

PARISH Shirebrook

APPLICATION Application for permission to build 37 No. dwellings with associated parking and external works.
LOCATION Land To The North Of 76 Main Street Shirebrook
APPLICANT Bolsover District Council The Arc High Street Clowne S43 4JY
APPLICATION NO. 16/00533/FUL **FILE NO.** PP-05589064
CASE OFFICER Mr Peter Sawdon
DATE RECEIVED 28th October 2016

DELEGATED APPLICATION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY: Assistant Director of Planning
REASON: Consideration of Viability and S106 contributions

SITE

The site is an irregular shape and occupies an area of sloping land situated between Main Street, Hill Top Avenue and Summit Drive. It measures 1.4 hectares in area. The north western part of the site is elevated and relatively level, but slopes in a south easterly direction with an increasing gradient towards the SE part of the site, which is too steep to develop.

The site is within the settlement framework and is surrounded by other residential development.

The majority of the southern and eastern boundaries are marked by a dense line of mature hedgerow. The northern western edges are defined by the rear and side fences of existing residential properties adjacent to the site.

The interior is laid to grass and is generally open. An informal path crosses the eastern part of the site, following a desire line that passes between the SE corner, which is open to the street, and the end of Summit Drive.

PROPOSAL This full planning application proposes the erection of 37 dwellings that are primarily 2-storey housing, but with an accessible bungalow and four flats. The scheme is intended to provide 100% affordable housing.

AMENDMENTS

Information regarding viability and financial contributions 5/12/16;
Flood Risk Assessment and Ecology Report submitted on 05/12/16;
Revised drawings, Revised Flood Risk Assessment, Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation, Geo-Environmental Study and Site Investigation Report submitted by William Saunders Architecture on 16th December 2016;
Noise Assessment submitted on 10/01/17; and
Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation submitted on 11/01/2017

HISTORY (if relevant)

BOL/1272/1 - Outline planning permission was granted on 28th June 1073 for residential

development on a larger area of land that included the site of this current planning application.

BOL/975/345 – Outline planning permission for residential development on a larger area of land that included the site of this current planning application was granted on 3/11/75.

BOL/1275/465 – full planning permission granted for 45 houses and 32 bungalows on a larger area of land that included the site of this current planning application.

BOL/778/429 – 22 dwellings granted full planning permission. The houses are outside of the current planning application site, but the planning permission includes highways that extend into the area of the current planning application.

BOL/487/158 – Outline planning permission granted for 4 houses on the frontage to Main Street (that forms part of the larger site to which this current planning application relates)

CONSULTATIONS

NHS Hardwick Clinical Commissioning Group - £14,151 contribution to health care provision is sought. The local practice (Shires Health Care) is fully utilised and does not have sufficient spare capacity to manage increased patient demand. The practice has applied for national funding for a substantial extension, this has been approved, however funding is not available until 2017, section 106 funding would contribute to this development. 2/11/16

Derbyshire County Council (Flood Risk Management) – Holding objection pending the submission of Flood Risk Assessment and further information to demonstrate that the proposed site is able to drain and that due consideration has been given to the space required on site for surface water storage. 03/11/16. More information still required 6/12/16.

Has sufficient information, other than a management and maintenance plan – Option to submit either more details or a condition can be recommended 4/1/17. Recommended condition for maintenance and management of the drainage scheme 10/1/17

Archaeology advisor – potential for prehistoric remains and recommends a conditioned scheme of archaeological works 8/11/16; Agrees that the submitted Written Scheme of Investigation is acceptable and provides comments on condition wording 12/1/17

DCC (Highways) - A number of minor issues that need to be addressed before conditions can be provided 9/11/16 Conditions and advisory notes recommended 16/1/17

Arts Officer – Seeking a public art contribution 10/11/16

Drainage Engineer - Advice regarding management of any agreed SUDS scheme and temporary drainage arrangements during the construction period 15/11/16

Strategic Housing Officer – Fully support the provision of 37 units of affordable housing for social rent through this scheme. Raising the access standard above the mandatory level to 'Lifetime Homes' and the inclusion of a 3 bedroom wheelchair standard bungalow will ensure that the properties provide for a wide range of housing needs. 15/11/16

