

2.11 REFERENCE NO - 16/505907/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Works to reinstate dilapidated quay and form creek side footway AS AMENDED BY DRAWING 387/11.15.1. Rev D RECEIVED ON 18 TH JULY 2017 AND DRAWING 387/11.15.2 REV A 27 TH JULY 2017		
ADDRESS Former Oil Depot Abbey Wharf Standard Quay Faversham Kent ME13 7BS		
RECOMMENDATION - Grant subject to conditions		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The proposed design represents a practical and aesthetically acceptable solution to an area of the quay which would otherwise be submerged in water at high tide from time to time, and which in overall terms represents a small conservation gain and would have the net effect of enhancing the character and appearance of the Faversham conservation area at the location in question.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE - Faversham Town Council Objection		
WARD Abbey	PARISH/TOWN Faversham Town	COUNCIL APPLICANT Nova Uk Ltd AGENT Design & Build Services
DECISION DUE DATE 27/09/16	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 17/08/17	

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 The site is a disused former oil depot located on the southern bank of Faversham Creek, accessed off Abbey Street to the south east.
- 1.02 The site currently comprises an open yard with a concrete wall on the creek frontage. Beyond this concrete wall the creek frontage includes an area of former quay fronted by a brick wharf wall with a capping of large stones that form the edge of the quay. It is the area between creek and the concrete wall that is subject of this application.
- 1.03 The site lies within Faversham conservation area.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The proposal involves two phases of works; firstly the repair and reinstatement phase to restore the historic quay wall to ensure its stability before works are commenced to preserve the structure for the future. Secondly to construct a Creekside Walkway which will sit above the original quay wall but will not involve any alteration on the wall itself. The application originally showed a timber walkway surface but this detail has since been removed and concrete surface is now shown.
- 2.02 A comprehensive method statement has been produced which, in more detail provides the programme of works, including:

PHASE 1 – REINSTATEMENT WORKS

1. Clearing the top of the quay wall and adjoining hard standing of all rubble, stone and mud deposits.
2. Carrying out a targeted programme of disturbance dredging to remove the mud deposits at the base of the brick walling to expose the junction of the brickwork and the shale bed of the creek.
3. Position a temporary deck to secure a working platform from which the bricklayers will work
4. Bricklayers to work on the wall, cleaning out decayed pointing and removing any damaged bricks. New brickwork to be installed where necessary and hard red stock bricks to match the existing wall should be used. (Bricks and mortar to be agreed)
5. No rubble or left over mortar is to be deposited in the creek - deposits from each days work can be cleared away
6. Once the brickwork is repaired to the underside of the coping stones there should be a period of drying out to allow the new brickwork to cure. A minimum of one week
7. Replacement coping stones sourced, to match the size of the existing stones, (To be approved by the Conservation Officer)

PHASE 2 – FORM A CREEKSIDE WALKWAY

1. The works to form the walkway should be carried out in accordance with the details set out in the Report and drawing produced by John Kettle and Associates.
2. Install small diameter piles in locations indicated (42 in total) in 16 rows along the length of the proposed walkway.
3. Install the wire mesh gabions over the complete area of the walkway, linking the cages together and placing them around the heads of the piles.
4. Fill the gabions with natural ballast (beach/ stone) and fix the lids of the cages.
5. Install the reinforcement mesh over a geotextile membrane laid over the entire area of the gabions. Form the reinforced cage to support the upstand edge of the quayside walkway.
6. Form the necessary box with shuttering grade plywood, to allow the concrete upstand to be formed with the base of the walkway.
7. Allow for the fall in the walkway and install the 63mm diameter drainage pipes @ 1600mm centres behind the upstand.
8. Allow to pour 225mm thick concrete slab using concrete grade RC40 (ST1 blinding grade + 20mm maximum aggregate size).

9. Walling to be formed in one pour and vibrating poker to be used to ensure full cover of steel reinforced cage and to eliminate air pockets.
10. New walkway to have brushed finish with the upstand having a metal trowel finish.
11. Ste is to be cleared of all building materials and waste.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

Potential Archaeological Importance
 Conservation Area Faversham
 Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 135664

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
 National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
 Development Plan: Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 DM14, DM19, DM21, DM32, DM33
 Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan
 Supplementary Planning Documents: Conservation Areas

