

App.No: 160929	Decision Due Date: 10 November 2016	Ward: St Anthony's
Officer: Anna Clare	Site visit date: 28 October 2016	Type: Planning Permission
Site Notice(s) Expiry date: 10 September 2016		
Neighbour Con Expiry: 10 September 2016		
Press Notice(s): 7 September 2016		
Over 8/13 week reason: n/a		
Location: 2-4 Moy Avenue, Eastbourne		
Proposal: Proposed refurbishment and extension to existing telephone exchange building and the construction of two number; part three, part four storey buildings to the rear to provide a total of 95 one and two bedroom flats, with 91 on site car parking spaces.		
Applicant: Moy Court Limited		
Recommendation:		
<p>A: Subject to legal agreement covering :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Employment Issues • Affordable Housing Issues • Highway Issues; the financial contribution to real time passenger information for two bus stops in Ringwood Road, the Travel Plan and its associated audit fee. <p>Then planning permission be granted subject to conditions outlined at the end of the report.</p> <p>B: If there is a delay in the processing of the S106 agreement (more than 8 weeks from the date of this resolution and without any commitment to extend the time) then the application be refused for the lack of infrastructure provision.</p>		

Executive Summary:

Application proposes the sustainable residential redevelopment of this previously developed parcel of land within the residential/urban fabric of Eastbourne.

The proposal is considered to promote a form of development that is of a scale that is appropriate for its site and surroundings whilst maximising its potential and would contribute the meeting the housing need locally and Borough 5 Year Housing Land Supply.

Given the level of development proposed it is acknowledged that there are issues of activity, car parking density, access/vehicle movement issues and overlooking issues that will result from the development however it is considered that these issues, individually or collectively do not amount to sufficient grounds to the justify a refusal of planning permission.

The scheme is recommended for approval subject to S106 agreement and planning conditions.

Relevant Planning Policies:

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

- 4. Promoting sustainable transport
- 6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- 7. Requiring good design
- 8. Promoting healthy communities

Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 Policies

- B1 Spatial Development Strategy and Distribution
- B2 Creating Sustainable Neighbourhoods
- C6 Roselands & Bridgemere Neighbourhood Policy
- D1 Sustainable Development
- D5 Houses
- D8 Sustainable Travel
- D10a Design

Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007

- UHT1 Design of New Development
- UHT2 Height of Buildings
- UHT4 Visual Amenity
- UHT7 Landscaping
- HO2 Predominantly Residential Areas
- HO7 Redevelopment
- HO20 Residential Amenity
- TR1 Locations for Major Development Proposals
- TR2 Travel Demands
- TR6 Facilities for Cyclists
- TR7 Facilities for Pedestrians
- TR11 Car Parking

Site Description:

The site consists of an existing building, part 3 part 4 storeys in height, a former BT Telephone Exchange Centre including maintenance/service yard

for operational needs/requirements for the wider BT network, however the building has been vacant and abandoned for a number of years. The rest of the site is an existing hardstanding and outbuildings/garages/

The site is situated at the corner of Moy Avenue and Waterworks Road, opposite the junction with Courtlands Road.

To the north-west lies the Courtlands Road industrial estate which has a variety of uses including Class B1 Business premises and A1 Retail.

The site surrounded by residential properties to the north, east and south. With Moy Avenue evens numbers to the north, properties of Whitley Road to the east and properties of Waterworks Road to the south.

There are two vehicular accesses existing from Moy Avenue, and an additional pedestrian access from Waterworks Road to the south-east corner of the site.

There are no significant changes of levels across the site and no significant trees or areas of soft landscaping.

Relevant Planning History:

29/11/2004

130708

Demolition and redevelopment to provide 36 (Class C3) residential units, with associated car parking access and landscaping.

Planning Permission, Approved conditionally 16/01/2015

Proposed development:

The application proposes the conversion and extension to the existing building on the site, block 1, to create 38 flats and the erection of two further blocks, block 2 to the south of the site containing 25 flats and block 3 to the east of the site containing 32 flats. Therefore providing 95 1 and 2 bed flats across the site.

Block 1 consists of 4 storeys.

The ground floor consists of 5 flats each with a small terrace, 27 undercroft parking spaces, bins and bike storage.

The first, second and third floors consists of 7 flats on each floor each with a terrace area. The upper floors are accessed via 2 stair blocks to the rear of the building.

Block 2 consists of 25 flats over 4 storeys, with the top floor in-set from the boundary of the site.

