Committee Report

Item 7B

Ward: Haughley, Stowupland & Wetherden.

RECOMMENDATION – PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development
Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved - access to be considered) - Erection of up to 29 No. dwellings(10 affordable dwellings).
Location
Land On The North Side Of, Station Road, Haughley, Suffolk

Expiry Date: 02/12/2019
Application Type: OUT - Outline Planning Application
Development Type: Major Small Scale - Dwellings
Applicant: Michael Howard Homes
Agent: Mr Philip Ashenden

Parish: Haughley
Site Area: 1.28 hectares

Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit: None
Has a Committee Call In request been received from a Council Member (Appendix 1): No
Has the application been subject to Pre-Application Advice: Yes (DC/18/01827)

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason/s:

i. The application provides for the development of more than 15 dwellings.

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies
Haughley Neighbourhood Plan
NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework
Core Strategy [2008]
The Haughley Neighbourhood Plan is currently at:- Stage 7: Adoption by LPA [October 2019]

Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan has significant weight.

Of particular relevance to the consideration of the merits of this proposal are Neighbourhood Plan policies:

- Policy HAU1 Haughley Spatial Strategy
- Policy HAU2 Housing Developments within Settlement Boundaries
- Policy HAU4 Land at Station Road East of Millfields
- Policy HAU10 Development Design and Character
- Policy HAU14 Protection of the Rural Landscape
- Policy HAU15 Rights of Way and Access

The site falls within the Settlement Boundary for Haughley as defined by Proposals Map PM2 of the Haughley Neighbourhood Plan

Status of Adopted Local Plan [1998]

A number of policies within the Plan have now been held to be ‘out-of-date’ as a result of recent planning appeal decisions on the basis of Inspectors declaring them to be inconsistent with the NPPF [22019]. On
this basis the tilted balance required by paragraph 11 of the NPPF may need to be brought into play but this will need to be tempered against the fact that there is now an up-to-date Neighbourhood Plan for Haughley and this now constitutes part of the Adopted Development Plan.

**Status of Draft Joint Local Plan [2019]**

The Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan is currently in Regulation 18 phase with the consultation period for comments now finished. Within the Draft Joint Local Plan the application site is not part of the proposed site allocations and would still be considered to be outside of the settlement boundary however it would sit adjacent to it. As the Draft Joint Local Plan is only in Regulation 18 it has very limited weight afforded to it when making decisions and therefore the existing Adopted Local Plan and the NPPF hold more weight along with the Neighbourhood Plan.

**Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement [5YHLS]**

The Council is currently able to demonstrate that it has a 5YHLS and therefore paragraph 11 of the NPPF [2019] is not required to be brought into play by the Government as there is no overriding need to approve sustainable development outside of settlement boundaries in order to urgently reduce a 5YHLS deficit.

**Consultations and Representations**

During the course of the application, consultation and representations from third parties have been received. These are summarised below.

**A: Summary of Consultations**

**Town/Parish Council (Appendix 3)**
Haughley Parish
Supports the proposal and ask that they are consulted as the development proceeds

**National Consultee (Appendix 4)**

**Anglian Water**
Section 1 - Assets Affected
Our records show that there are no assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within the development site boundary.

WASTEWATER SERVICES
Section 2 - Wastewater Treatment
The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Haughley-Old St Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows

**The Environment Agency**
No comments to make as it is considered to be an inappropriate consultation

**Natural England**
No comments
County Council Responses (Appendix 5)

SCC - Highways
We have reviewed the data supplied with this application; the summary of our findings are as follows:

. The proposed visibility splays for the accesses are sufficient for this application.
. The proposal for 29 dwellings would create approximately 15 vehicle movements within the peak hour (1 vehicle every 4 minutes) therefore the additional vehicles from the development will not have a severe impact on the capacity of the highway network in the area.
. The closest bus stop is 100m from the centre of the site with public transport services.
. There is a proposal to create a footway from the site to the footway on Station Road making safe access for pedestrians to school and the amenities within the village.
The development would not have a severe impact on the highway network (NPPF para 109) therefore we do not object to the proposal.

