

PLANNING COMMITTEE



Application Address	215-225 Barrack Road Christchurch BH23 2AX
Proposal	Demolition of existing buildings and erect 3 blocks of 38 flats with associated parking and access.
Application Number	8/21/0100/FUL
Applicant	Calendula Assets Limited
Agent	Mr Ken Parke
Date Application Valid	19 February 2021
Decision Due Date	21 May 2021
Extension of Time Date (if applicable)	22 November 2021
Ward	Commons
Report status	Public
Meeting date	24 May 2022
Recommendation	Grant in accordance with the details set out below
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee	The application was resolved to be approved by Planning Committee on 18 November 2022. The application is back before Committee to determine as it came to light following the previous committee that the application site is now within Flood Zone 2. Following the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment the proposals have been reassessed and it is considered that given Members of the Committee were not aware of the full facts of the site, the scheme needs to be brought back to Committee for determination.
Case Officer	Sophie Mawdsley

Description of Development

1. Demolition of existing buildings and erect 3 blocks of 38 flats with associated parking and access. The scheme involves the creation of 20 x 1 bed flats and 18 x 2 bed units with 21 parking spaces to the rear of the building.
2. The three blocks would each be three storeys in height with two vehicular access points to the rear in which the parking spaces, cycle parking and bin storage would be provided. Amenity areas are proposed directly to the rear of the three blocks.

Key Issues

3. Principle of development and housing supply
4. Flood risk and surface water drainage
5. Type and size of dwellings
6. Affordable housing
7. Design, form, scale and layout
8. Residential Amenity
9. Access and parking arrangements
10. Biodiversity
11. Contaminated land

Planning Policies

12. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan for an area, except where material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in this case comprises the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan and saved policies of the Christchurch Local Plan 2001.

Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy 2014

KS1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development

KS2: Settlement Hierarchy

KS9: Transport Strategy and Prime Transport Corridors

KS11: Transport and Development

KS12: Parking Provision

HE2: Design of New Development

HE3: Landscape Quality

ME1: Safeguarding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

ME2: Protection of the Dorset Heathlands

ME3: Sustainable development standards

ME4: Renewable Energy

ME6: Flood Management, Mitigation and Defence

LN1: Size and types of dwellings

LN2: Design, Layout and Density of New Housing Development

LN3: Affordable Housing

PC5: Shops and Community Facilities in Local Centres

Saved policies of the Christchurch Local Plan

H12 Residential infill

ENV1 Waste facilities in new development

ENV2 Protection of development from nearby polluting operations

Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance

- BCP Parking Standards SPD 2021
- Christchurch Character Assessment
- Housing and Affordable Housing SPD
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

The National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

13. Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

‘For decision-taking this means:

c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date⁸, granting permission unless:

i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed⁷; or

ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole’.

The relevant sections are;

Section 2 Achieving sustainable development

Section 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities

Section 12 Achieving well-designed places

Section 14 Meeting the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

14. Relevant Planning Applications and Appeals

8/09/0885 - Outline application for the erection of 3 blocks of 2½ storey providing 30x1 bed flats & 4x2 bed flats (total 34 flats) with associated parking & access. Matters for consideration as part of outline application are access, layout & scale. Refused June 2009 by LPA and Dismissed at Appeal October 2009 on the lack of affordable housing.

8/10/0059 – Outline permission for ‘The erection of 3 blocks of 2 ½ storey flats, providing 30 x 1 bed flats and 4 x 2bed flats (total 34 flats) with associated parking and access. Granted 24/12/2010.

8/13/0554 – Reserved matters application (to consider landscaping) following grant of 8/10/0059. Granted

Public Sector Equalities Duty

15. In accordance with section 149 Equality Act 2010, in considering this proposal due regard has been had to the need to —

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Other relevant duties

16. In accordance with section 40 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, in considering this application, regard has been had, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of this function, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.

17. For the purposes of this application, in accordance with section 2 Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, regard has been had to the register that the Council maintains of individuals and associations of individuals who are seeking to acquire serviced plots in the Council’s area for their own self-build and custom housebuilding.

Representations

18.35 Objections have been received on the following grounds;

Parking and Highway safety

- Insufficient parking
- Minimal parking lead to parking on surrounding roads causing congestion and restricted access
- Affect emergency services reaching their destination
- Heavy traffic congestion in the area
- Highway safety issues- children walking to school
- Cumulative impact of other developments in Christchurch on traffic issues
- Access onto Barrack Road already difficult
- Noise from traffic on Barrack Road
- Utopian view of everyone cycling and not using cars
- Only one bus on Barrack Road – public transport restricted

Housing and economy

- Shortage of family homes
- No affordable housing
- Loss of existing valued businesses
- Additional pressure on local infrastructure – doctors, schools etc
- Loss of well loved restaurant

Amenity

- Already considerable development in surrounding roads
- Flats likely to be rented resulting in transient occupiers and potential antisocial behaviour
- Low water pressure
- Overlooking into neighbouring properties and gardens
- Loss of privacy from balconies and full height glazing
- Loss of sunlight and daylight into adjacent flats
- Noise and disturbance from 38 flats

- Area of amenity space for future occupiers insufficient
- Loss of existing family housing for current residents
- Light pollution

Design and Scale

- Height of Block C too high and too close to side boundary
- Buildings overbearing and dominant in relation to existing buildings
- Examples of flats blocks in Barrack Road should not mean current scheme should be approved.
- Changes character of area dramatically
- Christchurch is an historic town
- Cramming of properties
- Overdevelopment
- No benefit to environment, current residents and businesses

Other matters

- No agreement that the SAMM Heathland Mitigation will be made
- Contamination risk

1 Letter of Support received;

- Much needed housing supporting local area

19. Consultations

- **Natural England** – No objection subject to mitigation being secured to ensure the identified adverse effects on the protected sites are mitigated.
- **Wessex Water** - None received
- **Dorset & Wilts Fire & Rescue Service** - In the event the planning permission is granted for this development, the development would need to be designed and built to meet current Building Regulations requirements.
- **BCP Highways** (summary of comments)

58 cycle spaces are now proposed which in terms of number now accords with the Parking Standards SPD. The plans now indicate 34 ground level cycle parking opportunities, if we count the lower level of the two tier cycle racks as

ground floor. That leaves 14 of the cycle spaces having to involve lifting a bike. We would not propose refusing the proposal on just 14 of the cycle spaces being at an upper level as the highway safety gains from the closure of the existing accesses and removal of commercial uses in this location outweigh any harm from these 14 upper cycle spaces. It is also noted that in stacking systems of this nature the 14 upper spaces will have a mechanical system to assist with lifting a bike.