Block 3 consists of 32 flats over 4 storeys arranged in an L shape with a central corridor, with the third floor in-set from the boundary of the site.

Number of beds/bed spaces	No. of units	DCLG's Technical Housing Standards Floorspace m2	Proposed floorspace m2
1 Bed (2 Person)	31	50	Min 50 Max 58
2 Bed (3 Person)	64	61	Min 62 Max 84

Consultations:

Specialist Advisor – Arboriculture

No trees on the site should be considered a constraint to development. Requested a condition in relation to the landscaping of the site.

Planning Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that sustainable residential development should be granted planning permission without delay to ensure greater choice of housing in the local market and to meet local and national housing needs. The site has been formally identified for development within the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment therefore is considered to be an identified site. It is also identified as a key area of change on the Roselands and Bridgemere neighbourhood key diagram. The Council relies on identified sites coming forward as part of its spatial development strategy (Policy B1 of the Core Strategy Local Plan) and to support sustainable growth identified in the Roseland and Bridgemere neighbourhood.

The application results in the net gain of 95 dwellings, higher than that assessed in the SHLAA or considered previously through planning applications for the site. Although there is an uplift in residential units and the site is located in close proximity to the Town Centre and key transport routes, the type of residential development proposed is considered appropriate for its neighbourhood location and conforms to the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment where smaller one and two bedroom accommodation is supported on appropriate sites.

The development would not be liable to a Community Infrastructure Levy payment, but would be required in the first instance to provide on-site delivery of affordable housing in line with Policy D5: Housing of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan.

Housing Policy and Development Manager (Eastbourne and Lewes)

Policy D5 of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 requires all appropriate development contribute towards affordable housing. The development is within a 'low value' area in terms of this policy and therefore 30% of the units should be provided as affordable. This equates to 28.5 units.

The developer has agreed to Block 2 of 25 units to be delivered as affordable housing. This, along with a commuted sum (in accordance with Policy D5) for the additional units will be secured by a S106 agreement.

Specialist Advisor (Economic Development)

Regeneration supports this development subject to the inclusion of a Local Labour Agreement as set out in the Employment and Training Technical Guidance Note April 2013.

The conversion and refurbishment of the building and new build of additional flat blocks has the potential to provide construction work for a range of small and medium enterprises. This development will also support the local supply chain and economy. The size and nature of the development will offer a range of employment and enable work experience placements and apprenticeships.

Southern Water

There is a public sewer crossing the site, the exact position of the sewer must be determined on site by the applicant. A condition is requested in relation to this issue.

A condition is requested by SW in relation to the submission of a drainage strategy detailing the proposed means of foul disposal and an implementation timetable prior to the commencement of development. The developer would likely thereafter be required to enter into a formal agreement with Southern Water to provide the necessary sewerage infrastructure required to service this development.

East Sussex County Council Highways

In principle the proposed redevelopment of this site at this scale is acceptable in terms of traffic impact expected on the surrounding network. In terms of location and local infrastructure, the site benefits from a range of services and public transport within walking distance. For this reason, the development does not impose a reliance on the private car.

The full response from ESCC Highways has been reproduced below:-

This site is located off Moy Avenue (UC2166) an area comprising of both residential and commercial premises. The existing vehicular access will remain largely unchanged with two separate pedestrian access points, one pedestrian access onto the Moy Avenue and one to the rear of the site providing a more direct route to Waterworks Road.

Access

The site lies within a 30mph speed limit whereby the visibility splay distances at the junction of with Moy Avenue should be 2.4 x 43m. These splays have been demonstrated by the applicant and are considered acceptable. The positioning of the access is to remain the same; this

provides a suitable stagger between the junction with Courtlands Road and the access into Parker Building Supplies and The Be Group.

The current access to the site is 14.6m wide at the channel line and 10m at the back of the footway, this is wide enough to cater for a two way flow of traffic and would therefore be acceptable in its current form. It has been noted that vehicles park in this section of Moy Avenue between Waterworks Road and Courtlands Road even though there are waiting restrictions (double & single yellow lines) in place. This is mainly an enforcement issue as the presence of the lines allows tickets to be issued during the times of operation.

Traffic Generation and Impact

The site is currently occupied by a building previously used as a telephone engineering centre. The site has subsequently been granted planning permission for 36 houses (planning reference: 130708). The submitted Transport Assessment has used the TRICS database to consider the number of trips that would be associated with the proposed use on the site and the previously consented use, rather than the former use as a Telephone exchange centre.

