

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 19/506038/REM		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Reserved matters of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, including external lighting and pedestrian crossing following an outline application 18/500041/OUT for erection of a new Community Hall, outside recreational facilities and car parking.		
ADDRESS Land Fronting Painters Forstal Road Ospringe Kent ME13 0EG		
RECOMMENDATION - Grant		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Contrary representations from Ospringe Parish Council		
WARD East Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Ospringe	APPLICANT Painters Forstal Community Association AGENT Red House Design
DECISION DUE DATE 12/02/20	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 23/01/20	

Planning History

18/500041/OUT

Outline application for the erection of a new Community Hall, outside recreational facilities and car parking (All Matters Reserved).

Approved Decision Date: 17.04.2018

SEE COPY OF DECISION NOTICE AT APPENDIX 1

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 The site is an open roadside field situated just to the north of the centre of Painters Forstal. There is an existing access in the form of a five bar gate already in situ. To the north is an existing dwelling at Pawley Farm; to the south are some residential dwellings separated by a small area of open field; to the east, across the road, are a number of residential properties situated in 'Cades Orchard'; whilst there are open fields to the west. The land is approximately 0.5m higher than that at Pawley Farm, which is a matter to be referred to later in this report
- 1.02 The site is situated just outside the Local Plan defined built up area boundary of Painters Forstal, and within the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
- 1.03 In 2018 outline planning permission with all matters reserved was granted under planning reference 18/500041/OUT for a new community hall, outside recreational facilities and car parking on this site. This permission includes conditions relating to the need for a 5m landscaped buffer along the boundary with Pawley Farm, control of external lighting, the need for a Construction Method Statement, hours of construction, hours of use, parking, cycle parking, sightlines and a pedestrian crossing. A copy of the decision notice is at Appendix 1 to this item, where these conditions can be seen in full. They all continue to apply to this development and those that control hours of construction and hours of use etc. do not need repeating at this reserved matters stage.

2 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The current application is a reserved matters application for the detailed layout and design of the community hall and site. The principle of this development on the site has already been established by the outline permission, and it is simply issues of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale that are to be determined under the current application.
- 2.02 The community hall itself is shown as a low-level timber clad (using locally sourced sweet chestnut) single-storey building of contemporary design and appearance featuring dark grey aluminium windows under a flat roof . It would have a footprint of 20.5m by 12.8m (with a further 3 to 4m overhang on the southern and eastern sides) to include the main hall, a kitchen, store and plant rooms, a lobby/drop in room, and toilets. The roof height would be 3.8m.
- 2.03 The building would be situated approximately 6.3m from the north-eastern boundary with Pawley Farm and approximately 12m further back from the rear of that property with a parking area for twelve cars to the front. An overflow parking area for 17 cars is shown at the southern end of the site. Covered cycle parking also shown under the buildings overhang, together with two electric vehicle charging points.
- 2.04 The north west corner of the site leaves a gap between the end of the building and the boundary, in case any future extension to the building is needed. However, such an extension is not part of the present application.
- 2.05 The building is orientated to face the south west, with a large expanse of grass to the south west, which will include a wildlife garden in the southwestern corner of the site. There would be large glass folding doors facing this area.
- 2.06 The application is accompanied by a Design, Access and Planning Statement; full plans and perspective visual drawings; a landscaping plan; and a Construction Management Plan (see Appendix B of the Design and Planning Statement).
- 2.07 The landscaping plan shows, amongst other features, a 5m planted buffer zone along the boundary with Pawley Farm as required by the outline planning permission.
- 2.08 The Planning statement includes the following information:

‘The building has been located as far away from Pawley farmhouse as possible to address the concerns raised by the residents at outline application stage. No part of the proposed building adjoins the farmhouse and, as conditioned by the outline consent (and explained in the officer’s report on the outline application), residential amenity will be protected by the provision of a 5m planted landscape buffer. In addition to this, the low-rise design of the building seeks to address the concerns previously raised about overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy.

Concerns were also raised about noise and light pollution. Noise arising from the use of the hall will be controlled in accordance with the normal standards and by the hours of operation attached by condition to the outline consent. It is also the case that the building will have a high level of insulation. Also, within the building the hall is located at the front, the furthest point away from the

farmhouse, and so any noise will be further contained by the store room and the kitchen/toilet area which are located to the rear of the building.