- Electrical vehicle charging bays can be secured by condition
 - The existing bus stop raised bus boarding kerbs would be located over one of the proposed access points and therefore the bus stop, and associated higher kerbs, will need relocating. These bus stop works should be done as first works prior to the access which is affected by bus stop being created so that appropriate bus facilities are maintained at all times for the general public.
 - The right turn lane opposite the site on Barrack Road will also need shortening to avoid vehicle conflicts between vehicles entering this right turn lane and those vehicles approaching the site from Christchurch wishing to turn right into the site.
 - Desire for the whole width of each new access to be a footway crossing style access. This can be secured by condition to ensure the eventual access details fit with the Transforming City Fund scheme along Barrack Road.
 - Be prudent to ensure 8 redundant accesses are reinstated back to full kerb height so ensure the footway is level of pedestrians use.
- **BCP Lead Flood Authority** (summary) - There is currently a low risk of Surface water flooding to the rear of most of the properties but this seems to be associated with a localised low spot rather than part of a wider flow pattern.

In conclusion so long as the ground levels mean it is still the car parking area to the rear of the proposed properties that is at low risk of surface water flooding then there is no objection on flooding ground and there is enough information to suggest that SuDs should be viable so a suitably worded condition to comply with the Defra guide lines should satisfy the planning requirements.

Additional comments on receipt of FRA

No objections to contents of FRA but limited information on drainage. If groundwater is as high as stated infiltration may be difficult, which is our preferred strategy.

- **BCP Environmental Health**

No objections subject to conditions

- **Christchurch Town Council**

“Objection raised:

- 1) *The Scheme would create harmful amenity concerns especially at the proposed western elevation with the provision of balconies overlooking into the amenity space of 213 Barrack Road which would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbours. The proposed layout of the scheme also provides a lack of purposeful outdoor amenity space especially at proposed block "C". Both matters are contrary to policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Core Strategy and saved policy H12 of the Christchurch Local Plan 2001 and paragraph 127 of the NPPF;*
- 2) *The scheme would generate further trips onto an already busy road; the cumulative impact of which contributes to environmental concerns. The proposal promotes car use and fails to identify opportunities to improve and mitigate the air quality impacts along Barrack Road through prioritising pedestrian and cycle movement, or allowing for green design initiatives such as providing charging points for ultra-low emission vehicles contrary to paragraphs 110 and 181 of the NPPF.*

Members raised concerns that the scheme fails to identify any affordable housing and that the District Valuer's report or the applicant's viability assessment has not been disclosed suitably redacted given the overwhelming public interest in sites which fail to provide affordable housing. Members noted that such public interest outweighs the business case exemptions to not disclose. Concerns were also raised relating to flooding and car-parking provision but members felt these did not justify sufficient planning harm to raise objection on these points”.

- **BCP Waste and Recycling**

Original objection now overcome with Waste Management Plan received outlining private collections on a twice weekly basis.

- **BCP Urban Design (summary)**

- Height, footprint and built form - Welcome consistent building line addressing the street; Spacing between Block A and no 227 remains rather tight; and would prefer to see 2.5 storey buildings with windows in gables and dormers.
- Residential amenity – Many of the flats have a balcony, patio or terrace which is welcomed but not all have direct level access to amenity space; more usable space would be provided if Block B was same depth as A and C.
- Appearance – Elevations well-ordered with generous fenestration; no objections to contemporary design, other than flat roof; materials reasonable but question grey bricks.

- Site layout and landscape – Welcome low brick front boundary wall and entrances on front with direct path from street; bike and bin store to rear is positive; and like to see variety of native trees and planting to provide biodiversity net gain.
- Sustainable construction/environmental impact – minimising emissions should be a priority; design adopt a Passivhaus or fabric first approach?; solar PV panels welcome and condition 10% of total regulated energy should be from renewable, decentralised and low carbon sources.
- Movement – welcome location of parking to rear; car park benefits from trees; like to see pavements rather than tarmac and white lines.
- **BCP Biodiversity**
“The Recommendations as given in ‘Report on Biodiversity at 215-225 Barrack Road Christchurch’ by Philip Smith, 10/8/20, should be implemented in full and secured by condition. I would also add that this development should also be providing enhancement for swifts of at least one swift brick built into each block, located in accordance with swift conservation guidance”.

Constraints

- Wildlife - 19.36m
- Flood Zone 2
- Highways Inspected Network - 7.58m
- Heathland 5km Consultation Area - 0.00m
- Airport Safeguarding - 0.00m
- Wessex Water Sewer Flooding - 0.00m
- Contaminated Land - Refuse Disposal - 202.50m
- Contaminated Land - Medium Risk - 24.46m

Planning Assessment

20. As referred to previously, the application was resolved to be approved by Planning Committee on 18 November 2022. The application is back before Committee to determine as it came to light following the Committee that the application site is now within Flood Zone 2 following changes to the Flood Zone data from the Environment Agency. There are no changes to the proposed scheme but the applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment in order to address the flood risk issues on the site. The only other material consideration that has altered since November 2021 is the updated housing supply but this is discussed further in paragraph 25.

