

**Development Control Committee  
21 August 2012**

**Additional Information**

PWM1 - S12/1374

**Proposal:** Erection of ten affordable dwellings and associated infrastructure

**Information Received:**

The following consultee comments have been received since the drafting of the committee report:

Drainage

A neighbour has expressed concern about the drainage of the site and impact upon neighbouring properties, specifically possible flooding from rainwater run-off; the characteristics of the geology of the soil and sub strata; the unsuitability of the site to be drained by soakaways and that the catchment of the River Witham is at capacity.

Comments on site selection and the need for the development

Claypole Parish Council has submitted the following in support of the site selection process and the need for this housing:

" On page 5 of the report to Committee it states that "no further sites were bought forward and in agreement with the Parish Council a village walk was carried out in 2010 with the Rural Housing Enabler and Waterloo Housing Association to try and identify potential sites in the village. Six potential sites were identified as follows in order of preference."

1. Rectory Lane
2. Barnby Lane
3. Hough Lane
4. School Lane
5. Fen Lane
6. Coulby Close

I need to point out that The Parish Council did not participate in a village walk and would not agree that the above list is realistic. The only discussions that the PC were involved in was around Rectory Lane and the current application for Barnby Lane. The Rectory Lane site is owned by the Diocese of Lincoln and would have required access via the PC owned car park, which is adjacent to the primary school and heavily used for people at the playing fields. Use of that site would have meant losing parking spaces and it was felt that there would be increased traffic problems, particularly at school opening and leaving times. The Barnby Lane site was suggested because the owner had previously approached the PC to discuss the opportunity to extend the adjacent playing field. That opportunity did not progress, but clearly the landowner was open to considering alternative use of the land, and the PC suggested that contact be made.

Beyond those two sites it is difficult to envisage how the other sites could be utilised. Fen Lane for example is over a half a mile out of the village and a disabled occupant of affordable homes would have difficulty reaching the village shops.

A factor in this affordable home scheme is that the landowner is prepared to sell the land at less than the full market rate and that no other landowner has come forward to similarly invest in the future of the village.

There is opposition to this proposal, mainly from residents close by the site, but there is also support, which recognises that the scheme will be meeting an identified need. Similar schemes in other villages have proven to be successful and have quickly become a part of the community.”

## **Officer Comments**

### **Drainage**

Both the Upper Witham IDB (UWIDB) and the Council's Drainage Officer are aware of these issues. Our officer has responded to the neighbour, advising that these points were taken into account when they commented upon the application. They note that in response to those concerns the applicant's drainage consultant has re-visited their design for the site.

The consultants have stated that they will be submitting detailed proposals on levels to provide evidence that will mitigate any potential problems by dealing with overland flows within the site. It is proposed, at the moment, to drain SW run-off via existing Anglian Water sewers. This is considered to be acceptable provided that such flows are attenuated to the rate stated by UWIDB. Anglian Water has no objection in principle to the development, subject to the imposition of condition 7.

In accordance with condition 7 in the recommendation, the details of surface water drainage must be subject to consultation with and approval by the relevant technical bodies.

**Comments on site selection and the need for the development**

The comments of the Parish Council are welcomed and are considered to indicate wider local support for both the principle of development and the choice of this site.

**Alterations/Additional Conditions**

None

**Changes to Recommendation**

No change to recommendation.

## JJ1 - S11/2300

**Proposal:** Demolition of existing football club buildings and structures. Residential development with associated infrastructure, including new means of access with Kettering Road.

### **Summary of information received:**

Environment Agency: No additional comments to make on the amended plans.

Peterborough City Council: No comments.

Crime Prevention Design Advisor: No additional comments to make on the amended plans.

Three additional letters of objection have also been received from members of the public. The objections can be summarised as follows:

- Concerns that the inclusion of a cycle track on the footpath where cars are regularly parked will be a danger to mobility vehicles, prams and the elderly,
- The [proposed new access will be hazardous for Kettering Road with the additional increase in traffic using Wothorpe Road,
- It appears that these plans have been amended due to the restricted view from the station. There does not appear to be any consistency of process by either the Planning Department of the Council Members. Plans for Ryhall Road (S11/2288) have been submitted to the Planning Department which have been agreed by Council members. Why? For example, using the process adopted on the Kettering Road site process, plans for Ryhall Road should not go ahead. Why is the visual impact of the open countryside/loss of view in one part of the town more important than the other? No such consideration has been taken into account for the Ryhall Road residents whose properties will actually back on to the proposed ground. Nor has any consideration been taken into account for the increased cross town traffic from the Kettering Road (S11/2300) site if the proposed re-siting of the Stamford AFC football ground moves to Ryhall Road (S11/2288) site.