With regard to light pollution, the design does not include any proposed floodlighting or highlevel lighting, as explained elsewhere in this statement. Any spillage of lighting from within the building will be ameliorated by the overhanging canopy, though no lighting at all is proposed at the rear of the building.

The statement also refer to the inclusion of air source or ground source heat pumps, low energy LED lighting, electric vehicle charging points and rainwater harvesting for watering and maintenance purposes.

3 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

3.01 Outside Established built-up area boundary

4 POLICY AND CONSIDERATIONS

4.01 Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 policies ST7, CP4, CP5, CP6, DM14 and DM19.

5 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.01 The Faversham Society supports the application, noting that; *'This application should be SUPPORTED because it provides much needed amenity for the village and is a well-designed proposal'*.

5.02 The AKO Foundation (a registered charity and strong supporter of community action) has made two grants to the project and fully supports the new community hall. They say they *"believe that the design/plan proposed is a model of its type that can be copied by others across the country"*.

5.03 A member of the Faversham and Villages Refugee Solidarity Committee has written to support the application, seeing it as a potential meeting place, and welcoming the care taken to consider the environmental impact of the hall

5.04 A representation on behalf of the West Faversham Community Centre supports the application, them having offered advice to the project, and seeing a need for more such facilities with the extensive expansion of Faversham. They see the proposal as well thought out and designed with today's users in mind.

5.05 Four objections to the application have been received, all from the immediate neighbours at Pawley Farm and their relatives. The views contained therein are summarised as follows:

- We have no objection in principle to a village hall being built but we object to the position of the proposed hall within the site which is close to the only property adjoining the site

- *‘The proximity to our property and surrounding amenity areas would have a significant and harmful impact on our use and enjoyment of the same and in particular intrude greatly upon our privacy’*
- Views to the farthest side of our farm would be removed
- Negative impact on value of our property
- Noise and air pollution from adjacent parking area
- It would be more appropriate for the building and permanent car parking area to be located on the far side of the development area and primarily within the area currently identified as ‘Wildlife/Attenuation pond’
- We have undertaken to assist in costs for further drawings to move the building
- Site has a ground level two feet higher than our land so the whole building should be set down, wherever it is located
- Proposed buffer should be 7.5 metres at least
- Not clear on what the proposed buffer landscaping would consist of; we would be opposed to any trees here, especially malus species
- Is the scheme financially viable?
- Increase in traffic by users travelling from outside the village
- Loss of light
- The proposal would impact upon their right to the privacy and peaceful enjoyment of the neighbours’ home (with its windows facing the site) and garden
- Is the proposed parking sufficient?

5.06 I have also received 26 supporting representations, some from Faversham. Their contents may be summarised as follows:

- There is an obvious need for a central community place within the village
- This will reduce the need to travel to Faversham for many events and activities
- Well-thought out, careful low-rise design
- Site is well located and ideal for such a use
- Access is appropriately situated on the site
- Proposed cycle storage is useful
- Painters Forstal has no facilities; *‘a healthy village needs a place where folk can meet for mutual support, particularly the sick and elderly, there being a minimum of public transport available’*
- Will bring life back into the village

- No community hub since use of the Methodist Hall was lost in 2015
- *‘The proposed design, layout and positioning within the site will maximise use of solar benefits in relation to heating and lighting, and accordingly limit the energy use to operate and maintain the facility’*
- *‘Our communities around Painters Forstal have been identified as having significant degrees of both geographical and social isolation for many residents. There is a wealth of evidence from such projects which demonstrate increased social cohesion within communities, alongside resultant improvements in physical and mental health wellbeing of residents and other users of services operating from community halls’*
- A wide consultation exercise to assess local needs was undertaken
- Building is located at the highest point of the field for drainage issues, and to make the maximum potential for outdoor use whilst shielding the neighbouring property
- Will create jobs for local people
- Strong environmental elements to the proposal
- The direction of the plot means any noise will naturally be pushed away from nearby properties towards open fields
- It will not be over obtrusive to neighbours

6 CONSULTATIONS

6.01 Ospringe Parish Council has raised objection to the proposal. Their comments are given in full as follows:

‘The parish council considered this application at its meeting on 8 January. We had the benefit of hearing at some length from representatives of PFCA regarding the application, and also from a representative of the owners of Pawley Farm, being the adjoining property on the northern side. Our comments are as follows.

We commend the architect, and find the design of the hall and the other proposed facilities to be attractive and imaginative, whilst (according to the Design and Planning Statement (“D&PS”)) still taking heed of PFCA’s initial budgetary constraints.