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.01 Two letters of support have been received from local residents who believe that the application is welcomed because it is in accordance with the Faversham Creek Streetscape Strategy and the Neighbourhood Plan and will contribute towards creation of a continuous Creekside footpath on the town side of the creek. Another resident suggests that the path is rather narrow at either end and he is not clear how it will join up with footpaths at either end.
- 5.02 Three letters of objection have been received from local residents who comment that the remains of the old timber wharf have been pulled out to provide moorings for more live aboard houseboats and this gives rise to concern regarding pollution. Two of these same objectors to the scheme consider that this application should be linked to 16/508709 for 10 dwellings on the site (an application yet to be determined) and their comments then concern the substance of that application and not the detail of the reinstatement of the quay wall.
- 5.03 One letter of objection was received from a local landowner when the original application was submitted in August 2016. They commented:

“ I write on behalf of Badlesmere Limited as nominee for the Trustees of The Fifth Earl Sondes Settlement concerning this application which relates to part of the creek wall adjacent to land as owned by my client and indeed potentially encroaching upon my client’s ownership. I pick up this latter issue towards the end of this letter.

The application has been submitted no doubt as a follow-up to the works which were carried out without the benefit of planning permission during the latter part of 2015 and which have now been largely removed.

The application provides a very sketchy level of detail over a number of detailed technical issues but it is helpful that the previous works were investigated by Kent County Council's Heritage Conservation Team. A report of those investigations has been prepared by Simon Mason, Principal Archaeological Officer with KCC. Although that report is cited in the short Design & Access Statement submitted with the Planning Application none of its recommendations have been followed. I attach a copy of the report as an Annex to this letter.

The KCC report sets out in detail the history, role and purpose of the wall as well as the potential for additional archaeology to be present to the landward side of the wall. Whilst not a listed structure, the wall is situated in the Faversham Conservation Area and any development proposal needs to be assessed for potential impact upon the latter.

Whilst my client acknowledges that repair of the creek wall along this length is undoubtedly necessary (in part, as noted in the KCC report, due to damage caused by the unauthorised works carried out in 2015) I write to set out the following objections to the planning application in its current form:

- 1. As stated in the KCC report, the creek wall is a heritage asset dating back to the 1840s and is a positive contributing factor to the character and significance of the creek in this part of the Conservation Area;*
- 2. No detailed assessment of the significance of this heritage asset has been provided as part of the application so that the Borough Council is unable to assess its evidential, historical or aesthetic or communal values (as set out in English Heritage's Conservation Principles) and the potential for diminution of those values as a result of the proposed development. As such the application fails to meet the requirements of paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework, namely:*

... As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation;

- 3. No detailed record of the wall has been provided as recommended in the KCC report and the Borough Council has merely been pointed in the direction of that report for further information on its significance. Due to the historical and other values of the wall, the potential for archaeological finds in the vicinity (including perhaps the route of the former Abbey Drain as cited in the KCC report) and the site's location within the Conservation Area, this is not a matter that could be dealt with by condition on any planning permission;*
- 4. The details of the proposed refurbishment of the wall is wholly inadequate given its potential value and location. The sketch sections do not provide adequate information, are not related to the context and no topographical survey which is tied into an OS base has been provided. It is therefore impossible to judge the nature of the proposed works in context;*
- 5. For similar reasons as set out at number 3 above it is wholly inadequate to rely on structural engineers details 'to be provided', presumably by condition, as set out on drawing 387 / 11.15.1 rev B or C (The reference is unclear on your website, appears to be a C but B is referred to in the DAS);*
- 6. No information is provided about the nature of the stone proposed as infill for the gabions;*

7. *The introduction of a reinforced concrete quay with timber decking above needs to be assessed on the basis of a report by an appropriately qualified historic buildings surveyor for the potential impact on the structure of the wall. However, it would be likely to introduce a modern-looking treatment and materials which could be incongruous to the remaining length of Standard Quay and impact negatively upon the Faversham Conservation Area;*

8. *Similarly, no attempt has been made to refurbish the wall in a manner consistent with its original construction (ie brick courses topped with capping stones) in a form which would be much more likely to contribute to the value of the wall and its setting within the Conservation Area; and finally*

9. *There are inaccuracies and errors throughout the document in addition to those noted above. For example, one of the photos submitted clearly shows a modern sawn timber telegraph pole in situ against the base of the wall alongside the notation 'original mooring post'. Given such inaccuracies and lack of detail the Borough Council cannot properly determine the application.*

On the basis of all the above the Borough Council cannot be in any position to comply with the requirements of paragraph 129 of the NPPF, ie:

... Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Furthermore, from the sketchy plans submitted with the planning application, it appears that the development may well result in a further encroachment upon land held by my client. No topographical survey on an OS base has been provided with the application, but the KCC report (including photographs) notes some collapse of the structure potentially onto land owned by my client. There also appears to be protrusion of the proposed hard concrete edge of the wall, potentially outwith the applicant's land ownership.