Derbyshire Wildlife Trust – No information included with the planning application to properly consider the impact of the development on protected species and further survey work is required. Known to be Japanese Knotweed present on the site, as well as records of bats in the wider area 21/11/16. Further comments on receipt of Ecology Survey – No objections subject to conditions and advisory notes 13/12/16

Shirebrook Town Council – No objections 29/11/16

Environmental Health Officer – No objection in principle. Recommends conditions relating to contamination investigation and, if required, mitigation, along with controls over noise protection in view of potential noise from an adjoining general store and approved hot food takeaway 30/11. Not satisfied that submitted reports have adequately fully resolved issues relating to contamination and noise impacts and recommend conditions to deal with these

25/1/17

PUBLICITY By site notice, press advert and 52 neighbour consultations. 5 letters of representation has been received raising the following issues: -

Highway Safety - Not objecting to the building of most the houses proposed in this development, but with the lack of regard to the health and safety of the existing residents of Hilltop Avenue and Summit Drive, regarding the means of access being proposed within the application, for this development. Access is unsafe. It is an established cul-de-sac that struggles to cope with existing traffic. Very narrow streets with high incidence of on-street parking with high car ownership levels, including dangerous parking around junctions that lead to this site. Young children live and play in the area – development would cause unsafe conditions. Treacherous conditions in the winter due to roads being on hills [Photographs provided]. Development should be built with its own individual access not using Hilltop Avenue. An access road could be built off of Carter Lane near to the top of Summit Hill by purchasing some of the existing car park that was once the Summit Public House or off Main Street; would be favourable/safer access points. Hill Top Avenue and Summit Drive roads are not wide enough for 2 lanes of traffic. The 5 houses built onto Summit Drive at present struggle to park due to not enough parking spaces and the width of the road. The drives to our homes are too steep to park on. On average, there are 2 cars to each home. Furthermore, Hill Top Avenue has 9 houses built which also have the same problem. When cars are parked, the road is only suitable for one lane of traffic. Both of the streets have bends in the roads which reduces the available road width to the detriment of road safety. It is impossible to have two lanes of traffic, with cars parked either side of the road without causing chaos on the roads and creates a safety hazard to the children and pedestrians.

Principle - Would destroy the character of the village. The application has to prove very special circumstances in order to be approved. Summit Field is a vital piece of greenery to the Shirebrook Community throughout the year. Dog walkers use this piece of land daily, mostly a few times a day. The children play on the field throughout the year even in the snow. The small greenery Shirebrook has left brings the community together. There is so much unused, abandoned land in Shirebrook which could be built on, creating new homes and new lives for the community. It is an inappropriate and unsympathetic design for this part of the village to the character of the local environment.

Amenity - Disturbance during construction. We believe building more houses on the greenery will demolish the peacefulness of the cul-de-sac. This will cause noise pollution and dust levels to increase rapidly at all times of the day and night. The apartment block will overlook our neighbour's property; this will lead to a loss of privacy and will certainly impact on the peaceful enjoyment of their home and garden. The estate that is in preparation of being built will be visually overbearing. 99% of the families living in these homes for many years, there is a friendly yet peaceful atmosphere throughout the cul-de-sac. We respect the homes of each other's and consider the noise levels to our neighbours. The privacy of our home may be compromised; we have a bungalow and feel that our living area which is mainly facing the rear of the property will be overlooked by the new flats/houses that are proposed. I would like to request that if the development is approved the trees, albeit small saplings at the moment remain as a green boarder to our property.

Trees - Can the trees opposite 89 Main Street be trimmed as they are dangerous and

uncomfortable for residents in view of close proximity? They block the street light and tangle with the telephone wires.

Flood Risk - Adding 37 houses to a small rural village that already suffers from flooding problems would make flooding problems severe, especially how the running water would fall straight onto our homes.

Other

Question who is responsible for the erection of the new fence to the rear of 4 Summit Drive? I choose the style of my fence to surround and contain my property; specifically that it is uniform and consistent around all three sides of my property. Strongly object to only part of fence being changed when plans show properties also to be constructed to the side of my property.

