

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 17/504563/PNQCLA				
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Prior notification for the change of use of 2 agricultural buildings into 3 dwellings. For it's prior approval to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Transport and Highways impacts of the development.- Contamination risks on the site.- Flooding risks on the site.- Noise impacts of the development.- Whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the use of the building to change as proposed.- Design and external appearance impacts on the building.				
ADDRESS Paradise Farm Lower Hartlip Road Hartlip Sittingbourne Kent ME9 7SU				
RECOMMENDATION Prior Approval required and granted.				
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The application conforms with the requirements of the permitted development rights afforded under Class Q of the General Permitted Development Order (2015), and as such permission can't be refused.				
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Called in by Ward Member and Parish Council objection				
WARD Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch		PARISH/TOWN Hartlip	COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr James Robson AGENT CYMA Architects Ltd
DECISION DUE DATE 27/11/17		PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 31/10/17		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):				
App No	Proposal		Decision	Date
17/501265/COUNTY	County application for extraction of brickearth, access improvements, and restoration after exctraction is completed.		Objection raised by SBC, permission granted by KCC.	06.04.2017
The Council raised an objection to this County application (on land adjacent to the current application site) on the grounds of harm to residential amenity, from dust in particular. However the County Council ultimately granted permission for the works.				
16/502762/FULL	Conversion of redundant farm buildings to provide residential accommodation of 5 new dwellings with associated parking and garages.		Refused.	
The application was refused because of the site's remote location and the lack of any evidence to demonstrate that the buildings had been marketed for use as anything other than residential dwellings. There were also concerns in regards contamination of groundwater sources and displacement of protected species (bats, in particular). Members should note, however, that				

the current application is under the Prior Notification process and is not assessed under the same criteria as a full planning application.			
14/503400	County application for brickearth extraction on adjacent land.	Withdrawn	2014
14/501272	Prior Notification application for change of use from agricultural to a single dwelling (Scotts Hill Farm, Hartlip)	Refused, appeal allowed	20.10.2014
SBC refused the application on the grounds that the site was in an unsustainable location, but in allowing the subsequent appeal the Inspector made it clear that NPPG advised this was a suitable location and a sustainability test was not required.			
SW/04/1093	Change of use to non-domestic storage, light industrial use, and formation of a new access.	Refused.	2004
Reason for refusal centred on the design, location and scale of the proposed new access road detracting from the character and appearance of the rural area.			
SW/03/0871	Lawful Development Certificate for use as builder's workshop, storage of plant and equipment, and garaging of vehicles.	Refused.	2003
The LDC was refused as insufficient evidence was provided to adequately demonstrate that the buildings had been in use for storage and garaging. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Inspector.			

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 Application site comprises two former agricultural buildings situated off Lower Hartlip Road. They are positioned at the end of a long private access track (approx. 180m) and comprise a collection of traditional brick and timber (with corrugated roofs and some corrugated wall sections) agricultural buildings in a loose knit farmyard layout.
- 1.02 The buildings appear to be in relatively reasonable condition, although deteriorating slightly through lack of use.
- 1.03 To the south, east, north and west are fields / orchards, with the residential properties known as Paradise Farmhouse and The Stables lying immediately adjacent to the northwest. There are a number of residential properties to the west and southwest.
- 1.04 The site lies approximately 2.2km from Newington village centre by road (2km via PRow), and 4km from Rainham town centre.
- 1.05 The submitted Design & Access Statement explains:

"The drive from Lower Hartlip Road to the site is about 180m long. The land in the ownership of the applicant covers an area of about 4,300msq or 0.43 hectares and is the former farmyard and agricultural buildings to Paradise Farm. The original farmhouse is located to the north of the site and is in separate ownership. The access drive has a gated entrance to the site and continues along the boundary to the grounds of the former farmhouse, through the site from west to east and on into the open agricultural land to the east. The access road is in a separate ownership, but the Land Registry Documents (K886028 see Appendix 1) confirms that the land at Paradise Farm, that is the

subject of this application, enjoys the right of access over the access road, and to the passage of gas, electricity, water and foul waste water.”