I note that no notice has been served upon my client in accordance with Article 13 of the Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. As such the application is invalid and cannot be determined by the Borough Council.

Assuming the Borough Council was in a position to determine this application I would urge its refusal on behalf of my client and the wider community of Faversham until a scheme is proposed which properly records the values of the Creek Wall at this point and proposes its refurbishment in a manner which is both structurally sound and appropriate to its location within the Conservation Area; as well as consistent with the advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and established local planning policy for the Borough."

Following submission of additional information no further comment has been received from this objector.

- 5.04 The Faversham Footpaths Group has commented that it supports the application as it complies with the policies of Creek Streetscape Strategy, the Creek Neighbourhood Plan and also contributes to our their aim for a continuous Creekside path. They note

that in the design and access statement the footpath is said to be initially for the use of *'boat owners and visitors rather than the general public'* but it goes on to say that *'when future development of the creek takes place an application could be submitted to divert the existing public footway on Standard Quay to a new location on the quay side'*. While they welcome this ambition they suggest that it would be very worthwhile making the footpath open to the public as soon as possible after it is created because of the views of the creek that this would make available.

Following the submission of additional information and revised drawings they commented that on the drawing labelled 'Additional Details', the footpath shown is very narrow at either end of the site. Additionally it is not clear how it would join up with the existing footpath outside the Coach Depot site or, in due course, with Provender Walk. They suggest that the Council asks for confirmation that the footpath would connect with the Coach Depot footpath. They also ask the Council to note that the path ought in due course to join up with Provender Walk in accordance with the Faversham Creek Streetscape Strategy and the Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan,

- 5.05 The Faversham Society commented in Sept 2016 offered no objection in principle to the creation of a public walkway but raised 3 concerns, namely:

- a) there is insufficient information to assess the impact
- b) unauthorised works in 2015 revealed a culvert and this could possibly be the Great Sewer of the mediaeval Abbey and requires investigations
- c) wish to see the walkway made public

Following the subsequent submission of additional information no further comments were received.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 6.01 Faversham Town Council objects to the proposal, stating that the proposed new surfacing with gabions on top of the existing bullnose stone edgings, concrete, above that and with timber decking since removed from the scheme) will be harmful to the character of the conservation area.

Additionally they state that no ecological or pollution reports are attached to this application and given the location of the site and the nature of its previous use the Town Council expects such reports to be necessary.

They welcomed the intention to re-open the footpath but considered this should not be at the expense of harming the existing character of the quay side.

They also would welcome a widening of the footpath at each end to more than the 1 metre proposed.

Following the submission of additional information and revised drawings in June 2017 they commented they are awaiting confirmation that previous objections have been addressed and the comments made earlier are still considered relevant. Before considering this application the Council required more detailed information on the previous points.

Following the submission of additional information and revised drawings in August 2017 the Town Council maintain their objection commenting that their previous

comments have not been addressed and that the coping stones should be preserved and put on top of the wall as recommended by the Environment Agency

- 6.02 With the original consultation, the Environment Agency (EA) stated they had no objection to the proposal, however they stated that the applicant will need to apply for a Flood Risk Activity Permit (formally known as a flood defence consent).

Following the submission of additional information and revised drawings in June 2017 the EA objected to the proposed development stating that in relation to Fisheries and Biodiversity this development appears from the 'Proposed Block Plan' to extend into Faversham Creek. If this is the case, then this will lead to loss of saltmarsh and mudflat habitats. These habitats are considered to be priority habitats or habitats of "principal importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity

In the absence of adequate information on the risk posed by the development and suitable mitigating or compensatory measures, the EA objected to the proposed development as submitted due to the likely impact of the proposed development on BAP priority habitat.

Following the submission of additional information and revised drawings in July 2017 the EA removed their objection and suggested conditions to ensure the protection of the Creek. They confirmed that as the wall will be reinstated with coping stones at the top and will not encroach on the Creek, and subject to there being no intrusive work and the operator taking normal pollution prevention measures, they have no further concerns about this proposal from a fisheries and biodiversity point of view.

However a misunderstanding of the drawings submitted in August 2017 led the EA to state that they are concerned that the amended plans are not in line with the approach discussed with the applicant to remove their objection. The EA suggested that the submitted plans appeared to show a new wall being built beyond the existing wall with a brushed concrete path over the existing vegetated margin of the water course. The submitted plans did not fit in with the details discussed to remove their objection. The details they were satisfied with in their previous letter included the re-instatement of a historic wall with no encroachment into the creek.