SCC - Archaeological Service
This site has not previously been subject to systematic archaeological investigation and no archaeological investigation has been undertaken in the immediate vicinity. Archaeological investigation would therefore be required as a condition of any granted planning application in order to assess the archaeological potential of this site, as groundworks associated with the development will damage or destroy any archaeological remains which exist.

There are no grounds to consider refusal of permission to achieve preservation in situ of any important heritage assets. However, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 199), any permission granted should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.

In this case the following two standard conditions would be appropriate.

SCC - Flood & Water Management
The following submitted documents have been reviewed and we recommend approval, subject to conditions;

. Level Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Ref IE18/097/FLI
. Indicative Site Layout 0228/0UTOOI
. Phase 1 Land Contaminated Assessment Ref IE18/097/CP1/r1

SCC - Fire & Rescue
Hydrants are required for this development

Access and Fire Fighting Facilities:
Access to buildings for fire appliances and firefighters must meet with the requirements specified in Building Regulations Approved Document B, (Fire Safety), 2006 Edition, incorporating 2010 and 2013 amendments Volume 1 - Part B5, Section 11 dwelling houses, and, similarly, Volume 2, Part B5, Sections 16 and 17 in the case of buildings other than dwelling houses. These requirements may be satisfied with other equivalent standards relating to access for firefighting, in which case those standards should be quoted in correspondence.

Water Supplies:
Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service recommends that fire hydrants be installed within this development on a suitable route for laying hose, i.e. avoiding obstructions. However, it is not possible, at this time, to determine the number of fire hydrants required for firefighting purposes. The requirement will be determined at the water planning stage when site plans have been submitted by the water companies.

Sprinklers Advised:
Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service recommends that proper consideration be given to the potential life safety, economic, environmental and social benefits derived from the provision of an automatic fire sprinkler system.

Consultation should be made with the Water Authorities to determine flow rates in all cases. Should you need any further advice or information on access and firefighting facilities, you are advised to contact your local Building Control in the first instance. For further advice and information regarding water supplies, please contact the Water Officer.

**SCC - Travel Plan Co-ordinator**
Thank you for consulting me about the proposed residential development at Land on the North Side of Station Road in Haughley. Having reviewed the application documents, I have no comment to make due to the rural location of the development, in addition to the size of the development not meeting the threshold that would require the submission of a Travel Plan in accordance with national planning guidance.

**SCC - Development Contributions Manager**
Cil Education:
- Primary school expansion £116,172
- Secondary school expansion £113,690
- sixth form expansion £22,738
Cil Early years expansion £49,788
Cil Libraries improvements £6,264
Cil Waste infrastructure £3,190

S106 Education:
- primary school transport costs £47,040
- secondary school transport £24,000
costs

S106 Highways tbc

**Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 6)**

**Ecology - Place Services**
No objection subject to securing biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures.

We have reviewed the Ecological Impact Assessment (Castle Hill Ecology Ltd, January 2019) relating to the likely impacts of development on designated sites, protected species and priority species & habitats.

We are satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination. This provides certainty for the LPA of the likely impacts on protected and Priority species/habitats and, with appropriate mitigation measures secured, the development can be made acceptable. Therefore, the mitigation measures identified in the Ecological Impact Assessment (Castle Hill Ecology Ltd, January 2019) should be secured and implemented in full. This is necessary to conserve Protected and Priority Species.
However, it is recommended that a condition should be secured for a wildlife Sensitive lighting Strategy following the Bat and Lighting Guidance (Institute of Lighting Professionals, September 2019).

Public Realm
The Public Realm Team would expect a local solution to the management of the open spaces and verges associated with this development. Open space within the development only serves the people living there and has limited wider community value. The District Council would not seek to adopt any of the open spaces.