Site and Surroundings

21. The application is currently occupied by two pairs of semi-detached properties, a detached dwelling with car sales and servicing business associated with it and a further building (No 215) occupied by a Chinese restaurant at ground floor and a residential flat above. The plot of No 221 has vehicles associated with the business parked within the forecourt and in the rear of the site so this area is largely covered by hard standing. The Chinese restaurant also has a large area of hard standing to the rear in use as a car park for the business. Therefore, overall the application site has minimal soft landscaping with only 'green' rear amenity areas for properties 217, 219 and 225.
22. The locality is characterised by a mix of uses including both residential and commercial. Barrack Road is a prime transport corridor into Christchurch town centre. There is a relatively tight urban grain in the area and along Barrack Road there is a mix of two, three and four storey buildings. There are examples of blocks of flats with a contemporary form along Barrack Road.

Principle of development

23. Objective 6 of the Core Strategy identifies that development will be located in the most accessible locations, focused on prime transport corridors and town centres. Policy KS9 identifies Barrack Road as a Prime Transport Corridor and advises that higher density development will be located in an around town centres and Prime Transport Corridors in order to reduce the need to travel. Policy LN2 advises that proposals for high density developments will be acceptable along the Prime Transport Corridors where they have an acceptable impact on the character of the area. The site is within walking distance to a range of services and facilities and has access to open space. It is therefore considered that residential use on this site is acceptable in terms of its locality.
24. The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development and Para 68 states;
'Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should:
c) support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes';
25. The Council does not have a 5 year housing land supply and since November 2021 when the application was previously discussed, the supply has decreased and it currently stands at 2.7 years (2021). Having regard to Paragraph 11 of the NPPF and given the above, the tilted balance is potentially engaged (Para 11 d). The site will provide 32 additional units towards the supply of housing but also lies within 5 km of a European Habitat site. The sections below will assess the

proposal including in the context of footnote 7 of the Framework and impacts on relevant habitats sites.

26. An additional material consideration in terms of the principle of development is the extant permission for 34 flats under the Outline and Reserved Matters applications granted in 2010 and 2014 at 217 to 225 Barrack Road. (Development commenced in 2016 and this was confirmed by Council). This scheme was on a slightly smaller scale with 3 x 2 ½ storey buildings of a more traditional style but was also on a smaller site. The applicant has since purchased No 215 to provide a larger site with an increase of 4 flats overall.

Flood risk and Surface Water Drainage

27. The Environment Agency updated their flood maps in 2021 and the application site which was in flood zone 1 now site lies within Flood Zone 2 (medium risk) (present day 2021) as defined in the Christchurch level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) 2019. In accordance with the NPPF, core strategy policy ME6 therefore requires application of the sequential test. The NPPF (2021) sets out the approach to planning and flood risk through paragraphs 159 to 169. The application of the sequential test is addressed specifically in paragraphs 161 163, 166 and 168. The Environment Agency does not have to be consulted; however, their Standing Advice is applicable to the proposal.
28. The sequential test for flood risk considers whether there are reasonably available sites to accommodate the development within lower flood risk areas. Whilst the Sequential Test is technically applicable for this site, it is considered that the fall-back position of an extant permission for 34 flats should be taken into account in determining whether the development would result in additional assets being put at risk of flooding. It appears that at the time of the Outline Planning permission 8/10/0059 the site was in flood zone 2 and a FRA was submitted. This supporting document recommended that finished floor levels should be 200mm above existing ground levels. However, there were no conditions on the permission stipulating finished floor levels or any other flood risk mitigation measures within the buildings.
29. Looking at the up to date Five Year Housing supply document (2022) there are sites that could be considered reasonable available to accommodate this development. However, the extant permission enables a significant proportion of the site to be developed and has 14 ground floor flats across the 3 blocks which is the same as the proposed development. There are existing residential dwellings on the site and the additional site, No. 215 (not part of 2014 extant permission) contains a restaurant at ground level and residential flat above). Therefore, the proposal does not involve a change in the vulnerability as it is remaining as residential which is considered to be 'more vulnerable' as set out in Table 3 of the NPPG. In addition, there is no change to the number of ground floor flats compared to the extant permission so the level of flood risk is not considered to be increased.

30. For the above reasons, it has been determined in this particular case that the Sequential Test does not have to be applied. More vulnerable developments within Flood Zone 2 are not subject to the Exception Test and development can be appropriate in these locations. This development is subject to the Environment Agency's Flood Risk Standing Advice (FRSA).
31. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been carried out since the previous resolution by Planning Committee to approve, demonstrates that the proposed development is a betterment to the flood risk on site from the extant scheme given the modern construction and the proposed finished floor levels. The site currently benefits from flood defences, 220 metres away which are designed to provide 1 in 100 year event standard of protection. The FRA states that during a 1 in 100 year plus 47% climate change allowance event the flood level at the site would be 4.01m AOD.
32. In line with the FRSA, the finished floor levels are to be set at 4.31m (at least 0.3m above 1 in 100 year plus 47% allowance of climate change flood level of 4.01m AOD). In addition, the following flood resilient measures are also advised; water, electricity and gas meters and electrical sockets located above the predicted flood level; electrical installations protected by suitable insulation in the distribution ducts; use of hard flooring; use of low permeability building materials up to 0.3m; air brick covers; and passive flood door systems. It is considered reasonable that a condition is imposed to ensure finished floor levels are no lower than 4.31 AOD and to secure details of the precise mitigation measures which are to be installed in the development.
33. The site is susceptible to surface water flooding towards the north west corner and close to the northern rear boundary. The submitted Drainage Options Technical Note states that the surrounding land consists of a layer of loose dark brown sandy-silty gravel followed by a layer of loose medium-dense, yellow-brown sandy gravel which should be ideal for infiltration drainage. It is proposed to install an infiltration crate system under the access drive and parking areas to drain surface water run off across the site along with permeable paving.
34. The latest FRA does indicate that there could be a shallow groundwater table in the area which would make infiltration not possible. If infiltration is not possible other options have been considered including discharging into a nearby surface water sewer which would require a crate or basin and being discharged off site at a limited rate. A condition is proposed to secure a detailed Surface Urban Drainage system (SUDs) and management plan.
35. Given the above, it is considered there is technical breach of policy ME6 of the Local Plan as the Sequential Test has not been applied. However, given the extant permission which has the same level of risk given the number of ground floor sites is the same on both proposals and the betterment to the flood risk on the current scheme, it is considered that this technical departure from policy is acceptable. The FRA has demonstrated that flood risk does not increase as a

