

Agenda Item A7	Committee Date 6 March 2017	Application Number 16/01150/FUL
Application Site Lune Valley Lawnmowers Sylvester Street Lancaster Lancashire	Proposal Demolition of existing industrial building and erection of 4 residential flats with associated car parking	
Name of Applicant Mr Colin Stephens	Name of Agent Harrison Pitt Architects	
Decision Target Date 18 November 2016	Reason For Delay Liaising with agent regarding revisions	
Case Officer	Mrs Petra Williams	
Departure	No	
Summary of Recommendation	Approval subject to conditions	

(i) Procedural Matters

This application has been called in to Committee by Councillor Brookes who is concerned that the site may be unsuitable for residential development and has concerns regarding the standard of accommodation and design (in relation to the character of the area).

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 The application site is a light industrial unit located within Sylvester Street which is a short residential street located immediately due west of the West Coast Mainline and is accessed from Sibsey Street. Sylvester Street comprises two-storey stone-fronted terraced properties along the western side of the road and a series of two and single-storey commercial units along the eastern side. Beyond this line of commercial units lies a high stone retaining wall to the West Coast Main Railway line.
- 1.2 The site is long, measuring 62m in length, and is narrow; tapering to a point at its northern end. The site comprises the northern commercial unit, associated open service area and a landscaped area with mature trees encircled by a low stone wall. The unit is broken into two distinct elements; a lower single-storey section (shop/office and workshop) and a two-storey element (workshop only). The building has a maximum height of 6.3m to the highest part of the pitched roof. The building has rendered walls under a cement fibre/asbestos sheeted roof and have until recently been occupied by Lune Valley Lawnmowers and Lancaster Lock and Safe Co. The site has been operational along with its adjoining neighbour unit for many years.
- 1.3 To the south of the site is a recreational field used by the Lancaster Girls Grammar School. To the northern end of the site is a small group of trees which are covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO 557(2015)). A public footpath (No.40) runs between the application site and the railway retaining wall. The footpath is relatively narrow approximately 1.5m wide. The footpath is also a cycle link forming part of the Strategic Cycle Network within the city.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The scheme originally proposed 5 dwellings. However, following concerns regarding design and private amenity space the submission has subsequently been amended to propose four residential flats laid out over two storeys with associated parking provision. The two flats at the northern end of the block will each provide 2 bedrooms with the southern end of the building offering two 3-bed flats.
- 2.2 The pitched roof design would have a maximum height of 7.9 metres with a mono –pitched link joining the two elements. The southern-element would contain a gable feature fronting Sylvester Street and materials would primarily be render under a slate roof. On-site parking provision for 5 vehicles will be made as well as bin and cycle storage.

3.0 Site History

- 3.1 The site has a limited planning history with a previous application in 2006 (Ref: 06/00282/OUT) which sought consent for 12 flats over three storeys. The application was recommended for refusal but withdrawn by the applicant before determination. More recently application 15/00754/CU for the erection of 6 residential dwellings was refused (at delegated level) for the following reasons:
- 1. In the opinion of the local planning authority, the scheme as submitted with severely restricted garden depths and area will result in habitable room windows to the rear elevation which face directly at a very short distance onto a large boundary treatment and are overshadowed and dominated by the presence of the substantial retaining wall immediately to the rear of the plots. This relationship is considered to overpower outlook from the dwellings, provide for wholly impractical private space and orientation will ensure little natural daylight reaches the rear of the properties to the detrimental of the amenities of the residential occupiers. As such the submission is considered to conflict directly with the guidance and policy position set out in Policy DM 35 - Key Design Principles of the Development Management DPD and design guidance contained within Section 7 (Requiring Good Design) of the NPPF.*
 - 2. The west side of Sylvester Street comprises modest two storey natural stone built houses under slate roofs. The proposed scheme whilst acknowledging the scale and overall form of the street, seeks to provide brick elevations under tiled roof with a poorly detailed and bland front elevation. The scheme is considered to add little to the quality of the street. Whilst the loss of the building could provide some wider benefit, the scheme as submitted, is not considered to enhance the character or appeal of the area and will result in the loss of valuable local trees. As such, the development is considered to be contrary to DM29 - Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland and DM 35 - Key Design Principles of the Development Management DPD, SC5 - Achieving Duality in Design of the Lancaster Core Strategy and design guidance contained within Section 7 of the NPPF.*
 - 3. In the opinion of the local planning authority, the lack of adequate car parking provision is considered to be detrimental to the amenities of future and existing residential occupiers and could lead to a reduction in highway safety in the area, as such the development is considered to be contrary to policy DM22 Vehicle Parking Provision and DM 35 - Key Design Principles of the Development Management DPD.*
 - 4. The application submission fails to provide for the provision of any affordable housing or seek to justify a financial viability appraisal for the omission of such provision as such the proposal is considered to be contrary to the demands of the Meeting Housing Needs SPD, DM41 of the Development Management DPD and policy SC4 of the Lancaster Core Strategy.*
 - 5. The proposal has not been supported by a marketing exercise and in the opinion of the local planning authority, the application has failed to demonstrate that the location has exceptionally severe site restriction or that the benefits of the proposal outweighs the loss of the site for employment purposes. In addition, it is considered that its loss has the potential to undermine the operation of the neighbouring employment site. As such the development is considered to be contrary to DM15 of the Development Management DPD.*