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 This is an application submitted under the prior notifications (PN) procedure for the conversion of the buildings to form three residential dwellings.
- 2.02 Members should note that, because this is a PN application, it is a technical assessment of the facts of the scheme to determine if it accords with the specified requirements as set out by Class Q of the General Permitted Development Order (2015), and not an objective assessment of the planning merits of the development. If the proposal meets the requirements of Class Q it can't be refused.
- 2.03 The scheme seeks to convert the two existing buildings into three residential dwellings. This will be done through internal alterations and installation of necessary services, the insertion of new doors and windows, and installation of replacement roof covering. No extension of the buildings is proposed.
- 2.04 Block 1 (directly in front of the access road) is the larger of the two and is roughly L-shaped. It will be divided in half so that each “arm” of the L forms a single semi-detached dwelling – plots 1 and 2. Each dwelling will have three bedrooms (two within the roof space) and associated bathroom, kitchen, dining room, etc.
- 2.05 Block 2 (to the rear of Paradise Farmhouse) will be converted into a single, three-bed dwelling with associated living space.
- 2.06 Each dwelling will have a private garden area and car parking space.

3.0 SUMMARY INFORMATION

	Proposed
Net Floor Area	383sqm
Parking Spaces	3
No. of Residential Units	3

4.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 4.01 None.

5.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.01 The main consideration here is the requirements set out by Class Q of the General Permitted Development (England) Order (2015) (as amended), which sets out the permitted development requirements for conversion of agricultural buildings to residential dwellings.
- 5.02 The conversion of agricultural buildings (other than in conservation areas, SSSIs, and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) is now permitted development by virtue of Class Q of the Order, subject to certain limitations and to an application for prior approval in relation to matters of:
- Transport and Highways impacts of the development.
 - Contamination risks on the site.

- Flooding risks on the site.
- Noise impacts of the development.
- Whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the use of the building to change as proposed.
- Design and external appearance impacts on the building

5.03 The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provides commentary on the working of Class Q, and states the following (my emphasis in bold):

What are the residential uses?

Subject to a number of conditions and restrictions, agricultural buildings and land within their curtilage may convert to a use falling within Class C3 of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order 1987 (dwelling houses). These conditions and restrictions are set out in Class Q of Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. The maximum floor space that may be converted under this permitted development right is 450 square metres of floor space of a building or buildings within a single established agricultural unit. The total number of new homes which may be developed under the right is 3. The right is extinguished once any of the conditions ie the 3 dwellings or 450 square metres threshold, is reached. The total number of new homes (3 dwelling houses) does not include existing residential properties within the established agricultural unit, unless they were created by the use of the permitted development right on a previous occasion, in which case they would be counted.

Are any building works allowed when changing to residential use?

Building works are allowed under the change to residential use. The permitted development right under Class Q assumes that the agricultural building is capable of functioning as a dwelling. However, it recognises that **for the building to function as a dwelling some building operations which would affect the external appearance of the building, which would otherwise require planning permission, should be permitted.** The right allows for the installation or replacement of windows, doors, roofs, exterior walls, water, drainage, electricity, gas or other services to the extent reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwelling house; and partial demolition to the extent reasonably necessary to carry out these building operations. It is not the intention of the permitted development right to include the construction of new structural elements for the building. Therefore it is only where the existing building is structurally strong enough to take the loading which comes with the external works to provide for residential use that the building would be considered to have the permitted development right.

Are there any limitations to the change to residential use?

There are some limitations to the change to residential use. The Class Q rights cannot be exercised where works for the building, extending or altering of a building, or the installation of additional or replacement plant or machinery for the purposes of agriculture under the existing agricultural permitted development, have been carried out on the established agricultural unit since 20 March 2013, or within 10 years before exercising the change to residential use, whichever is the lesser. The agricultural permitted development rights are

set out in Class A (a) or Class B (a) of Part 6 of Schedule 2 to the General Permitted Development Order (agricultural buildings and operations).

In addition, the site must have been used solely for an agricultural use, as part of an established agricultural unit, on 20 March 2013, or if it was not in use on that date, when it was last in use. If the site was brought into use after 20 March 2013, then it must have been used solely for an agricultural use, as part of an established agricultural unit, for 10 years before the date the development begins. If there is an agricultural tenancy in place, there are separate arrangements set out in Class Q.