result of the development proposed, and that options have been taken to reduce overall flood risk which does accord with policy ME6.

Housing mix and size

36. Policy LN1 states the size and type of new market dwellings should reflect current and projected local housing needs identified in the SHMA. The SHMA (2015) identifies that there is a higher demand for 2- and 3-bed market housing over 1-bed and 4-beds in Christchurch. However, there is a lower need for flats with a 20% requirement for flats compared to 80% for dwelling houses.
37. The proposal does result in the loss of 5 houses and provides accommodation which does not meet the area of greatest need or type of housing within the SHMA. However, this is balanced against the overall need for housing in the area, the location of the site on a Prime Transport Corridor promoting high density development and also the extant permission for 34 flats. It has previously been deemed acceptable to see the loss of the housing on the site on the Outline permission (Appeal decision). On balance it is considered that the mix of one and two bed units is acceptable.
38. Policy LN1 requires that units sizes comply with the Housing Quality Indicators. Whilst these have been overtaken by the National Space Standards, they are still referred to in the adopted Local Plan and therefore are a material consideration. For a 1-bed/2-bedspace unit the HQI standard 40-50m² and for a 2-bed/4-bedspace unit the HQI standard is 67-75m². All the proposed units meet these space requirements and whilst not referred to in any Local Plan policies, they would also meet the Nationally Described Space Standards.
39. Having regard to paragraph 15 of this report, it is considered this scheme is not suitable for self-build/custom housebuilding as it is for a block of flats and is likely to be sold as leasehold units.
40. It is considered there is a technical breach with Policy LN1 in terms of the house types but it is in accordance with the unit sizes as set out in the HQI's.

Affordable Housing

41. Policy LN3 of the Local Plan stipulates that 40% of the units on site should be affordable or a financial contribution made in lieu of on-site provision may be acceptable. However, a viability assessment has been submitted with the application which concludes there is no viability to provide affordable housing. This has been assessed independently by the Valuation Office Agency who have also included there is no viability for affordable housing. This is regrettable; but given current construction and delivery costs it is somewhat unsurprising.
42. However, given these could be short to medium term issues it is considered that a review mechanism should be included within the s106 to ensure the affordable housing viability is revisited within a given timeframe to see if any can be provided and the economic climate has changed. The Housing and Affordable

Housing SPD sets out in paragraph 8.11 that reviews can be used where financial viability concludes it is not possible to meet the relevant affordable housing targets under LN3.

43. With this included in the proposed s106 heads of terms (below), the scheme is considered to comply with Policy LN3.

Loss of businesses

44. The proposed scheme results in the loss of a car sales and garage local business and a Chinese restaurant. The site is not located within the primary or secondary shopping core of Christchurch and there are therefore no policies to restrict the loss of these commercial premises. The extant permission would have seen the loss of the car sales/garage business, but this current proposal sees the additional removal of the restaurant.
45. Paragraph 93 a) of the Section 8 in the NPPF refers to; 'decisions planning positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments'. Policy PC5 refers to commercial uses in Local Centres and seeks to ensure the loss would not result in a substantial decline in the range and quality of services for local people.
46. The concerns from the local community about the loss of the garage business and restaurant are understood. However, there is an extant permission which already sees the loss of the garage business, so this is a material consideration to the decision. The loss of restaurant would reduce the provision along this stretch of Barrack Road; however given the urban location and proximity and distance to the town centre where other restaurants are located, its loss is not considered to undermine the range and quality of services for local people. Therefore, it is not considered that a reason for refusal based on policy PC5 could be substantiated.

Design, form and layout

47. Core Strategy Policy LN2 requires that the design and layout of new housing development should maximise the density of development, but this is to be a level which is acceptable for the locality. Policy HE2 compliments the design requirements in section 7 of the NPPF by requiring development be compatible with or improve its surroundings in relation to 11 criteria including layout, site coverage, visual impact and relationship to nearby properties. Para 130 of the NPPF states;

'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;.....

33. The proposed development introduces a more contemporary form of architecture into this part of the street scene with the flat roofs and chosen materials. There is no doubt that the full three storey scale creates blocks which have a greater scale than the surrounding buildings which are generally pitched roof two/two and half storey properties. However, the design of the scheme has taken account of this as the built form adjacent to 1a Gardener Road and 211 Barrack Road has been stepped down to two storeys. It is recognised that without the traditional eaves, the overall height is slightly above the eaves of the adjacent buildings; however it is considered the built relationship is acceptable. There are examples of similar types of architecture along Barrack Road. The splitting up of the buildings into the three blocks, reduces the overall mass and bulk of the scheme, creates a consistent rhythm of buildings along the Barrack Road frontage whilst allowing views between them and into the rear of the site.
34. The front building line respects the building line along the street and in particular the building on the corner of Barrack Road and Gardner Road, No 1a Gardner Road. The depth of built form across the site will no doubt increase; however it is considered that sufficient distances between the proposed buildings and the surrounding buildings will be retained to ensure an acceptable impact on character. The layout is not considered to harm or disrupt the rhythm of development along Barrack Road. There are areas of defensible space to the front of the buildings beyond the public pavement and with the three main pedestrian entrances at the front of the site, an active frontage will be retained. Vehicles within the rear of the site is not an uncharacteristic feature, given the existing situation on the site and the proposal will enable some meaningful soft landscaping and amenity space to be incorporated into the scheme and improve the hard-surfacing materials.
35. The chosen materials include a mix of buff brick, grey brick and white render on the elevations with an aluminium profile grey roof and fascia and stainless steel handrails with glass balustrading on the balconies. The street scene sees a range of materials and as such the proposed mix is considered to be acceptable and would not harm the visual amenities of the area. BCP Urban Design Officer is in overall support of the scheme but does highlight a number of matters that could be improved. For example, they would prefer to see more traditional flat roofs with a 2 ½ storey height. These comments have been carefully considered;