4.0 Consultation Responses

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory and non-statutory consultees:

Consultee	Response
Tree Protection Officer	No objection to revised scheme subject to conditions (scheme for the type and distribution of new trees; and works to be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Implications Assessment).
Planning Policy Officer	Comments – Insufficient information on marketing and therefore it fails to satisfy the first element of policy DM15. Whilst this site is not within a defined regeneration priority area there are significant regeneration issues surrounding this site. Clearly the buildings are in a poor state of repair which do have visual amenity issues with the locality and therefore I would suggest that localised regeneration benefits arising from this proposal may well outweigh the loss of the site for employment uses.
Environmental Health (Noise)	No objection to revisions subject to the provision of 10/12/8.4 glazing with trickle vents or similar.
Contaminated Land Officer	Comments – Standard contaminated land condition requested.
County Highways	Objection to revisions due to highway safety and residential amenity concerns
Public Rights of Way Officer	Comments – Requests that the footpath surface is improved by the applicant as part of the development. The existing building has prevented water from draining away from the path and it is clear to see areas where water has pooled and the path has been difficult to use in wet weather. The poor repair of the existing structure has caused water to be discharged onto the path and this has caused some deterioration of the surface.
Natural England	No comments to make in respect of this application.
Network Rail	Comments - The proposals must not encroach into the influence zone of the wall. Developer is to submit directly to Network Rail, a Risk Assessment and Method Statement (RAMS) for all works to be undertaken within 10m of the operational railway under Construction (Design and Management) Regulations, and this is in addition to any planning consent. Comments to be provided to applicant as advice.
Lancaster Civic Society	No objection to revised scheme. The reduction in the proposed density is more appropriate for this location and the frontage is now of a more pleasing design.
Fire Safety Officer	Comments - advice in respect of access for fire appliances and water supplies for firefighting purposes to the site. Comments to be provided to applicant as advice.
Parking and Administration (LCC)	Comments - The applicant should be advised that the occupiers of the properties will not be eligible for residents parking permits for the Lancaster City Council Residents Parking Scheme – Fairfield Zone J.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 At the time of compiling this report 12 items of public comments (1 being a duplicate) were initially received in respect of the original proposal for 5 dwellings. All objected to the scheme with the primary concerns being as follows:

- Inappropriate location of development for residential development.
- Residential amenity issues, including overlooking/loss of privacy; loss of daylight; failure to comply with recommended distances to properties on opposite side of Sylvester Street; increase in noise; rear balconies unacceptable;
- Design issues, including failure to contribute positively to character of the area; not locally-distinctive; 3-storey design inappropriate;
- Highway and traffic issues, including traffic increase; increase in pollution; existing parking pressure in the area; inadequate delivery space during construction);
- Lack of smaller light industrial premises in the city;
- Biodiversity issues, including absence of bat and bird boxes;
- Application issues, including queries regarding marketing exercise; location of development is misleading; existing use is not at odds with residential use (so Design and Access Statement is misleading); Vibration and Noise Report is misleading;

- The joint owner of the adjoining business objects that development would compromise his ability to continue as a business/employer by leaving them as the only industrial premises in the street;
- Concerns regarding railway embankment wall and the impacts of development upon it.

