

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 10 NOVEMBER 2022**PART 2**

Report of the Head of Planning

PART 2Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 20/503675/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Part Retrospective Change of Use of land within Palm Trees Holiday Park to allow stationing of 28 mobile home lodges around a centrally located recreation area.		
ADDRESS Palm Trees Caravan Park Second Avenue (junction With Third Avenue) Warden Road Eastchurch Sheerness Kent ME12 4ET		
RECOMMENDATION Approve, subject to the conditions below		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The application is in accordance with policy DM 4 and would not give rise to any serious harm to the countryside. No objection has been raised by technical consultees.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Parish Council Objection		
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch	APPLICANT Palm Tree Management Ltd AGENT John Burke Associates
DECISION DUE DATE 26/7/2022	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 02/02/22	CASE OFFICER Paul Gregory

Planning History

15/506364/FULL

Change of use of land on the park to the stationing of 37 No. holiday caravans for 10 month occupancy.

Approved - 04.03.2016

SW/11/1431

Variation of condition (ii) of planning permission NK/8/62/16 to allow 10 month holiday use

Approved - 09.01.2012

SW/01/0826

Additional 61 pitches within existing site

Approved – 05.03.2003

SW/97/0812

Extension to club house

Approved – 13.11.1997

NK/4/72/590

Use of land as caravan camp

NK/4/72/30

Revised layout of caravan camp for 86 caravans and use of one van for wardens' accommodation

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.1 The application site measures approximately 2.5 hectares and forms part of the existing caravan park site known as Palm Trees, although it is situated outside of the approved site area for the stationing of holiday caravans.
- 1.2 The land is currently used as a recreational / amenity space in connection with the caravan park and is laid to grass. The land is generally flat but has slight fall from the north-west to the south-eastern boundary of the site.
- 1.3 The southwestern and southeastern boundaries of the site are formed by dense hedgerows and trees.
- 1.4 Access to the caravan park site is via the existing in out access arrangement from Warden Road via Fourth and Second Avenue. The immediately surrounding area is characterised by the coastline and a large number of holiday parks containing holiday caravans and chalets.

2. PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for the change of use of land within the existing caravan park from open amenity / recreational use to the stationing of 28 holiday caravans. The requirement for the proposal has arisen due to the need to relocate existing caravans as part of the site is in the cliff erosion zone and also due to the acceleration of cliff erosion along the northern coastal boundary of the site in recent years. It is noted that the number of caravans which are proposed to be removed totals 37.
- 2.2 The scheme also includes the construction of a new hard surface road and 28 No. caravan bases, a permeable parking space adjacent to each caravan and new landscaping including wildflower and tree planting and reinforcement of the existing hedgerow with supplementary planting.
- 2.3 As per the description of the development, the proposal is part retrospective as five of the caravans have been moved outside of the 0–50-year erosion zone, although these five caravans are proposed to be moved again as part of this application as they have currently been placed in the 50-100 year erosion zone.

3. PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.1 0–50-year erosion zone / 50-100 year erosion zone
- 3.2 Potential Archaeological Importance
- 3.3 Grade II Listed Structure – Fletcher Battery

4. POLICY AND CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 Bearing Fruits 2031 The Swale Borough Local Plan Adopted 2017 - Policy ST 3 The Swale settlement strategy; ST 6 The Isle of Sheppey area strategy; CP 1 Building a strong, competitive economy; CP 8 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment; DM 4 New holiday parks or extensions to existing parks; DM 5 The occupancy of holiday parks; DM 7 Vehicle parking; DM 14 General development criteria; DM 21 Water, flooding and drainage; DM 22 The coast; DM 23 Coastal Change Management; DM 24 Conserving and enhancing valued landscapes; DM 28 Biodiversity and geological conservation; DM 29 Woodlands, trees and hedges; DM 32 Development involving listed buildings; DM 34 Scheduled Monuments and archaeological sites.
- 4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): Paras 8-11 (sustainable development); 55, 56 (planning conditions); 84 (rural economy); 110, 111 (highway impacts); 153 (adapting to climate change); 169 (sustainable drainage systems); 170, 172 (the coast); 174 (the natural and local environment); 180 (biodiversity); 199-202 (heritage assets).
- 4.3 National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG): Flood risk and coastal change; Historic Environment; Natural Environment; Use of planning conditions.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.1 1 letter of objection has been received from a local resident raising concerns in respect of overlooking, increased amounts of litter and increased levels of noise.