however it is considered that the locality can accommodate the proposed form and scale of the buildings and the scheme does not result in overriding harm to the character of the locality and visual amenities of Barrack Road.

36. As stated above, Barrack Road is a Prime Transport Corridor and higher densities are encouraged in these localities. The provision of 38 flats at a density of 120 dph is considered to be in keeping with the promotion of high density development in this location in Local Plan policies. Overall, the proposal does not appear cramped or contrived and compared to the previous approved scheme provides for an improved layout with the parking area broken up and more opportunities for planting at the boundaries. This proposal will result in a change of character to this section of Barrack Road; however, this is not necessarily a negative change and as stated in the NPPF decisions should not discourage change or innovation (para. 130).
37. The detailed hard and soft landscaping can be secured by way of condition. There are opportunities to provide planting within the amenity areas and along the boundaries. Native species should be incorporated as much as possible and different permeable surfacing materials used to prevent a harsh environment within the parking areas.
38. Overall, the development is considered to comply with the requirements of policies HE2, LN2 and saved policy H12 and the scheme accords with the Local Plan's aim; 'New development will be expected to be attractive, functional, sustainable and of the highest quality, optimising the site potential and respecting the scale of the locality'.
39. Policy ME3 requires energy efficiency measures from fabric performance, scheme layout and building orientation and then the provision of on-site renewable, decentralised and low carbon energy. Policy ME4 encourages the use of renewable energy in major developments. Photovoltaic panels are being incorporated on the roofs of the three blocks which is welcomed and the supporting statement sets out how the layout and design of the buildings aims to maximise light penetration and solar gain.

Residential Amenity

40. Policy HE2 states that; 'development will be permitted if it compatible with or improves its surroundings in; its relationship to nearby properties including minimising disturbance to amenity'. Saved policy H12 states that residential development should not adversely affect residential amenities by noise or disturbance, or loss of light or privacy.
41. There are a number of residential properties surrounding the site in Barrack Road, Gardner Road to the west and Fitzmaurice Road to the north. Block A is positioned adjacent to 1a Gardner Road to the west. This building is occupied by flats with parking to the rear. Concerns have been raised from residents of this building with regard to the proximity of Block A and overlooking. The design of the proposal has taken into account this built relationship as the third storey has

been set in from the side elevation and there are no openings on the ground and first floor level. There are two windows on the side at second storey serving the kitchen and bathroom for Flat 9. The balconies proposed for the front do not extend around the side of the building so would not provide views directly into the adjacent building or the rooflights on No 1a. There are two windows at ground and first floor level with rooflights within the east facing roof slope. There is 3.4 metres between the side of Block A and No 1a with the exception where it decreases to 2 metres in the centre of the proposed building. This increases to 4.5m separation distance at third storey. It is recognised that the outlook from the side windows on No 1a will change from this proposal; however these separation distances are not uncommon in this urban locality. Furthermore, the extant permission allowed Block A to be positioned 2 from the western boundary and there was a greater number of windows at ground and first floor level.

42. There is likely to be a loss of sunlight in the mornings to those windows facing the application site and specifically Block A. It is understood these windows serve bedrooms rather than the main living rooms. The rooflights for the flat at second floor level at 1a will still have sufficient sunlight and daylight given the orientation of the windows and the stepped back nature of the third storey.
43. No 213 lies to the east of Block C. There is a greater separation distance between these two buildings of 6 metres, although the third storey is also stepped in. It is not considered this relationship creates a cramped or tight form of development in the street scene. To the north east No 1 Gardner Road, a semi-detached property is located. Careful consideration has been given to the impact on this property and the plans have been amended to move Block A slightly forward and the rear balconies changed to Juliet balconies to minimise any harmful impact on amenity. There is 9.7 metres from the rear of Block A to the rear boundary of the site (corner of No 1's rear garden) but 14.2 metres from the rear corner of Block A (two storey section) to southern corner of No 1 and 17 metres from the section of three storey height to the same corner of No 1. Regard has been given to the fallback position of the extant permission although it is recognised that the previous approval had a smaller building with a reduced level of glazing on the rear elevation. To the rear of Block A, the amenity space for future residents is proposed and as such there is scope to include some soft landscaping which would help minimise the impact. Views between the flats and house would be at an oblique angle and given the urban location, the proposed relationship is considered to be acceptable.
44. The properties in Fitzmaurice Road are located in excess of 30 metres from the rear of the proposed blocks. The proposal will bring additional built form of much greater scale; however, it will replace areas of hard surfacing, vehicle display and storage and parking close to the rear boundaries with landscaped areas and an area of reduced parking overall. Given the proposed height of the new buildings, there is no doubt that the outlook from the properties along Fitzmaurice Road will be altered but given the distances involved there is not considered to be

detrimental harm to the occupiers of these properties in terms of loss of privacy or an overbearing form of development.