Are there any conditions attached to the change to residential use?

There are some conditions attached to the change to residential use. Before beginning the development, an individual will need to apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the local planning authority is necessary for the change of use. This prior approval will be in respect of transport, highways and noise impacts of the development, and also as to the flooding and contamination risks on the site, and whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the building to change from agricultural use to dwelling house. In addition, applicants will need to check whether the prior approval of the authority will be required as to the design or external appearance of the building.

*The procedure for prior approval is set out in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. This procedure was amended in April 2014 to make clear **that the local planning authority must only consider the National Planning Policy Framework to the extent that it is relevant to the matter on which prior approval is sought, for example, transport, highways, noise etc.***

Is there a sustainability prior approval for the change to residential use?

The permitted development right does not apply a test in relation to sustainability of location. This is deliberate as the right recognises that many agricultural buildings will not be in village settlements and may not be able to rely on public transport for their daily needs. Instead, the local planning authority can consider whether the location and siting of the building would make it impractical or undesirable to change use to a house.

What is meant by impractical or undesirable for the change to residential use?

Impractical or undesirable are not defined in the regulations, and the local planning authority should apply a reasonable ordinary dictionary meaning in making any judgment. Impractical reflects that the location and siting would “not be sensible or realistic”, and undesirable reflects that it would be “harmful or objectionable”.

When considering whether it is appropriate for the change of use to take place in a particular location, a local planning authority should start from the premise that the permitted development right grants planning permission, subject to the prior approval requirements. That an agricultural building is in a location where the local planning authority

would not normally grant planning permission for a new dwelling is not a sufficient reason for refusing prior approval.

There may, however, be circumstances where the impact cannot be mitigated. Therefore, when looking at location, local planning authorities may, for example, consider that because an agricultural building on the top of a hill with no road access, power source or other services its conversion is impractical. Additionally the location of the building whose use would change may be undesirable if it is adjacent to other uses such as intensive poultry farming buildings, silage storage or buildings with dangerous machines or chemicals.

When a local authority considers location and siting it should not therefore be applying tests from the National Planning Policy Framework except to the extent these are relevant to the subject matter of the prior approval. So, for example, factors such as whether the property is for a rural worker, or whether the design is of exceptional quality or innovative, are unlikely to be relevant.

- 5.04 The policies of the adopted Local Plan do not fall to be considered here, as this is a technical assessment of whether or not the scheme meets the requirements of Class Q, as above.

6.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.01 Four letters of objection have been received from Cllr Wright in his capacity as an adjoining neighbour, in which he suggests that the application is invalid, the scheme is not permitted development and raises the following summarised points:

- The site is occupied under an agricultural tenancy [NB: it isn't];
- He has not given his consent as landlord [NB: he is not the landlord of the application site outlined in red];
- The red line includes land under his ownership [NB: the drawings have been corrected to exclude land not owned by the applicant]
- The drawings are incorrect [NB: they have been corrected];
- The buildings come close to the permitted allowance of 450sqm [NB: they do not exceed 450sqm];
- Does not comply with the NPPF requirements for sustainable development;
- Access track is in private ownership and there may be additional maintenance requirements arising from increased use;
- The amended drawings do not indicate how the site will access the highway network [NB: it is not a requirement that they do so];
- Sheep will be grazed in the field adjacent to the access track;
- The access track is not wide enough for vehicles to pass;
- Increased traffic onto Lower Hartlip Road;
- Junction between access track and Lower Hartlip Road is inadequate;
- He will be erecting a gate across the access road, and vehicles will have to stop on the highway to open it with consequent highway safety issues;
- The site may be contaminated;
- The site is within a water protection zone [NB: outer zone, zone 3];
- Agricultural pesticides on nearby fields may drift across the site;
- The buildings may have been used for storage of agricultural pesticides and chemicals;
- Burning took place in a pit on the site;
- Permission has been granted for brickearth extraction on fields to the east [NB: with an 80m buffer zone];

- The new dwellings could use agricultural PD rights to construct additional buildings [NB: they couldn't, as they would not benefit from agricultural PD rights]; and
- Various criticisms of inaccuracies within the submitted D&A and ecology report [NB: these are not required for the purposes of a PN application and I give them little weight in any instance];
- The site is not an agricultural holding of 15 acres [NB: this is not a requirement under Class Q];
- Unsustainable location;
- Will be a difficult site to deliver development on; and
- Parts of the building were originally thatched.