5.2 12 item of public comment (1 being a duplicate) have also been received in respect of the revised plans. Objections remain with the following primary concerns highlighted:

- Design is at odds with the existing street scene;
- Parking issues have not been addressed, including impact during construction;
- Amenity issues such as overlooking and loss of light; Additionally the Kitchen/ Dining/ Living" area for both Flat 2 and 4 has two of its three windows facing directly to the side wall of the remaining business unit. This raises noise concerns.
- Sylvester Street is an ideal location for small businesses because of its proximity to local transport routes and a city centre; and the joint owner considers that the proposal would compromise his ability to continue as a business and an employer; and,

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraphs 7, 14 and 17 - Sustainable Development and Core Principles

Paragraph 32 – Access and Transport

Paragraphs 49 and 50 - Delivering Housing

Paragraphs 56, 58 and 60 – Requiring Good Design

6.2 Local Planning Policy Overview – Current Position

At the 14 December 2016 meeting of its' Full Council, the local authority resolved to undertake public consultation on:

- (i) The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD); and,
- (ii) A Review of the Development Management DPD.

This enabled progress to be made on the preparation of a Local Plan for the Lancaster District. The public consultation period is from 27 January 2017 to 24 March 2017, after which (if the consultation is successful), the local authority will be in a position to make swift progress in moving towards the latter stages of; reviewing the draft documents to take account of consultation outcomes, formal publication and submission to Government, and, then independent Examination of the Local Plan. If an Inspector finds that the submitted DPDs have been soundly prepared they may be adopted by the Council, potentially in 2018.

The **Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD** will replace the remaining policies of the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008) and the residual 'saved' land allocation policies from the 2004 District Local Plan. Following the Council resolution in December 2016, it is considered that the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD is a material consideration in decision-making, although with limited weight. The weight attributed to this DPD will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

The **Review of the Development Management DPD** updates the policies that are contained within the current document, which was adopted in December 2014. As it is part of the development plan the current document is already material in terms of decision-making. Where any policies in the draft 'Review' document are different from those adopted in 2014, and those policies materially affect the consideration of the planning application, then these will be taken into account during decision-making, although again with limited weight. The weight attributed to the revised policies in the 'Review' will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy (adopted July 2008)

SC1 - Sustainable Development

SC2 - Urban Concentration

SC4 - Meeting the District's Housing Requirements

SC5 - Achieving quality in Design

6.4 Development Management Development Plan Document (adopted July 2014)

DM15 - Loss of Employment Land and Premises for Alternative Uses
DM20 – Enhancing Accessibility and Transport linkages
DM21 – Walking and Cycling
DM22 – Vehicle Parking Provision
DM28 - Development and Landscape Impact
DM29 - Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland
DM35 - Key Design Principles
DM36 - Sustainable Design
DM41 - New Residential Dwellings

Appendix E – Flat Conversion Standards

7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 The main issues are:

- Principle and Housing Supply
- Loss of Employment Site
- Design
- Amenity
- Noise
- Highways and Parking

7.2 Principle and Housing Supply

7.2.1 National and local planning policy requires new development to be as sustainable as possible, particularly in terms of locating new residential development in places where it would be convenient to walk, cycle and travel by public transport, and access a range of services and facilities via such transport modes. The proposal is sustainably-located close to the city's Railway Station and in relatively close proximity to the bus and cycle network and a range of local services within the city centre. As such the principle of residential use of the site is acceptable, subject to all site-specific issues being appropriately addressed.

7.2.2 The Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites, and so paragraph 49 of the NPPF is therefore engaged. This means that when considering development proposals, the adopted policies dealing with housing supply matters will not be considered up-to-date in these circumstances and so the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies (paragraph 14, NPPF). The provision of 4 residential flats will positively contribute – in a small but valuable way - to meeting the District's undersupply of housing

7.3 Loss of Employment Site

7.3.1 DM DPD Policy DM15 is relevant and states that the Council will seek the retention of land and buildings which are in an active employment use, has a previous recent history of employment use, or still has an economic value worthy of retention. Proposals which involve the use of employment land for alternative uses (such as residential) will only be permitted where:-

- Robust marketing has demonstrated that the premises is no longer appropriate or viable; *or*
- The location has severe site restrictions due to very poor access or serving arrangements or surrounding land uses to make continuing employment use inappropriate; *or*,
- Re-use of the employment land for some alternate use meets wider regeneration benefits or the benefits of the proposal outweighs the loss of the site for employment purposes.