While supportive of the application and the design proposals for the building, our most serious concern relates to the proposed position of the building on the site. Positioning the hall close to the northern boundary is likely to significantly adversely affect the amenity of the adjoining property Pawley Farm. Whilst we were told that the building had been moved modestly further to the north-west and a buffer zone of just in excess of 6m is planned between the rear of the building and the boundary to try and reduce its impact, our strong preference would be for the building and the hardstanding car park area to be moved elsewhere on the site where the overall impact would be reduced.

We have not seen a copy of the Ecological Survey referred to in the D&PS but understand from this and the PFCA representatives that only a badger latrine was found in the western corner of the site, and that it is likely that badgers forage and graze across the whole of the site and further afield. Provided the existence of the latrine does not preclude the western corner of the site being used for the building, we would welcome the applicants reconsidering the location of the building as well as the parking hardstanding. Whilst the western corner would be furthest from Pawley Farm, we considered that positioning the building more centrally north to south towards the rear (west) of the site could also still achieve the applicant's aims and provide a suitable setting for the building and the other facilities planned by PFCA as illustrated by the drawings.

Likewise, the effect on the amenity of Pawley Farm and its occupants of the proposed position of the hardstanding car parking close to the northern boundary concerned us, both as regards noise and fumes

Although not a material planning consideration, we saw a letter from the owners of Pawley Farm in which they offered a contribution to PFCA's costs of preparing revised plans. We are mindful of PFCA's finances and saw this as a means by which the alternative siting of the building and car parking could be investigated without possibly impinging on PFCA's resources, and we would very much welcome this being explored by PFCA and the owners of Pawley Farm.

If re-siting of the building to elsewhere on the plot is not considered necessary or desirable, then we would expect as much mitigation as possible of its impact on the adjoining property. Such measures could include – (1) moving the building further to the north-west and southwest away from the boundary, and extending the buffer zone; (2) conditioning that all windows on the northern elevation should be opaque and non-opening; (3) that no mechanical extraction should be sited in the northern elevation; (4) that the refuse bins be re-located away from the northern or eastern elevation; (5) that the skylights be non-opening and of a type to suppress noise transmission; (6) precluding the planting of trees in the buffer zone and instead providing for a hedge, with height being limited to a specified measurement to prevent overshadowing of the neighbour's property and garden.

We were also mindful that the ground levels of the plot are higher than the adjoining property. To reduce visual impact in all directions, we felt that ground levels should be reduced to those of the adjoining property coupled with a condition prescribing the maximum height of the roof above MSL or other identifiable yardstick.

We would also ask that the mix of hedging should not include malus.

The car parking concerns us. As well as the proposed location of the hardstanding (see above) we are concerned that sufficient onsite parking should be provided to prevent offsite parking in the vicinity and the village. Although we noted that the application provides for parking to KCC standards,

we would wish for additional spaces beyond those proposed to be earmarked to prevent offsite parking problems, with a condition that these be left available for use even if not formal hardstanding.

We considered the sustainability of the building and the comments in the D&PS. Whilst we welcomed the possible sustainability measures described in the Design and Planning statement which would contribute to the building of an environmentally sustainable community hall, we read them as aspirational rather than definite. Our experience suggests that some of the measures mentioned need to be incorporated or allowed for in the original design and construction stages rather than retro-fitted. We are also mindful of the cost implications to the project of implementing such measures, and if it were to be the case that incorporating the measures would make building of the hall financially unviable then we would accept that any unaffordable measures should be excluded. We would wish the applicants to incorporate as much sustainability as their budget allows.

Given problems elsewhere in the parish and nearby, we would ask that the construction management plan ensures provision for sufficient parking onsite for all vehicles including service and (sub)contractor traffic involved in the construction, and that there be a prescribed route for all vehicles coming to and leaving the site.'

- 6.02 The applicants have responded to these comments, and those expressed by the objectors, as follows:

'The Trustees of the Painters Forstal Community Association (PFCA) have reviewed the comments made on the above-mentioned application. We were pleased to note that by the deadline for comments (23 January) 32 comments of support and just one objection had been submitted. We note that Ospringe Parish Council state that they support the application, but wish to see a number of changes. We also note the comments made by KCC Highways, and these have been addressed in amended plans.