### **Officer's comments on information:**

The issues in relation to highway safety and the proposed cycle way are addressed in the main agenda. It is however noted that the Highway Authority

has raised no objections to this element of the proposed scheme and as such it is considered that the development will not be detrimental to highway safety.

A number of concerns have been raised which relate to the proposed relocation of the football club to Ryhall Road. These issues were debated under application S11/2288 when the application was considered at the Development Control Committee on 26 June 2012. The issues raised do not relate to this current application.

**Changes to recommendation:**

None.

JJ2 - S06/1151

**Proposal:** Non-food retail development (6 units) with associated parking, servicing and access.

**Summary of information received:**

Two additional letters of comment have been received from members of the public. The points raised can be summarised as follows:

- No objection so long as the 6 units do not affect the vitality of similar commercial enterprises within Stamford Town Centre.
- In the previous proposals, the Section 106 benefits were allocated to the provision of free buses for the elderly. Stamford lacks facilities for the young, it would be prudent to expect the above development to donate sufficient land for a youth centre with multi function hall.
- As an interested Stamfordian, I would be glad to speak for the development since it would bring more choice and employment to the Eastern Sector of Stamford.
- “Out of town” shopping and supermarkets etc are killing “retail” shopping in all town centres including our precious and historic town of Stamford. We shall soon be only left with “cafes, restaurants and take-aways”:- Charity shops (low rate payers) and estate agents and banks leaving nothing to attract “retail” customers.
- So called “sequential” surveys are very often a sham being used to justify a change of land use for profit and to build large so called single purpose shops which finish up in multiple use (in effect lots of small “shops” within the same building in different uses). Look at the so-called Waterside Garden Centre at Kates Bridge. – They retail anything now.

The applicant’s agent has made additional comments in relation to the published Committee Report. The issues raised are set out below:

The applicant’s agent has set out two important points of clarification based on the following extracts taken from the officer’s report:

*‘Buses*

*JMP considers the existing public transport service provision to the site to be relatively poor, with only one regular (hourly) Stamford Town Centre ‘hopper’ service on Monday to Friday, and eight other sporadic services Monday to Friday and five sporadic services on Sundays. There are no services currently operating on Saturday.*

*Bryan G Hall has agreed with the bus operator (Delaine Buses) that the 'Stamford Town Centre' service would run between the local areas and the site, providing some six journeys between 09:50 and 14:45. This would be funded for a period of three years. This proposal would have to be secured under a Section 106 planning Agreement.*

*We note that contrary to the general position in relation to development schemes of this nature no planning agreement is proposed or countenanced to address the adverse impacts of the scheme. At the very least we would have expected contributions to public transport and the travel plan to be properly secured by the use of a section 106 planning obligation. It would be wholly inappropriate to grant a planning permission in the belief that a bus service will be provided when no steps have been taken to secure this'.*

Officer Evaluation:

*'In order to help improve access to the site by public transport the applicants following discussions with the local highway authority propose to provide a designated bus stop located directly to the entrance of the site on Uffington Road.*

*In addition in order to address concerns raised by the Court when quashing the previous decision a condition is proposed requiring that a Saturday bus service be secured prior to the occupation of the buildings and that the service be maintained for a period of three years in order to enable it to become established.*

*There has been some concern raised in relation to the detail contained in the draft Framework Travel Plan submitted in support of the application. Although it is accepted that this will require some amendments before it can be considered acceptable the local highway authority has indicated that they are happy for the details to be addressed by way of a condition requiring the travel plan to be submitted and approved prior to the occupation of the proposed units'.*

The agent has stated that "it might be inferred from Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce (SCTC) comments that Bryan G Hall (BGH) concurs with the need for a Section 106 Agreement to secure the bus service. For clarity, this is only the view of the SCTC and not BGH. BGH continue to support the use of a condition to secure a Saturday bus service to and from

the site. See Condition 13, as amended, below under the sub-title 'Suggested Amendments to Draft Conditions'."