7.3.2 Unlike the previous refused scheme the current application has been supported by marketing information. However, this information is limited and comprises a letter from a local commercial property agent stating that they have acted as selling agents for the vendor of the property. The letter states that during its time on the market, the property agents received virtually no interest from prospective commercial users and that this is due mainly to the age and condition of the building.

No details have been provided regarding the marketing period or specific number of enquiries. The marketing letter also argues that the demolition of the building and its replacement with a new housing scheme will provide benefits in terms of adding to accessible housing supply and general environmental improvements. Further evidence of marketing would clearly be useful to support the applicant's case. This has been requested and a verbal update on this matter will be provided.

- 7.3.3 The submission argues that the current use of the site falls within Class B2 - General Industry. The site has no planning history relating to the commercial operation and has been operating in its current form for a considerable number of years. Lack of any complaints to the local authority and active support for the land use (as part of the planning application consultation responses) would appear to indicate that the current use is compatible with the surrounding residential area.
- 7.3.4 For a commercial use, the site does have a number of constraints and the highway network leading to the site is restricted by width and geometry. Only a limited servicing area is available with access to the workshop area directly from the rear of the pavement. The absence of any planning history indicates little, if any control over operating hours should another operator take over the use of the site (although the Environmental Protection Act may offer some protection, were it needed). Nevertheless, the premises has been successfully functioning as an employment site for many years and is likely to be served by smaller vehicles which can traverse the local highway network. Car parking restrictions have been designated to allow short-term parking (2 hrs) to help service the needs of this and the neighbouring site. The retention of the site for light industrial use has been supported by a number of local residents and the neighbouring commercial occupant.
- 7.3.5 Nevertheless, there are clearly some merits associated with residential re-use of the site. Furthermore, it can be argued that in light of the current housing shortfall within the district the provision of 4 residential units would provide benefits which, in planning terms, outweigh the loss of this commercial unit. As such it is considered that the localised regeneration benefits arising from this proposal would outweigh the loss of the site for employment use. It is considered that the proposal accords with one of the provisions of Policy DM15.

7.4 Design

- 7.4.1 The west side of Sylvester Street comprises modest two storey natural stone-built houses under slate roofs. The revised scheme incorporates pitched roofs with a stepped elevation and gable feature to the western elevation which would provide interest to the development. Furthermore the proposed use of slate and render will address some of the design concerns with the previous application. The proposed use of slate is welcomed and details of the finish and colour of render to the main elevations would be conditioned along with materials for the façade of the link element which would be set back from the main frontage. Primary windows will be to the western, northern and southern elevations with only hallway windows proposed within the eastern (rear) elevation. Details of windows, doors, eaves, verge and ridge would also be conditioned. Overall it is considered that the revised scheme sets out an acceptable design approach in this location.
- 7.4.2 In terms of scale and massing it is considered that the proposal has been reduced significantly compared to the previously refused scheme for 6 dwellings and during the course of the current submission. There will be a 9.5m gap between the flats and the remaining business unit and the revised plans have reduced the height of the roof by 600mm. It is considered that the scale of the proposal is more reflective of the dwellings on the opposite side of the road.

7.5 Amenity

7.5.1 General Amenity - Future Occupants

The development has been designed to take account of the spatial standards set out in the Development Management DPD. The flats are all conveniently laid out and include vertical stacking of lounge and kitchen to minimise noise issues from floor to floor. The latest plan revisions introduce a planting bed to the northern elevation in order to introduce a visual buffer between the outlook from the ground floor flat and the vehicle parking area. Further planting is proposed around the northern part of the parking area.

- 7.5.2 The 5 proposed parking bays will included disabled parking provision. Cycle storage and bin storage will be provided within the southern part of the site and this is considered to be acceptable.

7.5.3 General Amenity - Wider Area

The appearance of the existing building is not considered to enhance the local area. The external envelope of the building is in need of repair and maintenance and its external materials are not considered to contribute positively to the streetscene. Its loss and replacement with a well-designed two-storey building could add to character of the area and the streetscene along Sylvester Street.