In this letter I provide PFCA's response to the changes sought by Ospringe Parish Council and by the objector, Mr & Mrs Macey, which are very similar. We note that since the deadline for comments three further objections have been submitted by other members of the Macey family, but these do not make any additional points.

Positioning of the Building

Both the Parish Council and Mr & Mrs Macey are concerned that the positioning of the building will impact on the amenity of the adjoining Pawley Farm (the home of the objector). They both wish to see the building and the car parking moved to the other side of the site.

PFCA does not consider that the building will have the impacts claimed, and its' relocation would require a complete redesign of the building and of the layout of the whole site. The building has been specifically designed for this

location, which we believe is the most sustainable and beneficial. Condition (4) of the outline planning consent (18/500041/OUT) addresses the issue of impact on the residential amenity of Pawley Farm by requiring the provision of a “landscaped buffer area not less than 5m in width along the entire northern boundary of the site”. We have complied fully with this condition; in fact the building is set 6.35m away from the boundary with Pawley Farm, rather than the minimum 5m required. Furthermore, after discussion with the objector prior to submission, we moved the building a further 5.5m away from Pawley Farm than originally proposed, by moving it as far as possible into the northern corner of the site.

In addition, in designing the building we have been mindful of potential impact on the residents. The building is compact in form, modest in size and single storey with a flat roof. This means that its physical presence is much less than it could have been; certainly less than a traditional pitched roof style village hall and the nearby farm outbuildings. Also, the building has been designed so that any noise arising from the main hall will be further ‘buffered’ from Pawley Farm by the store room and service rooms. The building will be insulated and the appropriate noise standards will need to be adhered to. The operational hours are already the subject of a condition attached to the outline consent. Furthermore, with the building facing to the south-west, away from the farm, rather than to south-east, the activities in the hall will not be visible from the farm and there will be no overlooking. There will be also be no floodlighting.

Further Mitigation

Should their suggestion to re-locate the building not be accepted, the Parish Council and Mr & Mrs Macey seek further mitigation to the building as proposed. To this end they make the following suggestions, to which I set out PFCA’s response:

1. Move the building further to the north-west and south-west away from the boundary, and extend the buffer zone.

PFCA response: It is not possible to move the building any further to the north-west without removing the possibility of an extension to the hall. By moving the building further to the south-west, and thus extending the buffer even further, will mean that it will be more isolated in its position on the site, and thus become intrusive in views. As proposed, the building will be seen as part of the cluster of farm buildings in views from Painters Forstal Road, which we believe is a point of good planning practice.

2. Conditioning that all windows on the northern elevation should be opaque and non-opening.

PFCA response: We are content to accept this as a condition.

3. That no mechanical extraction should be sited in the northern elevation.

PFCA response: As far as possible any mechanical extraction will be placed on the roof of the building. However, it would be unreasonable to exclude all mechanical extraction from the northern elevation of the building as there would be no impact on residential amenity by having extractors along the far end of this side of the building opposite the farm outbuildings.

4. That the refuse bins be re-located away from the northern or eastern elevations.

PFCA response: We are content to accept this as a condition.

5. That the skylights be non-opening and of a type to suppress noise transmission.

PFCA response: We are content to accept that the skylights (light cannons) are non-opening. Together with other measures incorporated into the design this will be more than sufficient to suppress any noise.

6. Preclude the planting of trees in the buffer and instead providing a hedge with height limited to a specified measurement to prevent overshadowing of the neighbour's property and garden.

PFCA response: We are content to accept this as a condition if it is not considered that it would undermine the purpose of the buffer. However, we believe that the protection of residential amenity will be best served by higher planting rather than restricting height.

7. To reduce visual impact in all directions, ground levels should be reduced to those of the adjoining property coupled with a condition prescribing the maximum height of the roof.

PFCA response: The building has been designed so that it is low lying and will not be intrusive in views and so we consider that it is unreasonable to reduce ground levels to the extent suggested and to impose a maximum height of the roof. The part of the site where the building is proposed is slightly higher than the rest of the site so it will be necessary to reduce the ground level to create a level platform for construction.

8. That the mix of hedging should not include malus.

PFCA response: We are content to accept this as a condition.

Other Points

The Parish Council and Mr & Mrs Macey make some further points, as follows:

1. The provision of car parking: Concerns are raised about the prospect of off-site car parking, and the Parish Council considers that additional permanent spaces should be provided on-site.