The discussion which led to them removing their objection did not seem to have led to action on the part of the applicant. The EA said that they would like to see the details discussed in their letter of July 2017 or they would need to object to this proposal.

Following a renewed look at the information the EA stated they had no objection to the applicant's proposal to repair the wall and provision of the walk way and advised the Council to take note of the contaminated land conditions they had suggested previously and that the applicant may need a Flood Risk Activity permit to conduct these works.

- 6.03 Historic England say that their specialist staff have considered the information received and we do not wish to offer any comments on this occasion. Following the submission of additional information and revised drawings in June and August 2017 their comments remained the same.

- 6.04 The Council Archaeological Officer has commented that he had been asked to provide a specification for the archaeological evaluation of the site of the former Oil Depot in connection with the residential development that is proposed there and said;

“I provided a specification for trial trenching in the yard area. This has been designed to understand the archaeological implications of the development of the site as a whole and if the course of the drain outfall is encountered, which I have tried to target, should assist in the present application. It is a bit constrained by the present building on site and I haven’t put trenching on the rear of the wall either as that may cause more problems. It is only the specification and the significance of the river wall cannot be better understood until it has been implemented and reported.

I need to look at the present application in more detail but it is concerned with the development of a path over the frontage wall. My advice in the report I provided last year was that:

- *The brick and stone wall is an undesignated heritage asset that positively contributes to the character and significance of the Faversham Conservation Area. Further assessment by a suitably qualified Conservation specialist is needed to understand in detail the way in which the heritage asset contributes to that character and significance.*
- *Any proposals that come forward for the future treatment of the frontage need to take account of and avoid harm to the significance of the asset and preferably enhance its significance.*
- *The wall in its present state is vulnerable to the fluctuating tide in the Creek. A condition assessment is needed by an appropriately qualified surveyor to inform discussions on the future treatment of the wall and necessary measures for its protection and conservation.*
- *A more detailed record of the wall is needed in advance of any works to it. Any works on the wall or ground excavations for development of the land to its rear should be accompanied by archaeological assessment and mitigation. In particular archaeological work is needed to establish the significance of the drain outfall in the wall.*

I have not specified assessments that would address the advice in the first three bullet points. These are generally outside my remit other than in general terms and more for Simon Algar to advise on.

In terms of the archaeology of the present proposal the evaluation I have specified may help to inform an archaeological assessment of the significance of the heritage asset. I would be loath to specify work in the immediate vicinity of the wall and path without proper structural assessment and it could be that archaeological works and detailed wall recording tied into structural assessment would be useful. The impacts of the present proposal need to be properly assessed and in terms of archaeology may be very limited if the intention is to build up with no below ground works. How that can be achieved on the top of the heritage asset needs to be assessed and detailed. “

- 6.05 Swale Footpaths Group has no objection in principle, but say that the following will need to be established: precise legal status of proposed footway; who is to be responsible for its upkeep; and how it is to link with other footpaths and proposed footpaths. Following the submission of additional information and revised drawings in June and August 2017 they had nothing to add to the original comments.

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

Application papers and drawings referring to application reference 16/505907/FULL.

8.0 APPRAISAL

- 8.01 Since the submission of this original application in August 2016 it has been an ongoing process to gain all the necessary information to enable the full consideration of this application given the significance of the asset and its location within the Faversham conservation area.
- 8.02 Following submission of an Archaeological Recording and Assessment Report (Oct 2016), Method Statement (March 2017) and the Site Inspection report produced by the County Archaeological Officer (produced in Jan 2016) and further clarification on new drawings (August 2017) the application is now in a position to be determined.
- 8.03 The submission is actually relatively simple in that it proposes to repair a dilapidated quay wall and to create a creekside walkway above it.
- 8.04 This produces two areas the Council needs to be satisfied about; firstly that given the wall contributes to the character and significance of Faversham conservation area the works need to ensure no harm comes to this significance and; secondly that the proposed walkway over the wall is an appropriate addition.
- 8.05 The report on the Site Investigations of the Brick River Frontage/Wharf by KCC produced in January 2016 details the condition of the wall, its historical value and provides details of what additional information is required to be provided.
- 8.06 The Archaeological Recording and Assessment of the SECOS Oil Depot creek frontage report dated October 2016, the subsequent structural details submitted by John Kettle & Associates dated April 2017 and Method Statement dated March 2017 combined have produced sufficient information and clarity that provides certainty of the works proposed and the impact of them.
- 8.07 Having considered the information, and taking into account the recommended conditions regarding the works to be undertaken and the materials to be used will ensure the finished works, I am now satisfied that the works will result in an asset whose significance would be enhanced by the proposal.
- 8.08 I note the comments from the consultees and acknowledge that many of the objections or concerns raised following the original submission have been addressed by the additional information mentioned above.
- 8.09 The submission is now clear that the works proposed will not encroach into the creek or interfere with the ownership of others, and as such the concerns of the adjacent landowner and the Environment Agency have been addressed.
- 8.10 I note the comments from Faversham Town Council, and note that their concern remains regarding the “gabions on top of the existing bullnose stone edgings, concrete, above that and with timber decking will be harmful to the character of the conservation area”.
- 8.11 However, the drawings submitted in August 2017 clearly show, granite stone cappings, a brushed concrete walkway and the removal of the originally proposed