45. The development brings development and activity into the rear of the site; however, given the current use of some part of the application site, the vehicle movement of 21 cars and pedestrian activity associated with the flats is not considered to result in an unacceptable increase in noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents. Whilst the blocks of flats do have considerably more glazing than the existing properties and extant permitted buildings, the light levels from the residential units are unlikely to cause a nuisance given this urban area.
46. With regards to the future occupiers, the majority of the flats have small balcony areas and also a communal amenity space at the rear of the buildings. The site is within walking distance to open spaces and the overall the provision of amenity space is considered to be sufficient. The position of the three buildings and location of windows in relation to each other have been considered. Block A has minimal openings on its eastern elevation to as not to result in a loss of privacy to the occupants of Block B which has a number of windows on its western façade. Block C has also minimal openings facing the central block. The proposed access drives maintain adequate separation distances between the three buildings.
47. It is considered overall that the development complies with Policy HE2 in that the scheme has minimised general disturbance to amenity and the proposal complies with policy H12 as the residential amenities of existing and future occupiers of dwellings are not adversely affected by noise or disturbance or by the loss of light or privacy.

Parking, Access and Highway matters

48. Under the BCP Parking Standards SPD, the site is located within Zone B and this equates to zero parking requirement for 1 and 2 bed flats. However, this proposal sets out 19 unallocated parking spaces for future residents or visitors. The supporting information sets out that the extant permission provided parking and the proposal would be at a reduced level compared to the existing permission and the Chinese restaurant parking. BCP highways accept this reasoning and are satisfied with the level of parking provision. Two disabled parking spaces have been provided and spaces with electrical vehicle charge points have been identified.
49. With regards to cycle parking provision, one cycle parking space should be provided for each bedroom. The plans indicate a total of 58 cycle spaces with combination of Sheffield Cycle racks and two-tier cycle stands within the rear of the site along with visitor bike racks to the front and side of the three blocks. The level of provision meets the requirements of the Parking SPD; however two-tier cycle racks are not usually encouraged in this type of development. However, given that only 14 spaces are two-tier and they would use a mechanical system

to assist with the lifting of bikes and the safety gains from the removal of the number of existing access points, BCP Highways is satisfied with the proposal.

50. It is considered that the proposal represents a highway gain given the existing activities and vehicle movements associated with the buildings and business on site. BCP Highways have stated;

'The existing site has 8 vehicle accesses, the majority of which have no vehicle turning areas. There are businesses operating from the site which will have an existing traffic generation including parking demands, service vehicles arriving to load and unload and which will have turning movements into and out of the existing accesses, including vehicle reverse movements back out onto the busy main road. The removal of these numerous accesses to have just 2 accesses, which will be of sufficient width to allow two-way vehicle passing represents a highway safety gain in the proposal, particularly with regard to the existing potential reverse movements, turning movements and delivery activities.'

51. It is appreciated from the representations received there is concern surrounding the level of parking and the impact of the development on Barrack Road and the surrounding residential roads. However, the parking provision is beyond what we would expect to see and the traffic generated from the proposal is considered to be compatible with capacity on the wider highway network. The existing uses on the site will have an existing parking and traffic demand.
52. In order to reduce any potential conflict from the new access points into the site and the existing right turn lane into Somerset Road, this lane needs to be shortened and has the potential to be altered without impacting on the capacity of the junction. The existing bus stop outside of No 221 will also need relocating and BCP Highways originally requested a new bus stop with Real Time Information and a wider circulation space to the rear. The applicant had concerns over the viability of providing this new improved bus stop and given the size of the proposed development and the existing situation; it is not considered that a refusal on this basis alone would be reasonable. The Transforming Cities Fund scheme is currently designing a cycle route along Barrack Road and whilst these plans are not finalised yet, the proposed condition to secure amendments to the existing bus stop and right turn lane enables flexibility for the applicant and the Council to ensure the most appropriate highway improvements are carried out.
53. An objection was raised by BCP Waste and Recycling team given the size and location of the bins. However, a Waste Management Plan has been submitted by the applicant setting out that a private company will undertake two collections a week and as such the capacity of bins is not as great as required with BCP due to their alternate weekly collections. This Plan can be secured through condition.
54. It is considered that the scheme complies with policies KS11 and KS12 of the Local Plan and the Parking Standards SPD.

Biodiversity

55. Core Strategy Policy ME1 sets out that it aims to protect, maintain and enhance the condition of all types of nature conservation sites, habitats and species within their ecological networks.
56. The application site lies within 5km but beyond 400m of Dorset Heathland which is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest and as a European wildlife site. The proposal for a net increase in residential units is, in combination with other plans and projects and in the absence of avoidance and mitigation measures, likely to have a significant effect on the site. It has therefore been necessary for the Council, as the appropriate authority, to undertake an appropriate assessment of the implications for the protected site, in view of the site's conservation objectives.
57. The appropriate assessment has concluded that the mitigation measures set out in the Dorset Heathlands 2015-2020 SPD can prevent adverse impacts on the integrity of the site. The SPD strategy includes Heathland Infrastructure Projects (HIPs) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM). In relation to this development the Council will fund HIP provision via the Community Infrastructure Levy but SAMM, which forms the second strand of the strategy, requires that contributions be secured via s106 from all development where there is a net increase in dwellings. The strategic approach to access management is necessary to ensure that displacement does not occur across boundaries.
58. The current application is not yet accompanied by a completed unilateral undertaking; however the applicant has agreed to enter into such an undertaking and therefore there will be a mechanism to secure the necessary contribution (£8,664.00) towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring in accordance with the Dorset Heathlands SPD. This contribution does not relate to the provision of infrastructure, is reasonable and necessary; the contribution complies with Regulations 122 and 123(3) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). With this mitigation secured the development will not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the designated site and is therefore in accordance with policy ME2.
59. A biodiversity report has been submitted as part of the application and it concludes that no protected or notable species were noted on site. Biodiversity is considered to be low due to the hard surfacing and level of ornamental maintained garden on the site and minimal hedgerows. The properties were also considered to hold negligible value for bats. However, the following measures as set out in the report must be incorporated into the scheme to mitigate any potential harm to biodiversity;
- Removal of shrubs/area for nesting birds outside of bird nesting or if cannot take place ecologist must be on site during shrub clearance;