Communities (Major Development)
No comments

MSDC - Planning Policy - Contrary To Dev Plan/Departures
The submitted Design and Access Statement (August 2019) does not recognise or reference the Haughley neighbourhood plan correctly. The D&A statement states there is 'limited information if currently available from MSDC on the progress of this NDP'. It is clear from the Councils website there is a published examiners final report on the 13th June 2019. The referendum concluded in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan (https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/neighbourhood-planning/neighbourhood-planning-in-mid-suffolk/haughley-neighbourhood-plan/). Therefore, the Haughley NDP forms part of the development plan for decision-making.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) position
The IDP (July 2019) sets out both Babergh and Mid Suffolk's infrastructure requirements and priorities. It was published on the 22nd July 2019 as evidence which supports the Joint Local Plan and is an iterative document which will change over time dependant on changing infrastructure capacity, requirements and priorities.

The proposed development is not part of the proposed site allocations of the emerging Joint Local Plan. For the purpose of this response, and to understand the impact on infrastructure capacity, the content of the IDP has been considered together with the existing planning permissions and responses from infrastructure providers.

Heritage Team
The Heritage Team considers that the proposal would cause:

A very low level of less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset because development on the proposal site would erode the last tangible connection between Hill Farmhouse and its curtilage listed building and its historic agricultural setting. However, this aspect of the building’s setting is already largely lost.

The Heritage Team recommends that the impact of the development on the designated heritage asset is taken into consideration when balancing against the public benefits of the proposal.

Strategic Housing
Proposed open market housing = 29 dwellings
6 x 2 bedroom houses
3 x 3 bedroom bungalows
7 x 3 bedroom houses
2 x 4 bedroom houses
1 x 5 bedroom house
Suitable housing options for more elderly people are less available within the current housing stock. 6% of all households have elderly relatives who may need to move to Suffolk within the next 3 years. The affordable housing should be integrated into the scheme and not placed in one area. Although the proposed open market is a mixture of 2, 3, 4 and 5 dwellings we are disappointed that there is a large proportion of larger dwellings when the 2011 census data shows that many properties are under occupied.

**Affordable Housing Mix:**

The majority district-wide need is for 1 and 2 bedrooms dwellings followed by a smaller demand for 3 bed dwellings.

The current registered need for affordable housing in Haughley is 20 applicants with local connection with over half looking for 1 bedroom accommodation.

Having regard to the above housing information and to ensure a broad housing mix to reflect local and district need the following affordable housing mix is recommended:

**Affordable Rent:** Total: 7
- 4 x 2b x 4person houses @ 79sqm
- 1 x 3b x 5p person house @ 93sqm
- 2 x 2b x 4p person bungalows @ 70sqm

**Shared Ownership:** Total: 3
- 3 x 3b x 5p houses @ 93sqm

**B: Representations**

At the time of writing this report at least 6 letters/emails/online comments have been received. It is the officer opinion that this represents 5 objections and 1 general comment. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below:-

**Objections**
- Loss of countryside
- Lack of infrastructure or the infrastructure
- Highway safety; visibility splay
- Increase in traffic
- Impact on ecology and wildlife
- Already 2 developments going ahead
- Not sustainable in relation to being granted so suddenly when the new JLP lasts until 2038
- Concerns over design
- Loss of hedgerow which fronts the site
- Stowmarket area has already had major development works underway or planned which have created an increased strain on local amenities

**Neutral**
- Extends the limit of the 30mph area
- Concern over assess for construction traffic
- Only bungalows facing Station Road and therefore flats are out of keeping
- Inclusion of a pedestrian crossing is suggested
PLANNING HISTORY

REF: DC/19/03790  Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved - access to be considered) - Erection of up to 29 No. dwellings (10 affordable dwellings).

DECISION: PCO

REF: 0298/80/OL  Erection of scout hall and construction of access.

DECISION: REF 19.01.1981

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1.0  The Site and Surroundings

1.1. The application site is a parcel of agricultural land situated on the eastern edge of Haughley off Station Road. There are clusters of residential dwellings to the west and the south. There are agricultural fields to the north, east and southeast. The application site is 1.28 hectares. The site itself is higher than the adjacent highway and the frontage is characterised by mature hedgerow.