6.02 Two additional letters have been received from other residents, and raise the following summarised issues:

- The application doesn't meet the requirements of Class Q;
- Increased traffic is unacceptable;
- Agricultural use of the buildings has been abandoned;
- The access road is private and the new dwellings should be made to contribute to its upkeep;
- No highways assessment has been submitted;
- Lack of vehicle sight lines;
- The development affects a farm tenancy agreement [NB: the application site is not subject to an agricultural tenancy agreement];
- Unsustainable location;
- Potential for flooding from drainage;
- *"Reserve the right to plant or build any gardening structure to block any view any new proposal or build next door would have to protect our privacy;"*
- Potential for contamination on the site; and
- Noise and disturbance.

7.0 CONSULTATIONS

7.01 Hartlip Parish Council has objected to the scheme on the following summarised grounds:

- The access road is in private ownership;
- Within an impractical and undesirable location;
- Outside the built up area and not designated for residential development;
- The site is contaminated;
- Site is within a minerals safeguarding area;
- Brickearth extraction is due to commence on nearby land; and
- Wildlife in the area would be disturbed.

7.02 Kent Highways and Transportation have no objection, but I have asked for further comments to clarify vehicle access to the site. In this regard I refer to their comments in respect of the previous application for planning permission to convert the buildings to dwellings (ref. 16/502762/FULL):

"The bend in the road is in favour of the site, as the access is on the outside of it, so the sightlines are actually pushed forwards into the road. A car waiting to emerge from the access can be seen from around 110m south of the access, and getting on for around 85m from the north. Approaching vehicles will therefore view a car from a reasonable distance"

To be honest, I think you'd struggle to object, as it would be hard to demonstrate that traffic from 5 houses would be significantly worse than the traffic that could be possible from agricultural use of the site and its existing buildings. Given the length of the access track, and the level of activity expected, it's likely to be very infrequent that 2 opposing vehicles would meet exactly at the access point onto Lower Hartlip Road, and should it occur somewhere along the length of the track itself, this wouldn't affect the public highway where our interest would be."

- 7.03 Further to receipt of a contamination survey the Council's Environmental Health Manager has no objection subject to the contamination condition set out below. He also suggested an hours of work / deliveries condition, but it is not within the Council's powers to impose those on a PN application, as we are only looking at the scope of the development itself and not the associated construction activities.

8.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

- 8.01 The application is accompanied by all relevant and necessary drawings.
- 8.02 Of particular relevance is application ref. 14/501272 (PINS ref. 3003010), which relates to Scotts Hill Farm, a nearby property in Hartlip. In allowing the appeal the Inspector commented:

"3. National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) makes it clear that the permitted development right in this class does not apply a test in relation to sustainability or location. Therefore, the appeal would not fail on this ground. It would not appear to be an impractical location for conversion, as it has its own access from a main road and there is no evidence that the conversion works necessary could not be undertaken at the site.

4. The location and siting would not be undesirable; the appeal building is small, is visible from the road and is not seen as part of the open countryside. Therefore, a residential use would not be incompatible with its surroundings. I have taken account of the footpath, but in this location the change of use to the appeal building, including a domestic curtilage, would have very little impact in the landscape. The appeal building would not be considered as an isolated house in the countryside as it is only 85 metres from a residential area, visible from a partly residential road and close to the settlement boundary. The decisions referred to by the Council are not relevant because they either pre-date the PPG alterations relating to class Q, are located much further away from the settlement or relate to a holiday let (with little indication of a specific distance from the village)."