In addition the applicant's agent has suggested the following amendments (outlined in red) to the conditions contained in the Committee Report:

Condition 9

*The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans submitted as part of the application:*

- Proposed Site Layout Plan: Ref A1A00037 A(PL) 01-101 Rev A*
- Proposed Elevations: Ref A1A00037 A(PL) 01-200*
- Part Typical Elevation: Ref A1A00037 A(OO) 01-201*
- Proposed Site Sections AA and BB: Ref A1A00037 A(PL)01-202 [amend: not 200]*
- Tree Protection Plan: Ref SF1412 TPP01 Rev B*
- Proposed Roundabout: Ref 10-257-TR-009 Rev A*
- Proposed Bus Layby : Ref 10-257-TR-011*
- Proposed Pedestrian Crossing: Ref 03/332/100/013 Rev A*

*Reason: To define the permission and for the avoidance of doubt.*

Condition 10

*Prior to beneficial occupation of the development hereby permitted a new four arm roundabout on Uffington Road (as indicatively shown on drawing ref 10-257-TR-009 Rev A) shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.*

*Reason: In the interests of highway safety.*

Condition 11

*Prior to beneficial occupation of the development hereby permitted details of the proposed bus stop together with all ancillary [typo] works on Uffington Road shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing and the bus stop shall thereafter be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the beneficial [typo] occupation of the development.*

*Reason: In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway and the safety of the users of the site.*

### Condition 13

Prior to beneficial occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of a scheme ~~“the mechanism”~~ to secure a Saturday bus service to and from the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved service shall be implemented for a minimum of 3 years from first occupation in accordance with the frequency and timetable set out in the approved scheme ~~“submitted details”~~.

Reason: To improve the accessibility of the site by public transport.

### Condition 18

Prior to the beneficial occupation of any of the units hereby approved an updated Framework Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to achieve the aims, objectives and targets of the draft Travel Plan (ref: 10-257-003.2) submitted as part of the Application. Those parts of the approved Travel Plan that are identified therein as being capable of implementation after occupation shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable contained therein and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority conforms to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of promoting sustainable development.

### Condition 19

No development shall take place until all existing trees to be retained as part of the development as shown on the approved plan (ref SF1412 Tpp01 Rev B) have been fenced off to the limit of their branch spread or as otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority. No works (including removal of earth), storage of materials, vehicular movements or siting of temporary buildings shall be permitted within these fenced areas. The tree protection measures shall comply fully with the guidelines ~~[typo]~~ and recommendations ~~[typo]~~ set out in the Arboricultural ~~[typo]~~ Survey Report submitted on 27 February 2012.

Reason: To prevent unnecessary damage to existing trees and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

### Condition 21

No development shall take place until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include: proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures. ~~["proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports etc.)"]~~ Soft landscape works shall include: planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; and an implementation programme.

*Reason: Hard and soft landscaping and tree planting make an important contribution to the development and its assimilation with its surroundings and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).*

### Condition 27

The retail units hereby permitted shall only be ~~["sub-"]~~ divided in accordance with the approved plans and there shall be no further sub-division of the units without an express grant of planning permission by the local planning authority.

*Reason: To ensure that the size of the retail operation on the site would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of the town centre."*

### **Officer's comments on information:**

A request has been made for developer contributions towards a youth centre. As the proposed development relates to retail development it will not generate any additional impact on youth facilities or any additional demand for youth facilities. It is therefore not considered appropriate to request a contribution towards providing a youth centre, such a request would not meet the relevant tests associated with S106 contributions.

For clarification purposes it is recommended that condition 9 be amended to refer to plan Proposed Site Section AA and BB: Ref A1A00037 A(PL)01-202.

For clarification purposes it is recommended that condition 10 be amended to refer to drawing ref 10-257-TR-009 Rev A:

It is recommended that condition 13 be amended to refer to a 'scheme' rather than 'mechanism' to secure the proposed bus service and to require the scheme to be implemented for a minimum of 3 years from 'first occupation':

It is recommended that condition 18 be amended to refer to 'an updated Framework Travel Plan'. The agent has suggest further amendments to the wording of this condition, these are however, not considered to be appropriate as the original targets in the submitted Framework Travel Plan will need to be updated and additional targets may need to be added.