6. CONSULTATIONS

- 6.1 Eastchurch Parish Council – *“There is concern at this application on top of the recent events at Eastchurch Cliffs adjacent to the site. There has been a substantial loss of land and housing.*

The application shows no positive drainage for the dispersal of water from the site into mains drains. Water is shown as being diverted into Barrows Brook. Councillor’s query this as this is above the site area and whether this should have been corrected to Hens Brook.

The drainage report is from 2019 and the geological and drainage data provided is very much out of date.

SBC had commissioned a report after the catastrophic slippage which highlights the rapidly deteriorating soil run off and forecast further incursions in the area.”

Eastchurch Parish Council were reconsulted and raised the further following points:

“The Planning Committee of Eastchurch Parish Council continues to object to this application on drainage issues. Correspondence has been exchanged with the agent who did not seem to understand this and thought it was caravan numbers. The drainage issues have not been addressed. The committee asked to make it clear that the objection is on the grounds of drainage issues on the site and not on the relocation or numbers of caravans within the site.

Water cannot be drained to Barrows Brook which is uphill and along Warden Road on a dangerous blind corner. It cannot drain into Hens Brook as the cliff fall in 2020 has destroyed the access to it. The drainage reports are from 2019 or earlier before the cliff fall. The original

comments made in the PC objection still stand and have not been addressed; they are further supported by the comments from KCC Drainage and Southern Water. Their recommendations should be addressed by the applicant and resubmitted in an updated and amended application.

French drains should not be put in to drain over the cliffs as it is not sustainable (KCC comments) and will add pressure on to the already unstable cliff face.”

6.2 Lead Local Flood Authority (KCC) – *“The application is supported by Surface Water Drainage Design report (RMB, 17 October 2019).*

Drainage for the northern site includes filter drains for the caravan bases, however there is no drainage to intercept flows from the access road. We do not find allowing overland flows into the sea sustainable due to the adjoining land which we assume to be third party land.

We recommend that the applicant presents a sustainable means for the disposal of surface water in the northern site.

The proposed surface water drainage for the southern site involves the use of discrete filter drains for the caravan bases and an infiltration basin. The hydraulic calculation of the basin is based on an assumed infiltration rate. We recommend the applicant undertakes ground investigations to establish ground water level as well as infiltration rate to confirm infiltration is feasible on the site.

If infiltration basin is proposed due to the feasibility of infiltration, we would also recommend the applicant to confirm how the infiltration basin would be maintained as well as adequate access for maintenance.

In accordance with Table 1 of Kent County Council Drainage and Planning Policy document we recommend that applicant submits tender construction drawings for suds features.”

On the basis of the above comments the agent responded to these points as follows:

“With regard to the KCC Flood & Water comments the proposals contained in our consultants report addresses these issues adequately; these management proposals are the same as used throughout the Park historically without problem and the site has never had any of the surface water issues implied. Our engineer did however advise that we could install a ‘french’ drain along the northern side of the existing entrance road if needed. I would also point out that we are NOT increasing the number of caravans or surface drainage merely replacing existing caravans.”

In response, the Lead Local Flood Authority (KCC) made the following further comments:

“Kent County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority have reviewed the Surface Water Drainage Design prepared by RMB dated 17 October 2019 and agree in principle to the proposed development.

The proposals seek to utilise a combination of filter trenches for the caravan plots and access road with an infiltration pond.

The filter trench proposed for the length of the access road would be advantageous to the interception of surface water and should be included within the design.

It is essential that ground investigations and infiltration tests are undertaken as part of drainage strategy to confirm the underlying London Clay formation has the necessary infiltration rates.” On this basis a condition is recommended to ensure that groundwater is protected.

Further to receipt of an amended layout I sought the views of the Lead Local Flood Authority (KCC). They have responded confirming that they have no objection and refer to their comments immediately above.

- 6.3 Southern Water – The comments refer to a public foul rising main which crosses the site and sets out the offset distances for various works.

A separate application to Southern Water will be required for connection to the public foul sewer. The response provides further general comments for circumstances in which drainage features can be adopted.