The hedgerow shown to be retained at the rear of 2 Summit Drive has already been removed and replaced with fencing that is uniform to that at the rear of 4 Summit Drive.

POLICY

Bolsover District Local Plan (BDLP) Policies

GEN1 (Minimum Requirements for Development)

GEN2 (Impact of Development on the Environment)

GEN3 (Development Affected By Adverse Environmental Impacts From Existing Or Permitted Uses)

GEN4 (Development on Contaminated Land)

GEN5 (Land Drainage)

GEN6 (Sewerage and Sewage Disposal)

GEN8 (Settlement Frameworks)

GEN17 (Public Art)

HOU2 (Location of Housing Sites)

HOU5 (Outdoor Recreation and Play Space Provision For New Housing Developments)

HOU6 (Affordable Housing)

TRA1 (Location of New Development)

TRA10 (Traffic Management)

TRA13 (Provision For Cyclists)

TRA15 (Design Of Roads and Paths To Serve New Development)

CON13 (Archaeological Sites and Ancient Monuments)

Emerging Replacement Local Plan

Although the emerging Local Plan only carries limited weight prior to publication, examination in public and subsequent adoption, it is relevant and material to the determination of this application. The site remains within settlement framework limits although it is not specifically allocated.

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 14 – advises that permission should be granted for sustainable development.

Where the development plan policies are out of date permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework.

Core principles para 17...planning should...."encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value";

"take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it;"

Paragraph 47 footnote states that "To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable."

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that "Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites."

Para' 117 "To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, planning policies Should.....promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan"

Para' 118 "When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles.....

If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;

Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged."

Other (specify)

- Supplementary Planning Document Successful Places: A Guide to Sustainable Housing Layout and Design (2013).
- A Building for Life 12 (BfL12) - The sign of a good place to live.

ASSESSMENT

The main issues associated with this proposal are the principle of the development of this site for residential purposes, the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the area, impacts on the amenities of neighbouring residents, impact on biodiversity interests and impact on public safety. Also whether the viability information submitted is sufficient to override normal requirements for S106 contributions.

Principle

Whilst noting the objections received in respect of this proposal, the site is located well within the identified settlement framework of Shirebrook in close proximity to the town centre. The site has no specific policy designation within the adopted or emerging Local Plans. This very sustainable location means that the developing of this site for residential purposes is appropriate in principle and is in general compliance with policies HOU2 (Location of Housing Sites) and TRA1 (Location of New Development) in this respect and those contained in the

NPPF. Whilst previously undeveloped, the site has a history of planning permission being granted on it dating back to 1972, but these have not been implemented.

Design

The layout is generally appropriate. The buildings are aligned to take advantage of the site contours although some cut and fill will be required together with some sections of embankment and retaining wall. This will create a series of three platforms and give an impression of the buildings stepping up the hillside. The retaining structures are significant but will be partially obscured from wider view by the intervening houses.

The Urban Design Officer is happy that for the most part the scheme is appropriately designed with appropriately discreet parking and suitable boundary treatments. Amendments have been sought in terms of improving the design of the bungalow and the location and colouring of meter boxes; this is as the meter boxes are for the most part shown on the front of the dwellings and have the potential to be a poor dominant feature in the overall appearance of the scheme, especially if coloured white. There has been a verbal undertaking that amendments for the bungalow are proposed but that there is cost implications in respect of re-locating meter boxes, such that these would be moved if practicable and cost effective, but would look to colour boxes closely to the colour of the dwellings. Formal confirmation and amendments had not been received at the time of preparing this report and an update will be provided for the Planning Committee date. A condition can be included in respect of the finishes for the meter boxes.

An opening is retained to accommodate the existing pedestrian desire line to Main Street. Additional tree planting and areas of soft landscape are indicated on the Site Plan, although detailed landscaping is not provided at this stage. Such details can be made subject to a condition. Whilst frontage boundary treatments would normally be sought, it is noted that the existing development that this site would effectively extend is of an 'open plan' style, such that the omission of boundaries to frontages would be acceptable to integrate with those adjacent streets.