Having looked at these figures and having carried out my own analysis using TRICS it is evident that the proposal will result in additional traffic on the surrounding highway network. A development of 36 houses is likely to produce 24 trips in the AM peak and 18 in the PM, a development of 95 flats is likely to increase the number of trips to 26 in the AM peak and 29 in the PM. This increase of 13 trips in the peak hours is considered low level and can therefore be accommodated in the existing highway network without significant issue or additional congestion.

In addition if considering the use as a telephone exchange centre the level of trips that would have been generated would have been higher at approximately 69 in the AM peak and 34 in the PM. As the current consented use would result in a lower level of traffic than the proposed use, even though it has not been used for many years there are no grounds for a refusal on the traffic impact of the development.

Internal Layout

The internal layout has been revised and is now improved. The car parking spaces nearest to the site access has been removed which will now prevent conflict at the access it will also allow adequate room for these vehicles to turn and position them correctly to use the access.

Refuse Vehicles

The Local Planning Authority will need to satisfy themselves that the proposed refuse regime is appropriate/suitable.

Parking/Cycle Provision

In accordance with the East Sussex County Councils adopted parking guidelines, this development proposal if using ward data for Devonshire and Upperton should be provided with 93 car parking spaces. Taking into consideration Devonshire has lower car ownership than other wards in Eastbourne it is not necessarily representative. I have used three wards to get a more representative figure on car ownership. Using St Anthony's, Devonshire and Upperton 113 unallocated spaces should be provided. Therefore the overall provision of 91 spaces is 22 spaces short of the recommended number using these figures.

It should be noted that the housing stock and location of the St Anthony's Ward is also generally not representative of the site so would most likely result in a higher parking demand than will exist in reality. Manual for Streets notes 'In planning for expected levels of car ownership it is not always necessary to provide parking on site (i.e. within the curtilage or in off-street parking areas). In some cases it may be appropriate to cater for all the anticipated demand on street'. It is also recommended in the Manual for Streets that visitor parking is served by unallocated parking including on street. It is noted that a parking survey has been carried out to demonstrate if there is additional capacity within the surrounding network to cater for any shortfall.

The survey demonstrates that although the network is near capacity there is still space within the network to accommodate the shortfall of 22 spaces. Given the low car ownership in the area (0.9 vehicles per household, average of three wards) and the capacity to accommodate overspill parking on street a refusal on highway grounds cannot be justified as a severe impact would be unlikely to be created and therefore the proposal is in accordance with the transport requirements of the NPPF.

Cycle parking has been provided in accordance with the East Sussex County Council Standards. The 95 cycle spaces proposed should be covered and secure and located within the site in a convenient location for users.

Highway Safety

A review of the accident data around the site has demonstrated that there are no significant issues with the existing highway network

Accessibility

There are a variety of travel choices available in Eastbourne. Bus stops are within 250m of the site with services running between Sovereign Harbour and the Town Centre. There are also regular train services from Eastbourne Railway Station to Lewes which provide connections for onward journeys. Eastbourne Railway Station is 1.2 km away which is the recommended maximum walking distance however it should be noted that walking and cycling distances for commuting exceed this distance. The IHT 'Providing for Journeys on Foot' indicates that although desirable walking distances for commuting is 500m the preferred maximum is 2km. The same applies for

acceptable walking distance to town centres, the desired is 200m but the preferred maximum is 800m.

In terms of accessibility for non-car users, this site is within an acceptable distance to encourage the use of sustainable transport. It is noted that this development will create a greater demand for public transport and in order to encourage its use the two closest bus stops to the site in Ringwood Road should be upgraded to include high level kerbs, new bus stop flags and poles for both stops and a new shelter on the southern side. In addition a contribution towards providing Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) is required to help provide better, more reliable information about bus services. To provide two RTPI signs would require a contribution of £25,000.00. These works should be secured by legal agreement and would help the development meet the targets that would be set in the Travel Plan. Pedestrian facilities connecting the site to public transport and the Town Centre are generally good.

Travel Plan

A Travel Plan has been proposed as there are potential opportunities to enhance sustainable transport modes therefore reducing the need for major transport infrastructure. Details of a Travel Plan have been included within the Transport Assessment. The measures proposed include carrying out baseline surveys in order to set targets. Once targets have been set a travel plan coordinator will be appointed to introduce provide advice of walking and cycling routes to and from the site and the promotion of the use of public transport. This will include details of bus services, timetables and route information. This is considered acceptable as a method to raise awareness of alternative modes of travel to and from the site. The site is accessed via Whitley Road; this will potentially encourage sustainable alternatives given the congestion on this road during peak times.