- 6.4 KCC Highways & Transportation – *“In line with the comments provided for the previous application SW/15/506364/FULL, I request that no more than 50% of the proposed pitches shall be occupied until the existing pitches highlighted for relocation on the proposed plan (Dwg no.PLM-1018-01 Rev C) have been permanently removed, which should be secured by condition.*

Subject to the above, I raise no objection on behalf of the local highway authority.”

- 6.5 KCC Ecology – *“As a result of reviewing the data we have available to us (including aerial photos and biological records), and the information submitted with the planning application, we advise that the proposed development has limited potential to result in direct ecological impacts. We have taken this view due to the well-maintained nature of the site and relatively unobtrusive development proposal.*

As stated within Natural England’s response, the impact on the Swale Special Protection Area (SPA) and Wetland of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention (Ramsar Site will need to be considered. Swale Borough Council will need to ensure that the proposals fully adhere to the agreed approach within the North Kent Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (SAMMS) to mitigate for additional recreational impacts on the designated sites and to ensure that adequate means are in place to secure the mitigation before first occupation.

A decision from the Court of Justice of the European Union has detailed that mitigation measures cannot be taken into account when carrying out a screening assessment to decide whether a full ‘appropriate assessment’ is needed under the Habitats Directive. Therefore, we advise that due to the need for the application to contribute to the North Kent SAMMS, there is a need for an appropriate assessment to be carried out as part of this application.”

- 6.6 Natural England – Initially set out that as this application would result in an increase in residential accommodation that the impact may be increased recreational disturbance to the Special Protection Area (SPA) and RAMSAR site. Therefore, subject to the appropriate financial contribution being secured this will mitigate against these potential recreational impacts. However, this may also need to be checked via an appropriate assessment.

Further to the above comments I wrote to Natural England to confirm that the number of caravans is being reduced. In response they confirmed that their comments (summarised immediately above) can be withdrawn and as a result they had no comments to make in respect of this application.

- 6.7 KCC Archaeology – *“This involves the conversion of an area of existing sports field into caravan park access road and mobile homes. As noted in the design and access statement the caravan includes the location of the WW1 Fletcher Battery which is in part Listed. There are wider remains of military significance around the site including the magazine to the immediate north.*

Of particular note the area proposed for development includes the remains of a well-preserved base for a spigot mortar of WW2 date. It is not clear how this will be affected but it should be considered as an undesignated heritage asset. Its significance and the impact of development on the asset should be assessed. If the proposals affect the spigot mortar, I advise that the council should seek the adjustment of the development layout / design to accommodate the preservation in situ of the WW2 feature which forms part of the defence story of this site and the island.

With respect to the wider development, I agree that the proposals will not affect the setting of the listed structures and note the positive way in which the park has managed its heritage. Given the proposals involve groundworks to construct road access, bases and services I would recommend that if permission is given provision is made for a programme of archaeological works through the following condition” – condition to require the implementation of a programme of archaeological work.

- 6.8 SBC Environmental Protection Team – *“No objections to this application or comments to make.”*
- 6.9 Environment Agency – *“We have no comments to make on this planning application.”*
- 6.10 Sport England – *“The site is not considered to form part of or constitute a playing field as defined in The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (Statutory Instrument 2015 No.595), therefore Sport England has considered this a non-statutory consultation.*

Planning permission was previously granted for the siting on caravans on this part of the caravan site under application reference 15/506364/FULL. Sport England had no comment on that proposal that it understands has not been implemented. Similarly, it does not wish to comment on the current proposal.”

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

- 7.1 The application is supported by existing and proposed layout drawings, a Design & Access Statement and Surface Water Drainage Report.

8. APPRAISAL

- 8.1 The application site lies outside of the defined Holiday Parks area as defined by policy DM 4 of the Local Plan and is therefore located within the countryside. However, policy DM 4

specifically provides for minor extensions to holiday parks in circumstances where land is lost to coastal erosion, subject to the following criteria being met:

- a. in accordance with Policies DM 22 and DM 23 relating to the coast and the coastal change management area;*
- b. it is demonstrated that on-site upgrading and improvement is not practicable or viable;*
- c. there is no overall increase in the existing number of accommodation units;*
- d. it is part of a scheme to upgrade and improve the quality of tourist accommodation and other amenities on the site;*
- e. it results in a significant and comprehensive improvement to the layout, design and appearance of the site, together with an integrated landscape strategy that creates a landscape framework for both the existing and proposed sites that will reduce their overall impact within the landscape in accordance with Policy DM 24;*
- f. in accordance with Policy DM 5; and*
- g. there is no unacceptable impact on the local environment.*