It is recommended that condition 19 be amended to include the words 'or as otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority': This will enable some flexibility if alternative tree protection measures are required during the development.

The agent has requested changes to the wording of condition 21. The proposed changes are not considered to be necessary it is therefore recommended that the condition remains as per the main agenda.

Condition 24 lists in brackets the goods that would fall within the non-bulky goods category. It is recommended that the word 'including' be omitted from condition 24 and the following be added to the list of appropriate non-bulky goods: chinaware and kitchenware, Perfume goods, toiletries, stationery, and fashion accessories, chemists goods, sports equipment, hobbies, small electrical appliances.

Condition 25 lists in brackets the goods that would fall within the bulky goods category. It is recommended that the word 'including' be omitted from condition 25. This will ensure that the condition is more precise.

The agent has requested changes to the wording of condition 27. The proposed changes are not considered to be necessary it is therefore recommended that the condition remains as per the main agenda.

The following two additional conditions are suggested in order to ensure that there is no convenience / food sales from the proposed development.

29. The premises hereby permitted shall be used for the sale of non-bulky and bulky comparison goods only and for no other purpose (including any other purposes in Class A1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification.

Reason: To ensure that the retail operation would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of Stamford Town Centre.

30. The premises hereby permitted shall not be used for the sale of food and convenience goods (food and non-alcoholic beverages, tobacco, alcoholic beverages, newspapers and periodicals, non-durable household goods) without an express grant of planning permission by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the retail operation would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of Stamford Town Centre.

**Changes to recommendation:**

That condition 9 be amended to refer to plan Proposed Site Section AA and BB: Ref A1A00037 A(PL)01-202.

9. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans submitted as part of the application:

Proposed Site Layout Plan: Ref A1A00037 A(PL) 01-101 Rev A  
Proposed Elevations: Ref A1A00037 A(PL) 01-200  
Part Typical Elevation: Ref A1A00037 A(OO) 01-201  
Proposed Site Section AA and BB: Ref A1A00037 A(PL)01-202  
Landscape Masterplan: Ref SF1412 LL01 Rev D  
Tree Protection Plan: Ref SF1412 TPP01 Rev B  
Proposed Roundabout: Ref 10-257-TR-009 Rev A  
Proposed Bus Layby : Ref 10-257-TR-011  
proposed Pedestrian Crossing: Ref 03/332/100/013 Rev A

Reason: To define the permission and for the avoidance of doubt.

Condition 10 be amended to refer to drawing ref 10-257-TR-009 Rev A:

10. Prior to beneficial occupation of the development hereby permitted a new four arm roundabout on Uffington Road (as indicatively shown on drawing ref 10-257-TR-009 Rev A) shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

Condition 11 be amended to correct typographical error relating to the spelling of ancillary and beneficial:

11. Prior to beneficial occupation of the development hereby permitted details of the proposed bus stop together with all ancillary works on Uffington Road shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing and the bus stop shall thereafter be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the beneficial occupation of the development.

Reason: In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway and the safety of the users of the site.

Condition 13 be amended to refer to a 'scheme' rather than 'mechanism' to secure the proposed bus service and to require the scheme to be implemented for a minimum of 3 years from 'first occupation':

13. Prior to beneficial occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of a scheme to secure a Saturday bus service to and from the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved service shall be implemented for a minimum of 3 years from first occupation in accordance with the frequency and timetable set out in the approved scheme.

Reason: To improve the accessibility of the site by public transport.

Condition 18 be amended to refer to 'an updated Framework Travel Plan'.

18. Prior to the beneficial occupation of any of the units hereby approved an updated Framework Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Those parts of the approved Travel Plan that are identified therein as being capable of implementation after occupation shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable contained therein and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority conforms to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of promoting sustainable development.