If journey times to and from site take as long as walking or cycling trips then this can discourage car trips. The travel plan should incorporate the local cycle (Horseley Cycle Route) network to promote sustainable travel, the route will run along Waterworks Road, Moy Avenue and along onto Courtlands Road.

A Travel Plan Statement Audit fee of £6,000 would be required and secured through a 106 agreement.

Construction

A Construction Traffic Management Plan would need to be provided with details to be agreed. This would need to include management of contractor parking to ensure no on-street parking occurs during the whole of the demolition and construction phases. Deliveries should avoid peak times to prevent additional congestion on the network. This would need to be secured through a condition of any planning permission.

Conclusion

Although the internal layout and shortfall of parking are less than ideal, with the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (in 2012) which states that development should only be refused where the likely impact is severe, it is considered that we would have difficulty justifying a recommendation for refusal in this instance as it is unlikely the development would lead to a severe impact upon highway safety.

I recommend that any consent shall include suggested conditions as well as a Section 106 legal agreement to secure the Travel Plan, including audit fee and financial contribution for Real Time Passenger Information.

SUDS- No response received to date

Specialist Advisor – Waste

Providing the roads are constructed to adoptable standard (even if not adopted) then a standard waste lorry of 26tonnes would be able to access the site to collect from the bin store. The number of bins is acceptable given the number of units.

Environment Agency

The development proposal depicted within the 2013 Flood Risk Assessment, (undertaken by Environ, dated September 2013), submitted with this application states 36 residential units, of which has been increased within the 2016 planning application to 95 residential units. So long as the development boundary depicted within the FRA (drawing number PH1.01) is identical to the 2016 application, we have no objection in principal to 95 residential dwellings.

Although this site is protected by the Eastbourne Coastal Defenses to a standard of protection of a 1 in 200 year flood, we recommend that consideration be given to use of flood proofing measures to reduce the impact of flooding when if the defenses were to fail or were over topped. Flood proofing measures include barriers on ground floor doors, windows and access points and bringing in electrical services into the building at a high level so that plugs are located above possible flood levels.

Neighbour Representations:

The Council conducted a consultation regime comprising 222 letters to nearby residents a press and site notice were posted.

This consultation has resulted in the following responses being received:-

36 Objections have been received and cover the following points:

- Increase in volume of traffic
- Impact on Waterworks Road traffic lights
- Impacts on demand for on-street parking

- Impacts on road safety from additional traffic and parking
- Impacts from construction
- No parking proposed for visitors
- Design of the proposed buildings
- Density is too high
- Buildings are too high
- Flats are out of character with predominantly semi-detached houses of Moy Avenue
- Strain on schools and health provision
- Overlooking to surrounding properties
- Loss of light to surrounding properties
- Noise impacts
- Impact on Ecology (bats/amphibians/slow worms)
- High and density is oppressive and overbearing on surrounding houses
- Concern over the position of wells and the construction impact on water supply
- Access to the site is not adequate
- Anti-social behaviour
- Light pollution on surrounding properties
- Strain on drainage system
- No gardens or amenity space for occupiers of new flats
- Overcrowding of the small site
- Possible ground contamination
- Concerns regarding flooding

1 Letter of support was received.

Appraisal:

Principle of development:

NPPF:

The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that sustainable residential development should be granted planning permission to ensure greater choice of housing in the local market and to meet local and national housing needs.

The redevelopment of this previously developed brown-field site within the urban fabric, close to Eastbourne Town Centre and public transport links is considered to be sustainable development and as such in NPPF terms should be supported without delay.

5 Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS):

It is acknowledged that the Council do not have a current, robust 5YHLS and as such this is considered to be a significant material consideration on the determination of this application.

Given the lack of the 5YHLS it is considered that all development sites should be developed to their maximum potential in order to mitigate the shortfall

and also to alleviate the pressure for the release of less appropriate sites (these could be for example in Eastbourne Park).

Members are advised that a refusal of this application based solely on an in-principle objection to the redevelopment without demonstrable harm to the character of the site or the amenities of the occupiers of the nearby residential properties or other interest of acknowledged importance would be likely to result (at appeal) to an award of costs against the Council for unreasonable behaviour.