- Planks laid in foundations and drains kept covered overnight to prevent animals becoming trapped;
- Stag beetle larvae if dug up should be reburied in a safe shady place

60. The NPPF requires a net biodiversity net gain on site and as such the following enhancements are proposed;

- 1 bat access shelters built into the bin store
- Two house sparrow terraces
- Hedgehog gaps in fencing
- Four concrete bee bricks added to bike and bin store

61. The mitigation and enhancement measures outlined in the report can be secured by condition along with an additional enhancement of providing swift terraces. The soft and hard landscaping will be secured by condition and this will be a further opportunity to secure native species and provide additional habitats for wildlife. It is considered the scheme complies with policies HE2, ME1, ME2 of the Local Plan.

Contaminated land

62. A Contaminated Land Desk Study report has been submitted with the application give the existing car garage use on site. It identifies that potential sources of contamination include; made ground; leaks and spills from cars; fire pit; use of plots as car garage, car body workshop and forecourt for washing cars. The report concludes that given the moderate/low risk to human health, groundwater and surface water intrusive investigations are carried out. This should include drilling and the installation of boreholes to enable ground gas and groundwater monitoring. BCP Environmental Health are satisfied with this report but have suggested a specific condition which is set out below under No 6. The development is considered to comply with saved policy ENV2.

Planning Balance

63. Having regard to Paragraph 11 d) of the NPPF, given the lack of housing land supply, it is considered that the housing policies of the Development Plan are out of date. However, given the site lies within 5k of a protected European wildlife site and the potential cumulative impact of residential development, mitigation is required to address the harm to the protected site and this can be secured via a planning obligation and CIL as outlined above. The site also lies within an area at risk of flooding and as such the proposal must be in accordance with section 14 of the NPPF. As set out in paragraphs 27-35 it is considered that the Sequential Test does not need to be applied in this particular case and the proposed finished floor areas and mitigation measures will ensure the development is safe for its lifetime. On this basis it is not considered that any

policies listed in footnote 7 of the NPPF provide a clear reason for refusal and the tilted balance applies to this proposal.

64. It is considered that notwithstanding the provision of flats rather than houses which does not technically meet the requirements of the SHMA and the technical breach with policy ME6 on the application of the Sequential Test, the development complies with the Development Plan as a whole and the NPPF. As stated above, the extant permission for flats and the location of the site outweighs the provision of flats over houses. The proposed layout and scale of the scheme did raise questions regarding the impact on residential amenity as is discussed earlier in the report and the provision of flats is technically contrary to the housing requirements in the SHMA. In addition, there are some negative economic impacts from the loss of the existing businesses although there is already a commitment to the loss of most of these from the extant permission.
65. There are, however, positive economic and social impacts from the provision of housing and any environmental impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposals. The proposal is considered to provide a sustainable form of development and provides a net increase of 32 units of residential accommodation and as such the balance is tilted in favour of approving the application.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT permission subject to:

- (a) The following conditions; together with
- (b) a deed pursuant to section 106 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) securing the following terms with power delegated to the Head of Planning (or any other officer nominated by them for such a purpose) to agree specific wording provided such wording in the opinion of the Head of Planning (or other relevant nominated officer) does not result in a reduction in the terms identified as required:
 - Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) - £8,664.00
 - Review mechanism to cover affordable housing

and the following conditions;

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

P001 A Location And Block Plan
P10 C Site Plan

P011 A Block A - floor plans
P020 B Block A – Elevations
P021 Block B Proposed Elevations
P012 Block B Proposed Floor Plans (1 of 2)
P013 Block B Proposed Floor Plans (2 of 2)
P022 A Block C - Elevations
P014 Block C Proposed Floor Plans
P040 Street Scene And Site Section
P051 Rev C – Cycle and Bin Store Plans
P051 Rev C – Cycle and Bin Store Elevations

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until surface water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; such details to include a timetable for implementation. Before any details are submitted to the Local Planning Authority an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system, having regard to Defra's non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (or any subsequent version) and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority.

Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided:

- (a) the submitted details shall also provide:
 - (i) information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and
 - (ii) a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include any arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime; and
- (b) once implemented the works shall thereafter at all times be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure adequate drainage from the site.

4. Prior to the commencement of development, details of the finished floor levels (to be set at minimum of 4.31 AOD)) and flood risk mitigation measures to be incorporated into the building must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to protect the development from flood risk.

6. Prior to the commencement of development, other than in respect of demolition works, a scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to deal with potential contamination of the site. Such scheme shall include the following actions and reports, which must be carried out by appropriately qualified consultant(s):

(a) A Site History Report, which shall, by reference to site layout drawings of an appropriate scale, include a history of the site, past land uses, current and historical maps, site plans, locations of any known spillages or pollution incidents and the location and condition of old tanks, pits, fuel or chemical storage areas. (Please note it is the responsibility of the landowner, developer or consultant to provide and disclose all relevant information). This will be completed in accordance with the Environment Agency's Land Contamination Risk Assessment (LCRM) guidance and provide a Conceptual Site Model and Preliminary Risk Assessment.

(b) If development of the site over several phases is intended the developer will submit in writing for the approval of the Local Planning Authority a Phasing Plan. No alteration of the area covered by each Phase will occur unless approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Following approval of the Phasing Plan the conditions below will need to be addressed with respect to each Phase of the development before occupation of each Phase.