Condition 19 be amended to include the words 'or as otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority':

19. No development shall take place until all existing trees to be retained as part of the development as shown on the approved plan (ref SF1412 Tpp01 Rev B) have been fenced off to the limit of their branch spread, or as otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority. No works (including removal of earth), storage of materials, vehicular movements or siting of temporary buildings shall be permitted within these fenced areas. The tree protection measures shall comply fully with the

guidelines and recommendations set out in the Arboricultural Survey Report submitted on 27 February 2012.

Reason: To prevent unnecessary damage to existing trees and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

That the word 'including' be omitted from condition 24 and the following be added to the list of appropriate non-bulky goods: chinaware and kitchenware, Perfume goods, toiletries, stationery, and fashion accessories, chemists goods, sports equipment, hobbies, small electrical appliances.

24. The total net sales non-bulky comparison goods floor space shall be restricted to 2,803sq m (clothing, footwear, glassware, chemists goods, jewellery and other personal effects, sports equipment, games, toys and hobbies, books, pets and pets products, small electrical appliances, chinaware and kitchenware, perfume goods, toiletries, stationary, fashion accessories and soft furnishings).

Reason: To ensure that the size of the retail operation on the site would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of the town centre.

That the word 'including' be omitted from condition 25 and the words 'audio visual equipment' added:

25. The total net sales bulky comparison goods floor space shall be restricted to 1,773 sq m (furniture, floor-coverings, DIY and decorating goods, garden supplies, office equipment and supplies, motor accessories, bicycles, electrical and gas goods and appliances, audio visual equipment).

Reason: To ensure that the size of the retail operation on the site would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of the town centre.

Additional conditions:

29. The premises hereby permitted shall be used for the sale of non-bulky and bulky comparison goods only and for no other purpose (including any other purposes in Class A1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification.

Reason: To ensure that the retail operation would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of Stamford Town Centre.

30. The premises hereby permitted shall not be used for the sale of food and convenience goods (food and non-alcoholic beverages, tobacco, alcoholic beverages, newspapers and periodicals, non-durable household goods) without an express grant of planning permission by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the retail operation would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of Stamford Town Centre.

## KJC1 - S12/1720

**Proposal:** Section 73 application to vary conditions 4, 26, 30 and 50 of planning permission S11/2511 to increase floor area of building 6 (BIC) and decrease floor area of building 5 (hotel) and minor amendments to building 1 (Offices).

### **Information Received:**

The following consultee comments have been received since the drafting of the committee report:

Highways Agency

Confirmation that our response to the amended details is the same as that sent on 25 July 2012.

Environmental Protection

Environmental Protection have reviewed the documents for the above application to vary conditions and have no comments to make.

Planning Policy

This application seeks to vary conditions on an approved outline application (S11/2511). The variations are noted however from a planning policy point of view the overall principal of the development remains the same. Therefore the following policy comments remain:

This site has been subject to previous consultation through the process of adoption of the supplementary planning guidance (SPG) entitled - Station Approach Development Brief. This SPG was approved in October 2010.

The SPG helped to shape the policy SA1: Station Approach in the emerging Grantham Area Action Plan (not yet adopted). From a review of both the SPG and the policy in the GAAP it would appear that the proposal is compliant with both. Therefore planning policy has no objection to this variation to a previously approved outline application (S12/1720/EIAOL).

Furthermore the proposal is also supported by the National Planning Policy Framework where it states that “presumption in favour of sustainable development” means “approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay” (See paragraph 14).

I trust that this information helps in your consideration of the proposal.

Principal Conservation Officer

I refer to your memorandum dated 8<sup>th</sup> August 2012 inviting comment on the additional information submitted in connection with the above.

The proposed amendments to the floor area of the specified buildings will have no significant impact on the setting of the listed former railway workers cottages adjacent to the site or the unlisted heritage asset within the site that is to be retained and converted. If anything, the adjustments to building 1 should have a slight beneficial impact on the setting of the listed cottages over the original proposal.

I can advise therefore that I have no objection from a conservation point of view to the proposed amendments.

Natural England

Natural England has previously made comments to the authority and I can confirm that we have no further comments to make.

Upper Witham Drainage Board

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above application.

In the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) the Board **Objects** to the application.