Eastbourne's Housing Need:

Eastbourne needs to provide new homes to meet local needs. There is very limited supply of developable land in Eastbourne given the urban areas tightly confined by the South Downs, Wealden administrative area, the sea and land subject to flood risk (Eastbourne Park). It is considered therefore that where we have developable sites that they are developed to their maximum potential.

The site has been formally identified for development within the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and is therefore considered to be an identified site. It is also identified as a key area of change on the Roselands and Bridgemere neighbourhood key diagram. It is acknowledged therefore that the Council relies on identified sites coming forward as part of its spatial development strategy (Policy B1 of the Core Strategy Local Plan) and to support sustainable growth identified in the Roseland and Bridgemere neighbourhood.

Local Plan Policy Context:

The application contributes positively to the Council's spatial development strategy (Policy B1 of the Core Strategy). The proposed development will assist in ensuring the housing target for the neighbourhood is delivered over the plan period. The development would conform with the Roselands & Bridgemere Neighbourhood Policy (Policy C6 of the Core Strategy) by 'Delivering additional housing through making more efficient use of land', and subject to no harm to residential amenity should be considered sustainable development.

Previous Consent:

In addition to the above it is clear that the principle of residential redevelopment of the site is acceptable given the previous permission for the redevelopment of the site for 36 houses (mixture of 2, 3 and 4bed) with 59 parking spaces.

Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area:

Separation Distances:

Block 1 the south-western elevation of Block 1 would be separated from properties of Waterworks Road by approximately 30m.

The closest proximity would be between the north-eastern elevation of Block 1 and the adjacent property no. 6 Moy Avenue. There is only 9m between this elevation of the proposed building and the existing property. However the property does not have upper floor side elevation windows, the only overlooking impact would be the limited views back towards the property from the upper floor corner windows which serve the living accommodation of the proposed units.

Block 2 & 3 would be separated from properties of Waterworks Road by between approximately 28-30m. The building is set back 11m from this common boundary. These properties currently enjoy open vistas to the rear which will be reduced by the proposed buildings. The fourth storey of this building is set to the north-eastern elevation, therefore away from this boundary to decrease the height when perceived from the adjacent properties.

Properties on Whitley Road to the south-east of the site have gardens approximately 40m in length. Therefore the proposed buildings will be separated from these properties by approximately 45m.

Properties 4-9 St Philips Place to the eastern corner of the site, have smaller rear gardens which mean the proposed buildings will be approximately 25m from these.

It is accepted and acknowledged that the redevelopment in the manner proposed will give rise to a degree of overlooking, the area of the scheme within the highest degree of direct overlooking is from the flank on Block 1. Officers have secured an amendment to the scheme to delete these flank windows.

It is considered that given the proposed layout as amended, the internal configuration, the orientation of the buildings and the separation between buildings and to the boundaries of the site are such that a reason for refusal based solely on this issue could not be justified or sustained through to an appeal.

Design issues:

Layout:

The layout is broken down into three blocks, the majority of the car parking is provided to the site boundaries which pulls the buildings further from these common boundaries, this increases the separation and provides a buffer to the development.

The positioning of the blocks also provides the opportunity to create a central

amenity area within the centre of the development, this pocket park would provide external amenity space for the enjoyment of the residents of this development.

The layout is considered to maximise the potential of the site whilst offering a buffer to surrounding properties by setting the buildings in from the boundary with car parking to the edges of the development.

In layout terms the development is considered to be acceptable.

Materials & Appearance:

The ground floor of the blocks is to be formed from a dark stock brick, with a lighter mix of three stock bricks to create a flecked appearance to the intermediate floors. The top floors are proposed timber vertical cladding which provides a contrasting finish to the top floors and has the effect of reducing the visual mass and bulk at this level.

Projecting bay windows and recessed terraced areas with frameless glazed balustrades are proposed to break up the facades and provide more interest.

The buildings are horizontal/linear in appearance which assists with reducing the visual bulk of the buildings. Similarly the recessed upper floors in a contrasting material help to reduce the visual mass and scale of the proposed development.

The remodelled frontage building shares the common architectural reference and the material palette with the new buildings to the rear.

It is accepted that the design and external appearance of the proposed blocks is of a different scale, design and appearance to that of the predominant pattern of residential properties (primarily two storey family dwellings). However this in and of itself is not considered to be objectionable when the scheme is acceptable in all other respects.