PFCA response: The proposal meets car parking standards and KCC Highways raise no objection to either the amount of the car parking or its proposed siting and layout. It would be unreasonable therefore for additional permanent parking provision to be required. PFCA share the concerns about potential off-site parking issues and to address this the proposal allows for significant overflow car parking when needed.

2. Sustainability: Whilst welcoming the proposed sustainability measures described in the Design and Planning Statement, the Parish Council see them as aspirational rather than definite. They ask that the applicant incorporates as much sustainability as their budget allows.

PFCA response: It is unclear what the Parish Council is asking the local planning authority to do in this regard. It is the stated intention of PFCA to provide a building that is sustainable, both in its construction and in its use of energy, natural light and other resources as we explain in detail in the Design and Planning Statement. This is not just an aspiration, but a key objective of the development. This will, of course, in part be achieved by its proposed location where maximum solar gain can be achieved, which would not be achievable by a relocation to the western corner of the site as the Parish Council and objector seek.

3. Construction Management Plan: The Parish Council ask that the construction management plan provides sufficient parking onsite for all vehicles involved in the construction, and that there be a prescribed route for all vehicles coming to and leaving the site.

PFCA response: PFCA are happy to amend the construction management plan accordingly.

4. Viability: Mr and Mrs Macey express a concern as to the long term viability of the proposed new hall, suggesting that it could fail and not be self-funding.

PFCA response: This concern is unsubstantiated, and in any event has no bearing on the planning merits of our proposal.

Conclusion

Having reviewed the comments made by the Parish Council and Mr & Mrs Macey, we can see no valid planning reason why our application should be refused.

In preparing our proposals we have complied fully with all the conditions attached to the outline consent. We have designed a building that is modest in size and compact in its functionality, and sensitive to its location; it is not an imposing building and will be unobtrusive. We have given great thought to the positioning of the building in the site, and for the reasons explained in the Design and Planning Statement the location selected is the most sustainable and beneficial. Our plans have been the subject of extensive consultation with the community and have the full backing of residents. This is reflected in the 32

comments of support submitted to the application. The hall will provide a much needed community asset, and we hope very much that planning permission will be granted so that we can make it become a reality as speedily as possible.'

- 6.03 Kent Highways and Transportation (KHT) has confirmed that they are content with the position of the proposed site access and gates. However, KHT originally asked for clarification of parking space and visibility splay dimensions. The applicants have provided revised drawings showing adequate dimensioned parking spaces and visibility splays, and KHT raises no objection to the proposal.
- 6.04 The current KCC parking standard for village halls (using the standard applicable to a D2 Class Use) requires one parking space for every 22sqm of floorspace. This would equate to 12 spaces for this development and there are 12 (plus 17 overflow) spaces proposed. KHT has confirmed that the number of car and cycle parking spaces provided meets their standards and they welcome the electric vehicle charging points.
- 6.05 KHT has recommended certain conditions, and I have included those below where these are not already included on the outline permission.
- 6.06 The Council's Economy and Community Services Manager supports the application, saying:

Community/village halls with good quality internal and external facilities are the beating heart within communities and an integral part of the community infrastructure across Swale providing access to a range of services and facilities at a local level including developing community pride. Does the hall and ancillary facilities adequately reflect the green agenda with adequate provision made for use of renewable energy (solar panels), lock-up for cycles and electric vehicle charging points within the footprint? Happy to support the application.

7 APPRAISAL

- 7.01 The principal issues to consider in this case relate to the reserved matters proposed, not to the question of whether a village hall should be built here. As such matters of layout, scale, appearance, landscaping and access are to be considered.
- 7.02 I note the concerns raised by Ospringe PC, and those raised by the owners of the neighbouring Pawley Farm and their family. I do understand these concerns, and the Case Officer has met with the owners of Pawley Farm on-site to view the application site from their property. However, I note that the application places the proposed building more than the five metres away from the northern boundary required by condition (4) of the outline planning permission. I also note that to address the neighbours' concerns, the nearest elevation of the proposed building to the road would be set well behind the rear of Pawley Farm.
- 7.03 Furthermore, I note that the five metre landscaped buffer required by the outline planning permission is actually shown on the submitted drawings as being over six metres in width. I note that the neighbours and the Parish Council would like a condition on this vegetation to limit its height, and for malus (crab apple type) species not to be included. The applicants have agreed not to include malus in the planting, but they see

small trees as more likely to protect amenity than a low hedge, and I am inclined to agree with them. No coniferous species are planned and as such there should be no excessive shading of the neighbours' property from the planting.