- 8.2 In terms of these matters, I can find no conflict with policies DM 22 or DM 23 – in this regard it is important to note that the proposals will be moving caravans further away from the coast and as such outside of the coastal erosion zone. The number of caravans on the site will also be decreasing (as the proposal will remove 37 and reinstate 28) and therefore impacts upon the coast in general terms will in my view also reduce.
- 8.3 Having carried out a site visit, and assessed the aerial photos, there wouldn't appear to be sufficient space within the part of the site that lies within the Holiday Park designation as per policy DM 4 to be able to relocate the necessary number of caravans. The supporting details also set out that part of the reasoning for the application would be to allow larger units to be provided and to place them around the recreation area so that there would be more active surveillance of this area. This would in my view sit comfortably within the aims of improving the tourist accommodation on the site.
- 8.4 The proposed development will result in an alteration to this currently open and undeveloped part of the site. However, it is important in my view to consider two issues. Firstly, when you enter the site the area where the caravans are proposed to be located is experienced very much as part of the wider setting of the park, which includes the existing caravans. The reason for this is due to the hedgerow and trees which lie on the boundaries of the site, providing a screen to the wider surrounding area and reducing in my view any harm to the countryside to a very low level. I also believe that the planting will assist in providing a natural barrier between the caravans and those located within the caravan park to the southwest of Third Avenue. Based on the above I am of the view that the scheme is in accordance with policy DM 4.
- 8.5 In addition to the existing landscaping as discussed above, the scheme proposes additional landscaping in the form of tree and wildflower planting. I note that KCC Ecology raise no objection to the scheme, and I am of the view that the additional planting will give rise to biodiversity benefits. I have included a condition requiring precise planting details.

- 8.6 I note the comments of Eastchurch Parish Council as set out in full above, particularly in respect of their objection based upon the proposed scheme of surface water drainage. In terms of this issue, it is important to note that the Lead Local Flood Authority (KCC), who deal specifically with surface water drainage matters have been consulted and again, their comments have been set out in full above. In respect of these comments, I note that initially KCC did raise the same concern as the Parish Council in relation to surface water draining over the cliffs and into the sea.
- 8.7 After liaising with the agent, further comments were received which set out that a further drain can be installed along the northern side of the existing entrance road if needed. I passed these comments to KCC who responded setting out that a filter trench along the access road would be advantageous to the interception of surface water and along with the other measures, including filter trenches for the plots and an infiltration pond, the details are acceptable, subject to a condition relating to the protection of groundwater. I have also liaised with KCC regarding the date of the Drainage Report (as referred to in the Parish Council's comment) and KCC have commented that the information provided is valid. As a result, I have recommended the requested condition is imposed and as a result am of the view that surface water drainage can be acceptably dealt with.
- 8.8 The application site includes the grade II listed 'Fletcher Battery' which is a First World War Coastal Gun Battery, this is split across the holiday park and includes gun emplacements, concrete walling, tunnels, ammunition store, observation building, and cylindrical mortar mounting. Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended, imposes a general duty on the Local Planning Authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
- 8.9 Policy DM32 of the Swale Local Plan 2017 states that proposals that affect a designated heritage asset, or its setting, will be permitted only where the building's special architectural or historic interest, and its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, are preserved. Policy DM32 of the Swale Local Plan 2017 is consistent with the provisions of s16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended.
- 8.10 For the most part the proposal will move caravans away from the various elements of the heritage asset which are located on the existing holiday park. The exception to this is the cylindrical mortar mounting which would have caravans placed closer to it, however, it would not be surrounded by caravans as per the other existing elements of the heritage asset. The Council's Conservation Officer has assessed the application and concluded that due to there being no intensification of the use of the site that there would not be any harm caused to the setting of the listed building. I give a significant amount of weight to the comments made and as a result of this I take the view that the proposal is compliant with policy DM 32.
- 8.11 I note the objection that has been received from a neighbouring occupier, who has raised concerns in respect of overlooking, noise and litter. It is important to note that the neighbouring property in question lies approximately 60m from the location of the closest proposed caravan. There is also well-established planting separating the holiday park from the curtilage of the neighbouring dwelling. On the basis of the above considerations, I do not believe that there would be overlooking to an unacceptable degree. In terms of litter, it is

again important to note that the proposal will not lead to an increase in caravans on the site and as such I do not believe an increase in any litter could be reasonably expected. Finally, in respect of noise although this proposal will move caravans closer to residential properties, I give weight to both the distances involved, as set out above, and the lack of objection from the Council's Environmental Protection Team. As such I do not consider that the proposal would give rise to any unacceptable levels of noise. I have however recommended a condition restricting the hours of construction.