7.5.4 The surrounding area has a dense urban grain with rows of terraced housing all with limited rear garden areas. The proposal for residential flats rather than 5 dwellings overcomes the issue of private amenity space provision which was a significant concern (and the basis of a refusal reason) with the last application. It is also acknowledged that Policy DM35 seeks to ensure that there is at least 21m between habitable room windows that face each other. However, due to the existing road network and the relationship of surrounding dwellings the proposed distance falls short of this. It is therefore considered that the distance of approximately 12m as proposed in this instance is acceptable. Furthermore, given the height of the proposed development it is considered that the impacts of the built form on the occupiers of the western side of Sylvester Street will not differ significantly from the existing situation.

7.5.5 The previously-refused application proposed the loss of the small group of trees in the raised planting area to the northern end of the plot. The trees are considered to provide valuable 'greening' in this densely developed urban area along with a resource for local ecology. Unlike the previous submission, the current application includes a detailed Arboriculture Implications Assessment (AIA) which identifies a total of 5 individual trees and a single group of trees have been identified in relation to the proposed development.

7.5.6 The Tree Protection Officer is satisfied with the details of the AIA which includes adequate tree protection measures. The AIA makes reference to an off-site tree which is in poor condition and is identified for removal regardless of any future development of the site. The applicant will be advised to notify the adjacent land owner (Network Rail) of their findings. All other trees are to be retained and afforded suitable protection during the course of the development.

7.5.7 It is considered that the development is an important opportunity to improve planting within the streetscene. Whilst new planting opportunities are limited, it is important in terms of amenity that efforts are made to incorporate new planting. Plans indicate areas of new planting to the northern end of the site and this will be conditioned. Overall it is considered that the submitted scheme has satisfactorily addressed the tree related concerns of the previously refused application.

7.6 Noise

7.6.1 The site lies immediately alongside the West Coast Mainline. The railway line sits at a higher level than the application site (approximately 2.4m) and is separated by a narrow public footpath and a substantial retaining wall. The upper floor flats will be located at a similar level to the rail line with only the remaining stone wall between. The railway line lies 5m beyond the retaining wall.

7.6.2 The close relationship to the railway line is acknowledged and the application is accompanied by a Noise and Vibration Report. Vibration from the railway is not considered to be an issue in relation to the development but without mitigation, the rail use both during the day and at night is considered unacceptable. The Environmental Health Officer is satisfied that potential noise impacts from the adjacent railway line will be satisfactorily mitigated against with the provision of 10/12/8.4 glazing with trickle vents or similar, which shall be provided to the windows of the north and south elevations of the building. Subject to the construction and maintenance of the windows in accordance with the details contained within the Noise and Vibration Report (10/12/8.4 acoustic glazing with trickle ventilation) noise levels within the properties are considered acceptable.

7.6.3 Concerns have been raised by the adjoining business owners regarding possible noise complaints from occupants of the new development as a result of their business operations. It is understood that the business, Special Air Sea Services, operates industrial sewing machines which would cause potential noise and vibration impacts. However, this aspect has also been considered by the Environmental Health Officer who is satisfied that the mitigation proposed to address noise impacts from the rail line would also prevent adverse impacts from the neighbouring business operations.

7.6.4 Overall it is considered that subject to appropriate conditions, impacts from noise and vibration from surrounding uses can be satisfactorily mitigated against.