- 7.04 The building has been orientated away from the neighbouring property so that most activity would be shielded by the building itself. The building itself is low-scale, with a roof height of only 3.8 metres and the difference in levels between the sites is small. The planted buffer will dilute any perceived difference in levels and I do not consider it reasonable (bearing in mind the additional costs that would be involved) to require the building to be dug into this relatively flat site. The applicants have indicated that they would be happy to have all windows on the northern elevation fixed and obscure glazed and I have recommended a condition requiring the kitchen window to be fixed. I do not see any need for this ground floor window to be obscure glazed as it faces onto farm buildings and will be screened by the 5m planted buffer. A small toilet window is also proposed on this side at the far end of the building and I see no objection to that being openable. As such, I do not believe that a significant erosion of the neighbours' privacy or amenity would occur, and times of use of the hall are already set out in the outline planning permission at condition (8) in Appendix 1.
- 7.05 Similarly with a car park for only twelve cars serving the front of the village hall, I do not believe that this will produce significant noise disturbance or pollution. I further note that the informal overflow car park is on the opposite side of the site, and bearing in mind its supposed occasional use, this will not impact upon the residential amenity of neighbours.
- 7.06 In relation to other matters raised by the Parish Council, specifically bin storage and routing of construction vehicles my view is that whilst the applicants may be prepared to accept restrictions here, the position of the bins is the only logical place for them, and that they will be unobtrusive and screened from the neighbours by the landscaped buffer zone; whilst construction traffic will be short-lived and that any vehicles involving delivery of locally sourced timber may need to use a variety of local routes that an arbitrary routing restriction may obstruct or result in longer journeys or other unintended consequences
- 7.07 I would contend that the design of the building is acceptable being of a contemporary design which is pleasing to the eye, with the use of sustainable locally sourced cladding materials it should fit in well within the AONB, and I would agree with the Parish Council that the architect is to be commended for his design.

8 CONCLUSION

- 8.01 In conclusion, though I note the concerns raised by the Parish Council and objectors, I would contend that many of these issues have been addressed by the orientation, design and scale of the building, and residential amenity can be further protected by the inclusion of the conditions below. On balance, I am of the opinion that the details proposed are acceptable with minimal erosion of residential amenity and, as such I recommend that the reserved matters should be approved.

9 RECOMMENDATION - GRANT Subject to the following conditions:

CONDITIONS

- (1) The kitchen windows in the northern (rear) elevation to the building shall at all times be obscure glazed to not less than the equivalent of Pilkington Glass Privacy Level 3 and be incapable of being opened.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

- (2) Prior to its installation, details of any mechanical ventilation system that is to be installed shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Upon approval the system shall be installed, maintained and operated in a manner that prevents the transmission of odours, fumes, noise and vibration to neighbouring premises.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

- (3) The scheme of tree planting and landscaping shown on approved drawing PFCH/2173/PD/04 F shall be carried out within 12 months of the occupation of the building. Any trees or shrubs removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced with trees or shrubs of such size and species as may first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

- (4) Prior to the use of the building commencing, the electric vehicle charging points shown on approved drawing PFCH/2173/PD/03 A shall be provided and made available for use by visitors to the site.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging sustainable modes of travel.

- (5) Any gates leading from the highway to the site shall open away from the highway and to be set back a minimum of 5.5 metres from the edge of the carriageway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and amenity.

- (6) Prior to the first use of the building the access arrangements shown on approved drawing PFCH/2173/PD/04 F shall be completed.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and amenity.

- (7) The new access shall incorporate measures sufficient to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and amenity.

- (8) The visibility splays of 2.4 metres x 43 metres x 43 metres to both sides of the new access, and the blind spot visibility splay to the south (all as shown on approved drawing PFCH/2173/PD/04 F), shall be provided with no obstruction over 0.9 metres in height within the splays prior to first occupation of the building and these splays shall subsequently be kept clear of any such obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and amenity.

Council's approach to the application

The Council recognises the advice in paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019 and seeks to work with applicants in a positive and proactive manner by offering a pre-application advice service; and seeking to find solutions to any obstacles to

approval of applications having due regard to the responses to consultation, where it can reasonably be expected that amendments to an application will result in an approval without resulting in a significant change to the nature of the application and the application can then be amended and determined in accordance with statutory timescales.

In this case, the application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the Committee and promote the application.

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.