9.0 APPRAISAL

Principle

- 9.01 Of relevance to the considerations of this Prior Notification are the historic applications noted above. The 2003 application sought a lawful development certificate for non-domestic storage, but was refused by the Council on a lack of evidence and subsequently dismissed by the Inspector at a public inquiry, where the validity and accuracy of the appellant's submissions were criticised.

- 9.02 In 2004 a retrospective planning application was submitted for light industrial use of the buildings. This was refused on the grounds that such a use would be harmful to local amenity. Shortly thereafter an enforcement notice was served against the unauthorised light industrial use, which consequently ceased.
- 9.03 Whilst there has been an unauthorised light industrial use of the buildings, their lawful use remains as agricultural and there has not been any other use for an unbroken period of 10 years within the planning history for the site that would alter this situation. Therefore, the last *lawful* use of the buildings was for agriculture and the consideration of this case can proceed as a matter of principle.

Class Q criteria

- 9.04 I'd reiterate that it is important for Members to note from the outset that this is not an application for planning permission; it is a request to determine whether or not prior approval is required **only** in relation to:
- Transport and Highways impacts of the development.
 - Contamination risks on the site.
 - Flooding risks on the site.
 - Noise impacts of the development.
 - Whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the use of the building to change as proposed.
 - Design and external appearance impacts on the building
- 9.05 As a result, this is purely a technical assessment of the issues outlined in the GPDO (as set out at 5.03 above), which itself grants deemed planning permission for the development, and would normally be dealt with entirely under delegated powers. It has been referred to Members because the powers delegated to the Head of Planning require proposals which have a recommendation contrary to a view stated by the Parish Council to be reported to Planning Committee. (I would note, however, that the only relevant, material planning considerations they have raised are in respect of site contamination, which is discussed in detail below). Please note that the ward member has also "called in" this item so that it is reported to the planning committee for members consideration.
- 9.06 I am of the opinion that the proposal now being considered wholly complies with the conditions as set out in Class Q of the GPDO 2015 and the advice of the NPPG (as set out at 5.03 above). The agent has described in their Planning Statement how the proposal meets all of the requirements of Class Q and I concur with their views.
- 9.07 Set out below are the matters that fall to be considered under Class Q (and accompanying paragraph W) of the GPDO 2015.

Transport and Highways Impacts of the Development

- 9.08 The application, because it amounts to the creation of fewer than 6 dwellings, falls short of the agreed threshold for Kent Highways to comment. I have, however, asked for their detailed comments and will update Members at the meeting. Nonetheless, the creation of three dwellings is unlikely to give rise to significant numbers of additional vehicle movements to cause harm to the wider highway network sufficient to require the Council's prior approval. Parking and turning is available within the site, and would similarly not require prior approval in my opinion.

- 9.09 I note objections received in respect of the private access road, but this does not form part of the adopted highways network, and is thus not a matter for consideration. Use of a private access is a private legal matter to be agreed between the owner and the applicant, and is not a material planning consideration under Class Q. (I have, however, been given a copy of the Land Title by Cllr Wright, and note that it appears to grant unrestricted rights of access for occupiers / users of these buildings along the access road by foot, vehicle, horse, cart, and all other modes of transport.)
- 9.10 I note Cllr Wright's suggestion that he intends to erect a gate close to the highway, and that this will affect highway safety. This appears to me, to be an attempt to stymie the development, and will potentially put all users of the highway at risk. However, the gate is not in place at present and should therefore be afforded little weight in the decision-making process, in my view. I have also had regard to appeal decisions where highway access has been a factor in refusing prior approval on highways grounds, and where subsequent appeals have been dismissed. However, these appear to largely relate to sites where there was a significant *combination* of factors (poor visibility, unmade access road, high road speed, position in relation to existing highway junctions, etc.) and I do not consider that there are direct comparisons between those and this site to the extent that the application could justifiably be refused.
- 9.11 Subject to further comments from Kent Highways I do not consider the Council's prior approval is required in respect of highways and transport.