timber walkway. I therefore consider the concerns to have been addressed by the revised scheme.

- 8.12 Secondly they questioned the lack of ecological or pollution reports accompanying the application, but I note the Environment Agency now offer no objection “from a fisheries and biodiversity” point of view and have not required such information so I do not consider it to be necessary.
- 8.13 They further considered the walkway would result in “harming the existing character of the quay side” I do not consider this to be the case given the materials to be proposed and the revised plan of the walkway.
- 8.14 I further note the final comment that they would welcome a widening of the footpath at each end to more than the 1 metre proposed however this application is primarily concerned with the restoration of the quay wall and the full extent of the walkway is included in detail within application 16/5087019/FULL (Erection of 10 dwellings with associated parking and landscaping) which covers the whole site.
- 8.15 Drawing 2491/PL/21 of the housing application shows the walkway along the frontage of the site to be 3m in width along its entire length. (Despite this drawing showing the walkway to be finished in tarmac I anticipate the Council requiring it to be brushed concrete as shown here as this is the most appropriate finish). As such I consider this has been adequately addressed.
- 8.16 Therefore, with the recommended conditions, I consider the principal of the proposal to be acceptable.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.01 This is a relatively simple scheme but the sensitive nature of this heritage asset and its location within Faversham conservation area have required more detail of the proposal to be submitted and reviewed. With that additional information in place I am now content with the supporting structural engineering information and detailing re the protection of, and repair and re-use of the section of remaining historic quayside in question. I consider the proposed design represents a practical and aesthetically acceptable solution to an area of the quay which would otherwise be submerged in water at high tide from time to time, and which in overall terms represents a small conservation gain and would have the net effect of enhancing the character and appearance of the Faversham conservation area at the location in question.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to the following conditions:

CONDITIONS

- (1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

Reason: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- (2) Prior to the commencement of development, details in the form of samples of the replacement facing bricks and details of the lime mortar mix to be used in the repair work hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

- (3) Prior to the commencement of the development samples of the granite stone to be used for the coping course should be made available for inspection and approval by the LPA at the application site and additionally full details of the quarry from which the natural granite coping stones have been sourced from shall be provided with the samples. Works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity

- (4) The developer shall afford access at all reasonable times to any archaeologist nominated by the Local Planning Authority and shall allow him/her to observe the excavations and record items of interest and finds. The developer shall inform the County Archaeologist of the start date of construction works on site not less than two weeks before the commencement of such works.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded.

- (5) No development approved by this planning permission shall commence until a strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the LPA. This strategy will include the following components:
1. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified all previous uses; potential contaminants associated with those uses; a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors; and potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.
 2. A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
 3. The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
 4. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution.

- (6) Prior to any part of the permitted development being brought into use a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the LPA. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

Reason: To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to human health or the water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete.

- (7) 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 LPA) shall be carried out until a strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site.

- (8) Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the LPA, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters. A suitable piling risk assessment should be submitted to support the proposed piling method. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site.

- (9) A sample area of 1m by 1m of brushed finished concrete surface shall be made available for inspection and approval by the LPA at the application site prior to the commencement of works to complete the walkway surface.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity

- (10) The working platform required to allow the carrying out of the phase one works, shall be removed on the completion of the phase two works, and before the remodelled quayside is first brought back into use.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity

The Council's approach to this application:

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

Offering pre-application advice.

Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome.

As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance the applicant/agent was advised of minor changes required to the application and these were agreed. The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the Committee and promote the application.

INFORMATIVES

Notwithstanding the details of the method statement, the coping stones to be used shall be of pure quarried granite, and that re-constituted stone will not be acceptable.

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.
The conditions set out in the report may be subject to such reasonable change as is necessary to ensure accuracy and enforceability.