7.7 Highways and Parking

- 7.7.1 The issue of parking needs at the site has raised a number of concerns from neighbouring residents. Sylvester Street has resident parking over its full length on the west side fronting the existing houses and a mixture of double yellows and parking bays limited to a maximum of 2hrs for open parking or resident parking run on the east side of the street. The resident parking is controlled by way of permits (Fairfield Zone J, issued by Lancaster City Council).
- 7.7.2 Due to on-street capacity issues and the number of new housing developments being delivered in sustainable, urban locations it was determined (in 2005) that all proposals for new residential development in areas with good links with public transport would be excluded from eligibility for a parking permit. This position still exists.
- 7.7.3 The number of residential flats attracts a maximum parking demand of 2 spaces per unit using the guidance set out in the DM DPD. The scheme would therefore be required to provide a maximum of 8 spaces in line with policy DM22 and Appendix B. However, it is emphasised that the Car Parking Standards set out the *maximum* requirements and given the highly sustainable nature of the site location, as well as the inclusion of cycle storage, the provision of 5 spaces is considered acceptable.
- 7.7.4 County Highways have raised objections, based upon their view that 2 of the spaces are of substandard length and would lead to the potential for parked vehicles to overhang and obstruct the footway. When at right-angles to and contiguous with carriageways, parking bays should be at least 4.8m long x 2.4m wide, and there should be 6m in front of the bays to allow access and an additional 800mm strip at the back to allow for vehicle overhang. However, it is considered that the parking layout accords with the provisions of the Manual for Streets and therefore the proposed parking layout is of an acceptable standard in terms of dimensions. It is not considered that a refusal on highway grounds could be defended at appeal.
- 7.7.5 County Highways have also acknowledged the existing parking pressures on Sylvester Street. However, as occupiers of the proposed development will not be entitled to resident parking permits it is considered that the scheme will not increase pressure or competition for on street parking. Furthermore the loss of the business unit means that there will be fewer business visitors/customers parking in the short stay parking spaces on the east side of the street during the daytime.
- 7.7.6 The point at which the site is accessed for parking will require the relocation of the on-street parking spaces further along the street. The number of on-street parking space will not be reduced and therefore parking provision for existing residents will be unaffected. It is understood that the applicant has liaised with County Highways in respect of the off-site highway works. On balance, it is considered that the proposed on-site parking provision and cycle storage is acceptable.
- 7.7.7 The Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Officer has made comments due to the proximity of Public Footpath No.40 which runs along the eastern side of the site. This part of the footpath is unwelcoming given the proximity of the existing building and the boundary wall to the railway embankment. It is also noted that the surface of the footpath has deteriorated in parts. The PRoW Officer has requested that the surface of the footpath is improved by the applicant as part of the development. Whilst the current application would appear to offer such an opportunity, the footpath is not within ownership of the applicant and does not form part of the site, and therefore a condition cannot be imposed.

8.0 Planning Obligations

- 8.1 Not applicable.

9.0 Conclusions

- 9.1 The presumption in favour of sustainable development lies at the core of the NPPF (Paragraph 14). Overall the proposed development positively contributes to meeting the District's housing need by providing 4 open market residential units. The site is within a highly sustainable residential area and the local planning authority has worked positively and proactively with the agent in order to achieve an acceptable scheme in terms of design, amenity and parking provision. It is considered that the submission satisfies the requirements of policies DM22, DM35 and DM41.

9.2 It is considered that the revised scheme has satisfactorily addressed four of the refusal reasons of the previous submission and the issue of affordable housing which formed the fourth refusal reason is no longer applicable. Whilst limited evidence of marketing has been submitted (more evidence is awaited), it is considered that the scheme wholly accords with the third criteria of this policy in that the benefits of the proposal (housing provision) outweigh the loss of the site for employment purposes. On balance, it is contended that the revised scheme represents a sustainable form of development which can be supported..

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans list
3. Tree protection measures in accordance with Arboricultural Implications Assessment, produced by Yew Tree & Garden, dated 06.09.16.
4. Scheme for the disposal of foul and surface water drainage to be submitted pre-commencement
5. Schedule of window/door/roof details (including rainwater goods) to be submitted pre-construction of the building
6. Schedule and samples of all external materials and finishes to elevations and details of surfacing treatments to be submitted pre-construction of the building
7. Landscaping scheme including external lighting to be submitted pre-construction of the building
8. Scheme for making good the exposed elevation of the remaining business unit to be agreed and implemented.
9. Notwithstanding details submitted, details of refuse and secure cycle storage and provision to be agreed (pre-occupation)
10. Landscaping including type and distribution of new trees
11. Noise Condition (10/12/8.4 acoustic glazing with trickle ventilation)
12. Site to be drained on separate systems
13. Hours of construction
14. Car parking provision prior to occupation
15. Standard Contaminated Land Condition
16. Contaminated Land – Importation of Soil, Materials & Hardcore

Article 35, Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm that it has made the recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the applicant to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The recommendation has been taken having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in full in the report, and to all relevant material planning considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/ Guidance.

Background Papers

None