The dwellings comprise red brick (two types) under concrete tiles (Grey and Peat Brown) units with contrasting fibre cement weatherboard panels which provide an element of colour. This palette of materials would be consistent with the overall characteristics of Shirebrook and the locale, whilst adding some distinguishing elements.

The proposals are generally considered to comply with the Council's published guidelines and provides for satisfactory levels of privacy and amenity for occupants of existing and the proposed dwellings with the exception of the proposed block of four flats. At a minimum of 6.5m distance, the rear amenity space to the apartment block fails to provide the normally required 10.5m separation distance between windows in the rear of those apartments and the gardens to the rear and only 19m is proposed to the nearest window in the dwellings to the rear. This is not an issue at ground floor as this is easily screened by existing boundary treatments, but is not considered to be acceptable for the proposed first floor windows, due to the harmful degree of overlooking that would occur. Side windows also have the potential to overlook, but it is stated on the plans that these would be obscure glazed. It is recommended that a condition should be included to require obscured glazing and high level window openings to secure privacy of the neighbours from overlooking from the side and rear

facing windows in the first floor flats (flats 2 and 3). Two of the windows in each flat are to dining and kitchen areas where obscured glazing would not normally be considered as ideal, but given these form part of larger open plan spaces with an additional window to the front it is considered that a reasonable level of amenity would still be provided for occupants of the flats whilst securing privacy for the existing neighbours.

A neighbour has commented regarding the detailing of any fence to the rear of 4 Summit Drive that the occupant would like to match the existing fence at that dwelling. Full details of means of enclosure are not included and it is proposed to include a condition requiring final approval of such details. However, it is not considered that consent could be withheld if the detail were not to match the writer's existing fence, as long as it were of a reasonable design. Who will be responsible for such a fence is a private property matter that is not material to the consideration of the planning application.

Highways and Transportation

The issue of traffic generation from the housing development has been raised in representations made by local residents, living close to the application site. Whilst noting these, other than requiring some minor revisions to address some issues initially raised, no objections have been made by the Highway Authority, which has recommended conditions and advisory notes.

The Highway Authority has sought conditions requiring the provision of an on-site compound, highway cleaning, compliance with the Highway Authority's guidance and a restriction on gates on individual driveways. Notwithstanding these requested conditions, highway cleanliness is covered under the Highways Act and should not be duplicated through any planning permission condition. Compliance with the Highway Authority's guidelines is a requirement of any adoption process, so this condition would be unnecessary duplication. A compound is 'permitted development' and there is not considered to be an overriding highway safety or amenity need to require this provision by condition. Additional advisory notes relating to these issues can be included. Given that there will be no control over the addition of gates to any existing nearby dwellings and no overriding need for such a control over what is otherwise a general 'permitted development' right has been provided, it is not considered that such a condition to control the installation of gates is justified or reasonably necessary.

Open Space

Policy HOU 5 states that housing developments of this scale should provide for outdoor recreation and play space, unless adequate provision already exists.

The Green Space Strategy (approved in April 2012) states in relation to Shirebrook that the central location of Shirebrook Town Park means that accessibility targets for level 2 multi-functional green space are met across the whole settlement. Accessibility to neighbourhood and local green spaces is also good with only a few residential properties outside of requisite distances. The Strategy does identify that play areas are in need of improvement to meet quality standards such that financial contributions to those areas would normally be sought. No such contributions are offered due the viability of the scheme that is discussed later in the report.

Similarly no provision is made to contribute towards sports playing pitches. Within the overall

green space provision, the Council does not currently have evidence of the need for sports playing pitches within the District. To address this, a Playing Pitches Strategy has been commissioned and is due to be published early in 2017. This Strategy will among other things identify whether the need for sports playing pitches exceeds the current provision and whether new sports pitches will be required in light of planned growth through the Local Plan for Bolsover District. In the absence of any evidence to demonstrate any need for provision, this should not be sought under the tests that should be applied to S106 contribution requests.

Affordable Housing

As a 100% affordable housing scheme, the proposal exceeds the requirements of policy HOU6 (Affordable Housing). The Strategic Housing Office has stated full support for the proposal.

