the over Blackett-Ord Court site, and any additional parking occasionally required can legally and safely be accommodated on-street without affecting the amenities of local residents.”

3.3.17 I have no reason to doubt this analysis and it is at least clear that the ratio of accommodation to car parking would increase post development over that currently available. Moreover, I am mindful of the NPPF advice at paragraph 109:

“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.”

While some residents who have objected may take issue with the applicant's assessment of the amount of publicly available parking locally, there is clearly on-road parking available in the vicinity. Further, this is a reasonably well located site in terms of access to facilities, including the town centre and the railway station. Moreover, it is clear that the demand for car parking is undoubtedly much lower than would be for a conventional housing scheme and in this regard the proposal is specified on the basis of one car parking space per every additional unit of accommodation. In the round therefore and in light of the evidence available, I can see little basis for concluding that the proposal would be likely to exacerbate highway problems in the area to such a degree as to warrant a refusal of planning permission. A condition should be imposed which requires the submission of travel plan which is available for inspection on request by the Planning Authority once approved. This plan should be monitored and updated by the operator of the scheme going forward.

Planning Balance

- 3.3.18 The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land and in these circumstance permission should be granted unless the harm of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development.
- 3.3.19 This scheme would provide 17 units of needs housing in a sustainable location. The type of housing being proposed would cater of older people at a time we know the population generally to ageing. This type of accommodation is likely free up dwellings which could then become available for younger families. These are social and economic benefits of some significance in the planning balance.
- 3.3.20 The scheme would underprovide car parking against standard. However, the available evidence suggests that this under-provision would be unlikely to occasion significant environmental harm. The scheme would also introduce building mass and form into the aspects of adjacent properties and occasion the loss of self sown areas fronting both Mill Road and Stamford Avenue. This accepted, I am now satisfied that re-designed scheme has acceptably addressed these concerns and would occasion little or no material harm.
- 3.3.21 In sum therefore, I am of the view that the changes to this scheme have moved it to a point whereby the harm would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of approval.

Other Matters

- 3.3.22 The Council's ecological advisor....
- 3.3.23 The proposal is for 17 additional units. This exceeds the threshold for affordable housing in the ELP but below the threshold in the Saved Local Plan. This said, the proposal represents an extension to an existing affordable sheltered housing scheme and would provide 11 affordable rented units and 6 units for shared ownership. In the circumstance no affordable housing requirement exists to be secure by legal agreement.
- 3.3.24 The Highway Authority has asked for a contribution of £36k toward sustainable transport (bus stops and pedestrian crossings). This would secured by unilateral undertaking.

4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 That permission be granted subject to conditions

4.2 Alternative Options

None applicable

4.3 Pre-Commencement Conditions

I can confirm that the applicant is in agreement with the pre-commencement conditions that are proposed.

4.4 **Environmental Implications**

- 4.5 The proposal would not have any adverse environmental impacts such that would warrant that permission be refused.

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 and receipt of a satisfactory unilateral undertaking such that will deliver sustainable transport measures.

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. The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Drainage Statement carried out by GH Bullard and Associates LLP reference 264/2017/DS Rev P dated April 2019, submitted and the following mitigation measures:

1. Limiting the surface water run-off generated by the 1 in 100 year + climate change critical storm so that it will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site and not increase the risk of flooding off-site.
2. Undertaking appropriate drainage strategy based on infiltration or attenuation and discharge into Anglian surface water sewer restricted at 8l/s for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.
3. Undertake the drainage to include permeable paving as indicated on drawing 264/2017/01 P3.

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site.

4. No development shall take place until the final design of the drainage scheme is completed and sent to the LPA for approval. The surface water drainage system will be based on the submitted Drainage Statement carried out by GH Bullard and Associates LLP reference 264/2017/DS Rev P dated April 2019

1. Undertaking appropriate drainage strategy based on infiltration or attenuation and discharge into Anglian surface water sewer restricted at 8l/s for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.

2. Full detailed engineering drawings of all SuDS features including cross and long sections, location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features. This should be supported by a clearly labelled drainage layout plan showing pipe networks. The plan should show any pipe 'node numbers' that have been referred to in network calculations and it should also show invert and cover levels of manholes.

3. All calculations/modelling and drain down times for all storage features.

4. Details regarding any areas of informal flooding (events those exceeding 1 in 30 year rainfall event), this should be shown on a plan with estimated extents and depths.

5. Details of final exceedance routes, including those for an event which exceeds to 1:100 + cc rainfall event.

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site.

5. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until a remediation strategy that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority:

1. A Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) including a Conceptual Site Model (CSM) of the site indicating potential sources, pathways and receptors, including those off site.