Impact on the amenity of future occupiers of the site:

Number of beds/bed spaces	No. of units	DCLG's Technical Housing Standards	Proposed floorspace
1 Bed (2 Person)	31	50	Min 50 Max 58
2 Bed (3 Person)	64	61	Min 62 Max 84

Each flat has a balcony or terrace to provide a small area of amenity space. A communal amenity space is provided to the centre of the site.

The layout of the buildings and the flats within the proposal does not result in flats overlooking each other in close proximity. All flats are accessed from central corridors with all rooms, except bathrooms with external windows for light and ventilation purposes

Overall the quality of accommodation in terms of the size of the flats is considered acceptable and will provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers.

Impacts on trees:

None of the existing trees/landscaping on site should be a constraint on development. A landscaping plan will be requested by condition to ensure satisfactory landscaping is carried out post completion of the development.

Impacts on highway network or access:

It is acknowledged that for this proposal there are a number of objections received relating to access and parking issues. However officers are mindful of the former/lawful use of the site and the permission granted in 2013 for the development of the site for 36 houses (mix of 2, 3 and 4 bed) with 59 parking spaces.

It is also considered that given the sites' proximity to the town centre that the delivery on site of 91 parking spaces just below 1 space per unit, is considered to be acceptable and appropriate for the redevelopment of this site.

ESCC Highways comments on the application are available in full above. They conclude that the development will not result in severe impacts on highway safety/capacity. The proposal of a travel plan which will be controlled by way of a S106 agreement will provide potential opportunities to enhance sustainable transport modes.

The applicant agrees to the requests of ESCC highways in relation to a contribution of £25,000 towards the provision of real time passenger information at the two closes bus stops to the site in Ringwood Road to provide better more reliable information about bus services.

Planning obligations:

The applicant will be required to enter into a S106 agreement in relation to:

- the delivery of affordable housing in compliance with Policy D5 of the Core Strategy,
- a Local Labour Agreement.
- Travel Plan
- Highway Infrastructure

It is anticipated that Eastbourne Homes would be looking to take on the affordable housing element of this proposal.

Other matters:

The precise location of the existing sewer through the site is unknown and a condition is recommended that details of all foul and surface water drainage

should be submitted for subsequent approval. It is acknowledged that this could have implications on the layout of the site should it be determined that the sewer is within 3/5m of the proposed buildings.

Members should be aware that any significant divergence from the layout plans proposed under this application should form the content of a further submission to the Council and any such application will be reported back to planning committee for determination.

The comments from Southern Water are noted and the developer has committed to supplying further details to meet SW requirements .

Human Rights Implications:

The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.

Conclusion:

The scheme is considered to be an appropriate redevelopment of this parcel of previously developed land and would not give rise to any substantive issues that would warrant or justify a refusal of planning permission.

The provision of the residential units in the number proposed by this scheme would go some way to contributing to the shortfall in the Councils 5YHLS and would also ensure that this development site is maximised to its full potential.

Subject to S106 to cover infrastructure issues then the scheme is considered to be acceptable.

Recommendation:

A. Subject to a S106 Legal Agreement to cover:-

1. local employment issues
2. Affordable housing delivery
3. Travel Plan
4. Highway infrastructure

Then planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:-

Conditions:

1. Time for commencement
2. Approved drawings

3. Materials to be submitted
4. Landscaping/planting scheme to be submitted
5. Prior to any development commencing a survey of the true location and routeing of the existing sewer shall be undertaken and if any building hereby approved compromises Southern Water access and maintenance thresholds then a scheme for the re-routing of the sewer or a revised layout of the proposed block shall be submitted and approved.
6. Submission of a drainage strategy detailing the proposed means of foul disposal and an implementation timetable.
7. Submission of details of proposed means of foul and surface water sewerage disposal.
8. Submission of details of the layout of the reconstructed access
9. Development not to be occupied until parking areas provided
10. Submission of a construction traffic management plan
11. Turning space for vehicles
12. Provision of cycle parking
13. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved FRA.
14. Flood proofing construction
15. Roads should be constructed to adoptable standard.

B. If there has been no movement with the negotiations of the S106 element of the scheme within 8 weeks from the date of this resolution then the application be refused for the following reason:-

The application does not deliver on the infrastructure required by this development and in the absence of any evidence/information to the contrary it is considered that the lack of infrastructure would be contrary to policy

Informative:

- Pre commencement conditions informative
- Southern Water Informative
- EA Informative