(c) Before any works commence on site, consultants must be appointed to carry out an intrusive site investigation which is conducted in accordance with BS 10175:2011 + A2:2017 and BS 5930:2015. The sampling strategy must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The intrusive site investigation should include for:

- * A gas risk assessment in accordance with CIRIA C665:2007 and BS 8485:2015 + A1:2019;

- * Groundwater elevation monitoring and chemical analysis to enable an appropriate assessment of the hydraulic gradient and impact to controlled waters. The groundwater assessment should be designed to establish the level of risk to the proposed development from off-Site sources of contamination identified in the Phase I report;

- * Establish if legislated and non-legislated invasive plant species are present and assess the potential impact to ecology;

- * Establish the presence and likelihood of risk of contamination sourced from the demolition activities; and

- * Establish the presence and likelihood of risk of relevant contaminants outlined in the Phase I report and the Department of Environment (DoE) Industry Profiles for on-Site activities (Note: The DoE Industry Profiles are not

considered a definitive study for land contamination but introduce technical considerations which are useful in the development of initial Conceptual Site Models and should be considered in future environmental risk assessments and intrusive investigations for this development).

(d) A Site Investigation Report (based on the information contained in the site history report), will be required where the appointed consultant and/or the Local Planning Authority anticipate that contamination may be present in, on or near the proposed development area. The site investigation report must characterise and identify the extent of contamination, identify hazard sources, pathways and receptors and develop a conceptual model of the site for purposes of risk assessment.

(e) Where contamination is found which (in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority) requires remediation, a detailed Remediation Statement, including effective measures to avoid risk to future and neighbouring occupiers, the water environment and any other sensitive receptors when the site is developed, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(f) Development shall only take place in accordance with the approved Remediation Statement.

(g) If, during works on site, contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified, the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Any such scheme shall require approval to be obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

(h) On completion of all the works detailed in the agreed Remediation Statement, a Remediation Completion Report must then be completed by the environmental consultant(s) who carried out the remediation work confirming that they have supervised all the agreed remediation actions. This report is to be submitted to the planning authority confirming that all works as specified and agreed have been carried out to the point of completion. Until the Planning Authority is in receipt of said Remediation Completion Report and is satisfied with the contents of the statement and the standard of work completed, it will be viewed that the remediation of the site is incomplete.

Reason: To protect controlled waters, ecological receptors, human health and property.

7. Notwithstanding the approved plans, no development above DPC (damp proof course) shall take place until additional details of all three cycle stores have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved cycle parking shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and implemented prior to the occupation of the residential

units to which that parking is associated and shall thereafter be maintained available for that parking use at all times thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable forms of transport.

8. No development above DPC (damp proof course) shall take place until details of the construction and layout of the first 5m of the proposed car park vehicle accesses to Barrack Road have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented prior to either of the approved car parks coming into operation for car parking associated with any residential unit.

Reason: To ensure safe access to the highway.

9. No development above DPC (damp proof course) shall take place until details of all external facing and roofing materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). All works shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the details as approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing.

10. No development above DCP (damp proof course) shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works and a landscape management plan (management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include hard surfacing materials; means of enclosure; details of boundary planting, schedules of plants (noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate)

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development and the planting carried out in the first planting season following completion of the development or its first occupation, whichever is the sooner. Any planting found damaged, dead or dying in the first five years following their planting are to be duly replaced with appropriate species.

Reason: The long term establishment, maintenance and landscaping of the site is necessary to preserve the amenity of the locality.

11. No development above DCP (damp proof course) shall take place until details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;

- i. Works to relocate the existing Barrack Road bus stop and associated signage, road markings and raised kerbs; and
- ii. Works to shorten the right turn lane road markings into Burnett Avenue on Barrack Road.

The approved bus stop relocation works must be completed prior to the opening up of the approved vehicle access which affects the bus stop. Approved works to the right hand turn must be carried out prior to first occupation of any residential unit.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the continuation of the provision of sustainable transport facilities.

12. No development above DCP (damp proof course) shall take place until details of the provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Points and associated infrastructure shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be in accordance with the BCP Council Parking Standards (2021) and implemented and brought into operation prior to any residential unit hereby approved being occupied. Thereafter the EVC Points shall be retained and kept available for use at all times.

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable forms of transport.

13. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations as specified in 'Report on Biodiversity at 215-225 Barrack Road Christchurch' by Philip Smith, 10/8/20. In addition, at least one swift brick built into each block, located in accordance with swift conservation guidance and away from man-made lighting, see <http://www.swift-conservation.org/OurLeaflets.htm>. shall be implemented and thereafter retained.

Reason: To ensure the biodiversity mitigation measures are secured and to provide net gains for biodiversity.

14. The development hereby approved shall be carried out and used in accordance with the Waste Management Plan received 18/10/21 detailing private collections.

Reason: To ensure adequate provision if made for waste and recycling storage and collection.

Informatives

1. The applicant has provided a s106 dated (to be confirmed) to pay the appropriate contribution in relation to Heathland mitigation as required by the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020-2025 - Supplementary Planning

Document (SPD) Background Papers and to include a review mechanism to cover affordable housing.

2. The applicant needs to be aware that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be applied to this development. The Council will shortly be issuing a CIL Liability Notice following the grant of this permission which will provide information on the applicant's obligations.
3. The applicant's attention is drawn to the need to enter into the appropriate procedures with, and obtain the appropriate licences from, the Highway Authority regarding any works on the Highway prior to those works taking place.

Background Documents

Documents uploaded to that part of the Council's website that is publicly accessible and specifically relates to the application the subject of this report including all related consultation responses, representations and documents submitted by the applicant in respect of the application.

Notes. This excludes all documents which are considered to contain exempt information for the purposes of Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972.

Reference to published works is not included