2. The results of a site investigation based on (1) and a detailed risk assessment, including a revised CSM.
3. Based on the risk assessment in (2) an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken. The strategy shall include a plan providing details of how the remediation works shall be judged to be complete and arrangements for contingency actions. The plan shall also detail a long term monitoring and maintenance plan as necessary.
4. No occupation of any part of the permitted development shall take place until a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the remediation strategy in (3). The long term monitoring and maintenance plan in (3) shall be updated and be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3).

6. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3).

7. Development shall not begin until a scheme for surface water disposal has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Infiltration systems shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approval details.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3).

8. Piling or any other foundation designs and investigation boreholes using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3).

9. Prior to the first occupation of the residential units hereby approved, details of a scheme Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be operated in accordance with the approved Travel Plan in perpetuity and shall be made available for inspection in the future by the local planning authority upon receipt of a written request to do so.

Reason: To ensure the scheme is operated in accordance with an agreed travel plan in the interests of promoting sustainable travel.

10. Notwithstanding the information submitted, full details of landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to works commencing to implement this permission. The landscaping details shall include:

Details of all hard landscape surfaces
Details of all new trees and shrubs including species, size and planting densities
Details of all trees and shrubs to be removed
Landscape maintenance arrangements

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the completed scheme

11. 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.

12. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations specified in the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated Jan 2018 and carried out by MKA Ecology except recommendation 9 (badgers).

Reason: To protect and enhance site ecology

13. The affordable housing element of the scheme hereby approved shall remain as defined by the NPPF (as amended) in perpetuity

Reason: To retain housing stock as affordable as promoted by the Emerging Local Plan and the NPPF.

Proactive Statement:

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted proactively through positive engagement with the applicant 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 (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Informative/s:

Desktop analysis has suggested that the proposed development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. We therefore highly recommend that you engage with Anglian Water at your earliest convenience to develop in consultation with us a feasible drainage strategy.

If you have not done so already, we recommend that you submit a Pre-planning enquiry with our Pre-Development team. This can be completed online at our website <http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/pre-development.aspx> Once submitted, we will work with you in developing a feasible mitigation solution.

If a foul or surface water condition is applied by the Local Planning Authority to the Decision Notice, we will require a copy of the following information prior to recommending discharging the condition:

Foul water:

Feasible drainage strategy agreed with Anglian Water detailing the discharge solution including:

Development size

Proposed discharge rate (Should you require a pumped connection, please note that our minimum pumped discharge rate is 3.8l/s)

Connecting manhole discharge location (No connections can be made into a public rising main)

Notification of intention to connect to the public sewer under S106 of the Water Industry Act (More information can be found on our website)

Feasible mitigation strategy in agreement with Anglian Water (if required)

Surface water:

Feasible drainage strategy agreed with Anglian Water detailing the discharge solution, including:

Development hectare size

Proposed discharge rate (Our minimum discharge rate is 5l/s. The applicant can verify the site's existing 1 in 1

year greenfield run off rate on the following HR Wallingford website -

<http://www.uksuds.com/drainage-calculationtools/>

greenfield-runoff-rate-estimation. For Brownfield sites being demolished, the site should be treated as

Greenfield. Where this is not practical Anglian Water would assess the roof area of the former development site

and subject to capacity, permit the 1 in 1 year calculated rate)

Connecting manhole discharge location

Sufficient evidence to prove that all surface water disposal routes have been explored as detailed in the surface

water hierarchy, stipulated in Building Regulations Part H (Our Surface Water Policy can be found on our website)

Planning

Ecology

Any vegetation clearance or removal/repositioning of nest boxes, should be undertaken outside the nesting bird season (March to August inclusive) to protect breeding birds, their nests, eggs and young. If this is not practicable, a search of the area should be made no more than two days in advance of vegetation clearance by a competent Ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest.

It is an offence to take or disturb the breeding or resting location of protected species, which include: all Bats, Badger, Otter, Hazel dormouse, Water vole, Reptiles (Common lizard, Slow-worm, Grass snake), Great crested newt, wild birds and Roman snail. Precautionary measures should be taken to avoid harm where appropriate. If protected species, or evidence of them, is discovered during the course of any development, works should stop immediately and advice sought as to how to proceed. This may be obtained from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England.

In the event of bats or evidence of them being found, work must stop immediately and advice taken on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England. Any external lighting scheme should be designed to minimise light spill, in particular directing light away from the boundary vegetation to ensure dark corridors remain for use by wildlife as well as directing lighting away from potential roost / nesting sites.