Noise Impacts of the Development

- 9.12 Residential use of the buildings would not give rise to such substantial noise or disturbance so as to require the Council's prior approval. A certain degree of noise is to be expected during conversion works, but this would be short-lived and is a factor of development in general.
- 9.13 In my opinion there is little potential for significant noise and disturbance to future residents from existing surrounding activities, which largely amount to grazing, agricultural land, residential uses, and a commercial nursery. I do note that Kent County Council has recently granted permission for brickearth extraction on the land to the east, however. This has potential for noise disturbance, but due to the buffer zone to be incorporated around the existing adjacent dwellings I consider that this is unlikely to be to a degree that would seriously harm residential amenity or justify a refusal here. Furthermore I note that the Borough Council did not raise an objection on noise grounds when consulted on the County application.

Contamination Risks of the Site

- 9.14 The Council's Environmental Health Manager identified that the site, because of its past agricultural use, may be contaminated. Agricultural buildings are often used for the storage of chemicals, which can require some remediation once the use has ceased. A contamination survey was submitted (as additional information) further to his comments, which he has assessed and considers to be acceptable. The EH Manager therefore raises no objection subject to the condition set out below, which requires evidence to show that the remediation works identified in the contamination survey have been carried out as necessary.
- 9.15 The need for planning conditions, in itself, suggests that the Council's prior approval is required on this aspect of the development. However, the Council has the powers to grant its prior approval subject to the imposition of the suggested conditions, which is

in accordance with the regulations and has been done on previous similar applications – 17/501760/PNQCLA is one such conditional approval granted at Brent Orchard, Lower Halstow, earlier this year.

- 9.16 Therefore, subject to the condition requested by the EH Manager I consider that the Council's prior approval is required in respect of contamination, and should be granted.

Flooding Risks on the Site

- 9.17 The site is not within a defined Flood Zone, and the Council's prior approval is therefore not required in this regard.

Location or Siting

- 9.18 The site lies adjacent to existing residential dwellings, and close to Hartlip and Newington. The land is served by an existing vehicular access via Lower Hartlip Road. The NPPG, case law, and also the appeal decision in relation to Scotts Farm (as above) indicate that this location can't be considered unsustainable for the purposes of the consideration of an application for prior notification, and I therefore consider that prior approval is not required in this respect.
- 9.19 There is a pair of listed cottages to the west of the site, fronting on to Lower Hartlip Road. These are a minimum of approximately 260m from the nearest part of the buildings to be converted, and therefore unlikely to be affected by the proposed conversion.
- 9.20 With regard to proposed brickearth extraction on land to the east, as discussed above, I do not consider that this would be seriously harmful to the extent that this could be considered an unsuitable location for residential development.

Design or External Appearance of the Building

- 9.21 The design of the proposed dwellings is, in my opinion, acceptable. They will have a mixture of traditional (stable doors, shutter, crittal style windows, etc.) and modern details (bi-fold doors) but will, on the whole, be of a good standard of design. I do not consider that the proposed appearance of the buildings would be harmful to the character or appearance of the site or the wider countryside, and prior approval is therefore not required in this regard.

Other matters

- 9.22 As noted above, the Council has very limited powers under which it can consider these sorts of application, and these have been set out in detail above. Comments raised in respect of rights of access, minerals safeguarding, agricultural pesticides, ecology, brickearth extraction, public transport, rural protection policies, etc. are not material to the consideration of this proposal and do not amount to reasons to refuse prior approval.

10.0 CONCLUSION

- 10.01 This proposal meets the requirements of Class Q and is acceptable. However further details are required in respect of potential contamination on the site, and in this regard a condition is necessary to secure the relevant works / information.

10.02 I note local objections but they do not amount to a reason for the Council to justifiably refuse consent under the very limited scope of the Class Q prior notifications procedure.

10.03 Therefore, with the above in mind, I recommend that the Council's prior approval is required in respect of contamination risks at the site, and should be granted subject to the condition set out below.

11.0 RECOMMENDATION – PRIOR APPROVAL IS REQUIRED AND IS GRANTED
Subject to the following condition:

- 1) No development shall be commenced until a Closure Report, including full verification of the submitted remediation method statement (and incorporating details of any post remediation sampling and analysis, together with documentation certifying quantities and source/destination of any material brought onto or taken from the site) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any material brought onto the site shall be certified clean.

Reason: To ensure any contaminated land is adequately dealt with.

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.