**Reason:** The FRA submitted with the application does not demonstrate effectively how the flood risk can be safely managed. In particular the FRA fails to

- i. **Identify how the existing site drains.**
- ii. **Does not contain details of where the surface water will be discharged from the site.**
- iii. **Have the agreement with AWS to discharge into any of their assets.**
- iv. **Does not contain details of the surface water system.**

Considering the amount of work that has been done on this site it must now be a priority to produce a workable surface water drainage system if that is possible.

All drainage routes through the Site should be maintained both during the works on Site and after completion of the works. Provisions should be made to ensure

that upstream and downstream riparian owners and those areas that are presently served by any drainage routes passing through or adjacent to the Site are not adversely affected by the development.

Drainage routes shall include all methods by which water may be transferred through the Site and shall include such systems as “ridge and furrow” and “overland flows”. The affect of raising Site levels on adjacent property must be carefully considered and measures taken to negate influences must be approved by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To prevent an increase in the risk of flooding and/or water logging on adjacent property.

I would recommend that the applicant approaches the South Kesteven Flood Risk and Drainage Management Group and give a presentation. This group includes all the relevant authorities to discuss and agree any drainage matters.

The Board’s comments have been made following receipt of information through the planning process. The Board would wish to be re-consulted should the details of the application change, more details become available and/or when future applications are submitted for this site.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

No observations

**Officer Comments:**

**Drainage**

The Upper Witham Drainage Board raised no objection to the initial application for this development when it was reported to Committee in March 2012. The amendments to the development which are the subject of the current application do not materially alter the drainage of the site.

The comments of the Environment Agency support this view:

“We have examined the revised plans and have no objection to the proposed changes. The implications of the changes will need to be considered when finalising the details of surface water drainage scheme for the site at the discharge of conditions stage”.

It is considered that the other consultee comments do not raised any additional comments not already discussed in the main body of the report.

**Alterations/Additional Conditions:**

None

**Changes to Recommendation:**

No change to recommendation.

AH1 – S12/1129

**Proposal:** Reserved Matters application in respect of the erection of 5 No dwellings (approved under outline planning permission ref S10/2650/OUT)

### **Information Received**

The applicants have submitted revised drawings showing minor alterations to the external elevations of the dwellings.

The minor alterations to the external elevations of the proposed dwellings are proposed to better reflect the scheme that is being built by the applicants on land to the rear of No. 42 Main Street, Baston.

### **Officer Comment on Information Received**

It is considered that the minor alterations to the scheme better reflect the vernacular character of development in the locality but do not raise any additional issue that has not already been addressed in the officer report to the Committee. The revisions mean, however, that the suggested conditions in the report need to be revised to reflect this most recent submission.

### **Alterations to Conditions**

The development scheme hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans submitted as part of the application:

Drawing No. 3602A-S01  
Drawing No. 3602A-S02  
Drawing No. 3602A-P01A Rev A  
Drawing No. 3602A-P02B  
Drawing No. 3602A-P03C  
Drawing No. 3602A-P04  
Drawing No. 3602A-P05B  
Drawing No. 3602A-P06A  
Drawing No. 3602A-P07B  
Drawing No. 3602A-P08  
Drawing No. 3602A-P09A  
Drawing No. 3602A-P10A  
Drawing No. 3602A-P11B  
Drawing No. 3602A-P12

Drawing No. 3602A-P13  
Drawing No. 3602A-P14 Rev B  
Drawing No. 3602A-P15C

Reason: To define the permission and for the avoidance of doubt.

The external materials to be used in the construction of the dwellings shall be implemented in accordance with the Finishes Schedule (Project Ref: 3602A Rev A) received on 9 August 2012.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010)

Before the access is brought into use all obstructions exceeding 0.6 metres high shall be cleared from the land between the highway boundary and the vision splays indicated on Drawing No. 3602A-P02B and thereafter the visibility splay shall be kept free of obstacles exceeding 0.6 metres in height.

Reason: In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway and the safety of the users of the site.

Prior to any of the dwellings being first occupied the private drive shall be completed in accordance with the details shown on Drawing No. 3602A-P11B.

Reason: In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway and the safety of the users of the site.

**Changes to Recommendation:**

None.

RV2 – S12/1622

**Proposal** Affix steel plaque

**Amendment to report**

**Summary of Reasons(s) for Approval (page 151)**

The application is not subject to a Section 106 Agreement.

Recommendation: delete “a 106 Agreement and “