Archaeology

The Archaeologist has advised the site is immediately adjacent to a possible site of prehistory activity, and the edge formed by 'The Rocks' may once have passed through the site before perhaps being obscured by later landscaping. There is consequently some potential for prehistoric remains within the proposal site.

A conditioned scheme of archaeological work in line with NPPF paragraph 141, to include an initial evaluation of the potential of the site by trial trenching and/or test pitting, with further excavation in the event that significant remains are present. Conditions to require this are recommended. This approach would be in line with NPPF paragraph 141 and with Policy CON13 (Archaeological Sites and Ancient Monuments) of the Bolsover District Local Plan.

Environmental Health (Noise)

The Environmental Health Officer initially recommended the submission of a noise assessment to consider potential impacts from noise from the adjoining retail site to the north. This was undertaken and whilst finding a minor impact from the retail use to the north, this identified a greater noise impact from noise from the adjacent road to the south. Such impacts can be resolved through mitigation, including the use of acoustic fencing to gardens and acoustic double glazing, although the Environmental Health Officer does not consider the submitted scheme to be satisfactory. A revised detail can be required by condition.

Environmental Health (Contamination)

Given the site's location adjacent to a former quarry and is approximately 170m north of a former landfill site the Environmental Health Officer initially advised the inclusion of a condition relating to the identification of potential contamination and mitigation to address such contamination if it exists. Further to this, the applicant's have submitted additional investigative information to seek to deal with the identification of contamination. The Environmental Health Officer has advised that there are some issues with the methods undertaken to compile this information that does not include any details (method or results) of gas monitoring that has been identified as a requirement. Whilst it is clear that this issue is resolvable in planning terms through a suitably worded condition, the applicant is keen to avoid any pre-commencement conditions to assist in making a prompt start on site and as such, looking resolve this issue further if possible. On this basis this issue is not fully resolved and an update on this matter will be provided to the committee when it meets.

Ecology/Biodiversity

The Derbyshire Wildlife Trust has reviewed the submitted Phase 1 Habitat Survey which included an assessment of the site to support bats and birds. The site was found to support semi-improved amenity grassland, hedgerows, mature trees, scrub and garden boundaries and states that there are no buildings on site that could support roosting bats and none of the trees are assessed as supporting suitable features for roosting bats. The site is assessed as having moderate foraging and commuting potential. A range of birds were recorded on site including house sparrow which is a red list species of high conservation concern. The report makes recommendations for bat box provision, bird box provision and measures for hedgehog. The development will retain the existing boundary vegetation including hedgerows which is welcomed and the majority of the hedgerows will be within areas of public open space. An area of grassland in the south east of the site is to be retained which is also welcomed. The Trust advise that adequate survey work has been undertaken in support of this planning application for it to be determined and recommend conditions relating to lighting design, hedgerow removal, ecological mitigation and protection of retained habitats. With the exception of the condition regarding hedgerow removal, which is covered under more specific legislation; an advisory note can be included.

Flood Risk/Drainage

In terms of flood risk, the site is not in a Flood Zone but the proposals are for major development and it is therefore necessary to consider how surface water runoff would be dealt with. The sloping nature of the site also means it is important to consider how drainage will be dealt with not least to prevent any risk to properties at a lower level.

Derbyshire County Council's Flood Risk Management Team has assessed the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and associated drainage proposals and is satisfied with the proposed details, subject to the inclusion of a condition relating to the future management and maintenance of the drainage for the lifetime of the development. The Council's Drainage Engineer has provided advice regarding management of any agreed SUDS scheme and temporary drainage arrangements during the construction period.

Healthcare provision.

It will be noted from the summary of consultation responses above that the NHS is seeking S106 contributions. There is no agreement to make such contributions and this is to be discussed in respect of the development viability generally with other contribution requests later in the report.

Public Art

It will be noted from the summary of consultation responses above that the Arts Officer is also seeking S106 contributions. Again, there is no agreement to make such contributions for reasons that are discussed later in the report.

Neighbour comments.