2.0  The Proposal

2.1. The application to be considered is for outline planning permission for the erection of up to 29 dwellings with 10 affordable dwellings. Access is to be considered as part of this outline application however all other matters are reserved.

2.2. As this is an outline application only with all matters reserved, the design and layout details are not for consideration at this stage although the indicative site plan does demonstrate that the plot is large enough to accommodate 29 dwellings.

3.0  The Principle Of Development

3.1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications under the Planning Acts be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Strictly speaking, that direction is of greater relevance to the determination of applications for planning permission; however, it is considered appropriate that the development plan be the starting point in determining the appropriateness of the reserved matters detail that has been submitted and is no less relevant in that respect.

The Development Plan comprises the following:

- Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998
- Mid Suffolk Core Strategy 2008
- Mid Suffolk Focused Review Core Strategy 2012
Within the current development plan, those policies considered to be most important for the determination of this outline application and its associated details are as follows:

- GP1: Design and layout of development
- CL8: Protecting wildlife habitats
- H4: Provision for affordable housing in larger schemes
- H5: Affordable housing in the countryside
- H13: Design and layout of residential development
- H14: A range of house types to meet different accommodation needs.
- H15: Development to reflect local characteristics.
- H16: Protecting existing residential amenity.
- T9: Parking standards.
- T10: Highway considerations in development.
- T11: Facilities for pedestrians and cyclists

3.2 Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan states that all settlements not included in the Settlement Hierarchy list will be designated as countryside and countryside villages as such development will be restricted to particular types of development to support the rural economy, meet affordable housing, community needs and provide renewable energy.

3.3 Haughley itself is designated as a Key Service Centre in the Core Strategy. Key Service Centres are expected to be the focus of development outside of that attracted to towns.

3.4 The application site sits outside the settlement boundary for Haughley however it does lie directly adjacent to it and less than 800metres from the centre of Haughley. Furthermore, there is a footpath approximately 30metres or so away from the site which then links up to the centre of Haughley and offers pedestrians a safe access route to the facilities and services.

3.5 Whilst it is noted that the application site is not contained as an allocated site in the emerging Joint Local Plan and would still be considered to be outside of the settlement boundary, it is however allocated within the Haughley Neighbourhood Plan which has significant weight. Indeed, that weight may be held to exceed that now associated with CS1 and on that basis and as a matter of judgement point strongly to the principle now be supportable.

3.6 Haughley Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in October 2019 and sets out Haughley’s vision for new development up to 2036. As the Neighbourhood Plan has now been formally adopted this document is considered to hold significant weight when determining applications within Haughley. The application site has been included within the neighbourhood plan under Policy HAU4 know as “Land at Station Road East of Millfields”.

4.0 Nearby Services and Connections Assessment Of Proposal

4.1. The application site is approximately 375 metres from the centre of Haughley. Whilst there is currently no footway directly abutting the site this would come forward as part of the proposed development and would connect to the existing footpath which is only some 65metres to the west of the site.
4.2. There are sufficient services and facilities within Haughley as well as a number of bus stops and a regular bus service. The site is considered to be well connected to sufficient services and facilities to meet future occupiers needs without sole reliance on the private motor car.

5.0 Site Access, Parking And Highway Safety Considerations

5.1. The application site would see the creation of a new vehicular access onto Station Road.

5.2. Suffolk County Council Highway Authority initially raised concerns with regards to visibility splays however revised information has been submitted and it no longer objects to the proposal.

5.3. The nearest bust stop from the site would be approximately 100m away in the centre of Haughley and the proposal seeks to create a footpath from the site to join the existing footpath on Station Road, as such pedestrians would have safe access to the local facilities and services.

5.4. Parking for the proposed dwellings is provided to the required Suffolk Parking Guidance

5.5. In light of this the proposal is considered to accord with the NPPF and comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policies T9 and T10.