Whilst most issues raised in representations are covered in the above assessment, one writer is asking for trees on the site boundary to be trimmed. However, no development is proposed on this part of the site and no removal of trees is proposed; this issue does not therefore directly relate to the development proposal and is not material to the consideration as to whether planning permission is granted for the development proposal.

The comment that a neighbour's hedgerow at No. 2 Summit Drive has been removed and replaced by a fence is noted, but this does not affect any material planning considerations relating to this planning application.

Viability

As highlighted in the above report, there have been several requests in respect of S106 contributions in respect of recreation, education, public art and health. In this respect, a valuation report, which assesses the residual valuation of the scheme on a commercial basis has been submitted that shows that the scheme has a negative value of @£400,000. The Council's Commercial Property and Developments Manager has stated that "Whilst as a Local Authority we fully understand and support the need for developer contributions to public service, on this occasion, due to the nature of the scheme, those contributions are not affordable, as the scheme being developed is unviable...The negative commercial viability is not a surprise to the Council. The aim of the development is not to generate profit. The scheme is designed to provide 37 (100% of the development) new, high quality and affordable council houses in an area with significant housing needs. In addition to a high energy efficiency and lifetime homes standards, the development includes a fully wheelchair adapted bungalow to meet the immediate need of a local family. It is on this basis that Bolsover District Council are not proposing to make any [S106] contributions as part of this development."

With most commercial housing proposals, S106 contributions would form a proportionate contribution to infrastructure, whilst maintaining commercial viability of a scheme and this would potentially include a smaller proportion (normally 10%) of affordable housing amongst other contributions; these contributions are funded through the profit from the private house sales. As a scheme specifically for the provision of 100% (affordable) Council Houses, the proportion of affordable housing provision is significantly higher than would normally be expected and is considered to provide sufficient mitigation against any request for contributions to other areas where contributions may be sought; it is accepted that as there are no private property sales there can be no profit from which to fund any additional S106 contributions. Additionally it is worth noting that, due to the generally depressed nature of the housing market in recent years, coupled with a temporary waiver of the normal requirements for affordable housing in some circumstances, very little affordable housing has been secured nor delivered, despite an ongoing need for such provision and this scheme will assist in meeting this underlying need for affordable housing provision. On balance therefore, considering the above issues, it is considered that this scheme should be accepted without any additional contributions in respect of recreation, education, public art and health.

Conclusions

This is considered to be a generally sustainable form of development within an existing settlement that is in general compliance with adopted planning policy. There are expected amendments to address outstanding issues and conditions can be included to satisfactorily mitigate identified issues; updates on some issues are proposed for the Planning Committee when it meets, but these are considered to relate to minor resolution of outstanding issues that are unlikely to change the overall planning balance relating to this proposal.

It is acknowledged that the normally required S106 contributions are for the most part not

being provided for. Nevertheless, the nature of the proposal, for 100% affordable dwellings, is considered to outweigh the normal requirements for other contributions that may otherwise be sought from a housing scheme of this scale and the planning balance in this case is considered to be appropriate in terms of the ability to grant permission for the development proposed.

Other Matters

Listed Building: N/A

Conservation Area: N/A

Crime and Disorder: No significant issues arise

Equalities: No known issues

Access for Disabled: No known issues

Trees (Preservation and Planting): See assessment

SSSI Impacts: N/A

Biodiversity: See assessment

Human Rights: No known issues

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT planning permission subject to conditions deemed necessary, including those set out below in précis form to be formulated in full by the Assistant Director of Planning/Planning Manager in consultation with the chair and vice chair of the Planning Committee:

1. Std Full
2. Landscaping
3. Obscured glazing in the side and rear facing windows of flats 3 and 4.
4. Hard and Soft Landscaping
5. Archaeology
6. Car parking provision in accordance with approved plans
7. Pedestrian visibility splays to all accesses.
8. Vehicle accesses shall be no steeper than 1 in 20 for the first 5 metres.
9. Surface water drainage prioritising SUDS.
10. Maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme
11. Detailed lighting design strategy.
12. Detailed scheme for ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement.
13. Meter box details.
14. Environmental Health (Noise)
15. Environmental Health Officer (Contamination)

Advisory Notes

Protection of Wildlife

Highway matters