6.0 Design And Layout [Impact On Street Scene]

6.1. The application is for outline only with access to be considered and all other matters considered. The application seeks the erection of up to 29 dwellings. There would be a new access created onto Station Road. As the application is outline only, the design and layout details are not for consideration at this stage although the indicative site plan does demonstrate that the plot is large enough to accommodate these. Whilst the application is outline only and the design and layout details are not for consideration at this stage, the indicative layout demonstrates that the proposed development would be in keeping with the surrounding areas. Officers have been keen to establish a baseline for design quality through negation.

6.2. It is suggested that the materials put forward at the reserved matters stage would need to be of traditional vernacular palette; for example, clay plain or pantiles and natural slate, soft red stock bricks Suffolk white gault stock bricks boarding and/or render. Windows to be set back with reveals and all glazing bars to be externally applied to glass in double glazed units.

7.0 Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity And Protected Species

7.1. Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect and conserve landscape qualities taking into account the natural environment and the historical dimension of the landscape as a whole rather than concentrating solely on selected areas, protecting the District's most important components and encouraging development that is consistent with conserving its overall character.

7.2. Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils.

7.3. The application site currently consists of agricultural land. There is an existing mature hedgerow which runs along the eastern (side) boundary. The proposed development is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on the existing landscape although it is noted that in order to achieve the visibility splays the hedgerow to the front of the site would mostly be lost. However,
given the existing built up form of development adjacent this minimal loss of hedgerow is not considered to cause harm.

7.4. An assessment has been undertaken with regards to the protected species and sufficient ecological information has been submitted to provide certainty as to the likely impacts on protected and Priority species/habitats. The mitigation measures identified in the submitted Ecological Impact Assessment have been considered and the mitigation measures outline in the report are considered to be suitable. As such the proposal is considered acceptable in this regard.

7.5. Whilst the land is currently in agricultural use and falls within Class 2 of the National England Agricultural Land Classification (ALC), its modest size of 1.275 hectares means that the loss of this land as agricultural does not post any strategic threat to agricultural activity within the area or the District generally. The shape of the site is rectangular and does not leave any adjacent farmland as unfarmable by reason of awkward shape. Its loss is therefore acceptable in this circumstance.

8.0 Land Contamination, Flood Risk, Drainage and Waste

8.1. Environmental Health confirm that there is no objection to the proposal in this regard.

8.2. SCC Flood & Water Management confirms that it has no objection to the proposal in this regard and recommend conditions which run concurrent with the reserved matters application.

9.0 Heritage Issues [Including The Impact On The Character And Appearance Of The Conservation Area And On The Setting Of Neighbouring Listed Buildings]

9.1. To the south of the site, on the opposite side of Station Road lies the Grade II listed Hill Farmhouse. Hill Farmhouse is timber-framed and dates back to the 16th century.

9.2. The Heritage concern relates to the potential impact of the development in the setting of the listed building. Before the mid-20th century, the setting of Hill Farmhouse was characterised by open, agricultural land and as a former farmhouse would have historically had an important functional relationship with this land which would form part of its setting.

9.3. However since the mid-20th century the surrounding areas have been largely developed and the farmhouse is now almost entirely surrounded by suburban housing estates. The only open agricultural land which remains now is the land to the north east – the land that forms the development site.

9.4. The Heritage Team has been consulted and object to the proposal as it is considered to cause a very low level of less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset. It is considered that the proposed site would erode the last tangible connection between Hill Farmhouse and its historic agricultural setting.

9.5. The duty imposed by s.66(1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 imposes a presumption against the grant of planning permission which causes harm to a heritage asset (South Lakeland DC v Secretary of State for the Environment [1992] 2 AC 141). A finding of harm, even less than substantial harm, to a listed building or the setting of a listed building is a consideration to which the decision-maker must give “considerable importance and weight” (Bath Society v Secretary of State for the Environment [1991] 1 W.L.R. 1303).
9.6. Here, the heritage officer is of the view that the development does cause harm to the heritage asset (albeit a very low less than substantial harm within the meaning of paragraph 196 of the NPPF).

9.7. However, your Officers feel that the level of harm is insufficient to refuse the development against the wider benefits of housing supply, economic growth, good design and use of this particular sustainable site.

9.8. Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 8). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits.

9.9. From Woolpit Public Enquiry Appeal benefits were defined as follows and are applicable to this development.

- An increase in the provision of housing numbers at a time of pressing need
- An increase in choice and type of homes
- Affordable housing provision
- Employment opportunities during the construction phase
- Residents would be likely to use the local shops and services within the settlement making a positive contribution to their vitality and viability
- Footpath improvements to the village centre and the wider countryside
- Highway works

9.10. In the light of the above and the requirements of paragraph 196 of the NPPF it is considered that the proposal offers public benefits which outweigh the less than substantial harm. Furthermore the application site is not considered to be directly experienced visually in relation to the farmhouse, in fact given the already eroded setting and the distance between the Farmhouse and the application site it is argued that the development proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the setting given the existing modern suburban developments which surround the site.

10.0 Impact On Residential Amenity

10.1. The application is for outline only with all matters reserved save for access. As such residential amenity is not a consideration at this stage as any issues could be addressed and overcome subject to design, form and siting within the plot, it is unlikely that there would be any impact on the existing residential amenity and this would not be sufficient to warrant refusal at this stage as the design could address these issues.

11.0 Planning Obligations / CIL

11.1. The proposal is for up to 29 dwellings with 10 affordable proposed. A S106 agreement is sought to ensure that these dwellings are delivered as affordable dwellings and can be offered in accordance with the Council’s nomination rights and allocated through the Choice-based lettings system.

11.2 All the other infrastructure impacts of this proposal would be subject to funding via CIL.
12.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion

12.1. The application site is not currently allocated in the Adopted Development Plan nor within the Draft Joint Local Plan. However it should be noted that the application site is identified and indeed allocated within the recently adopted up-to-date Haughley Neighbourhood Plan. The site is not isolated and is reasonably well connected to all the facilities and services within Haughley and is considered to be sustainable across all three strands (environmentally, economically and socially). As such it carries considerable weight in terms of the NPPF.

12.2. The proposal would result in benefits from the provision of housing, some of which would be affordable, in a highly sustainable location, and is not considered to result in adverse impacts to outweigh the benefits, such that the proposal is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

That the application is GRANTED planning permission/listing building consent/other and includes the following conditions:-

(1) Subject to the prior agreement of a Section 106 Planning Obligation on appropriate terms to the satisfaction of the Chief Planning Officer to secure:

• Affordable housing
• On site open space and including management of the space to be agreed and requirement for public access at all times.

(2) That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to GRANT Planning Permission upon completion of the legal agreement subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:

• Standard time limit (3yrs for implementation of scheme/Outline/Reserved/Section73?)
• RM to include layout, appearance etc. and detailed cross sections that show relationship of finished development with all adjoining sites + a minimum of 10% open space
• Layout shall broadly conform to that shown on illustrative layout drawing ref:
• Phasing Condition (To allow phasing of the development and allows spreading of payments under CIL)
• External Materials to be submitted and chosen from traditional vernacular palette
• The northern and eastern site boundaries to be fully landscaped with a hedgerow of indigenous field edge species to the open countryside edge. Any fence or other means of enclosure shall be located on the development side of this hedgerow.
• Swift boxes installation scheme to be agreed
• Hedgehog fencing scheme to be agreed
• SuDs conditions
• Market housing mix prior to or concurrent with reserved matters to be agreed
• Energy and renewal integration scheme to be agreed
• Rainwater harvesting to be agreed
• Construction Method Statement to be agreed.
• Level access to enable wheelchair access for all dwellings/buildings.

(3) **And the following informative notes**

• Proactive working statement

(4) **That in the event of the Planning obligations or requirements referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured and/or not secured within 6 months of this resolution along with an appropriate extension of time to the application to ensure such obligation/requirements are secured in a timely manner that the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate ground/s**