8.12 I also note the comments of the KCC Archaeological Officer and have recommended the condition requested is imposed to ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded. In terms of Natural England, they have confirmed that a SAMMS payment is not required as the number of caravans is not increasing and therefore increased recreational pressure on the SPA will not occur.

9. CONCLUSION

9.1 In many respects this proposal is like that granted planning permission under reference 15/506364/FULL. As per the previously referenced unimplemented planning permission I give great weight to the need to place the caravans in this part of the site due to existing caravans being situated within the erosion zone and therefore needing to be removed. Policy DM 4 allows in circumstances where land is being lost to coastal erosion, minor extensions to holiday parks subject to certain criteria being met. As per the discussion above I am of the view that the proposal complies with this policy. I have also considered other relevant matters such as heritage, drainage and ecology and am of the view that the proposal is acceptable, subject to the conditions as set out below.

10. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Subject to 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 on which the permission is granted.

Reason: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with drawing PLM-1018-01, Rev E (Proposed Block Plan).

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

- 3) No more than 150 caravans in total shall be stationed on the entire caravan park site at any one time.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the area.

- 4) No caravans shall be occupied between 3rd January and 28th February (or 29th February in any leap year) and no caravans shall be occupied unless there is a signed agreement between the owners or operators of the Park and all chalet/caravan owners within the application site, stating that:

- (a) The chalets/caravans are to be used for holiday and recreational use only and shall not be occupied as a sole or main residence, or in any manner which might lead any person to believe that it is being used as the sole or main residence; and
- (b) No chalet or caravan shall be used as a postal address; and
- (c) No chalet or caravan shall be used as an address for registering, claiming or receipt of any state benefit; and
- (d) No chalet or caravan shall be occupied in any manner, which shall or may cause the occupation thereof, to be or become a protected tenancy within the meaning of the Rent Acts 1968 and 1974; and
- (e) If any chalet or caravan owner is in breach of the above clauses their agreement will be terminated and/or not renewed upon the next expiry of their current lease or licence.

On request, copies of the signed agreement[s] shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to prevent the chalets/caravans from being used as a permanent place of residence, in accordance with policy DM5 of Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017.

- 5) Any chalet or caravan that is not the subject of a signed agreement pursuant to condition 4 shall not be occupied at any time.

Reason: In order to prevent the chalets/caravans from being used as a permanent place of residence, in accordance with policy DM5 of Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017.

- 6) The owners or operators of the Park shall at all times operate the Park strictly in accordance with the terms of the Schedule appended to this decision notice.

Reason: In order to prevent the chalets/caravans from being used as a permanent place of residence, in accordance with policy DM5 of Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017.

- 7) Within 3 months of the date planning permission being granted a detailed soft landscaping scheme to include precise details of species (which shall be native) and an implementation programme shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance to the development and to provide for biodiversity benefits.

- 8) Upon completion of the approved landscaping scheme, any trees or shrubs that are removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced with trees or shrubs of such size and species as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, and within whatever planting season is agreed.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and encouraging wildlife and biodiversity.

- 9) Where infiltration is to be used to manage the surface water from the development hereby permitted, it will only be allowed within those parts of the site where information is submitted to demonstrate to the Local Planning Authority's satisfaction that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters and/or ground stability. The development shall only then be carried out in accordance with the Surface Water Drainage Design prepared by RMB dated 17 October 2019.

Reason: To protect vulnerable groundwater resources and ensure compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 10) No further development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written specification and timetable which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded.

- 11) No construction work in connection with the development shall take place on any Sunday or Bank Holiday, nor on any other day except between the following times:-

Monday to Friday 0730 - 1900 hours, Saturdays 0730 - 1300 hours unless in association with an emergency or with the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

- 12) No more than 14 of the proposed pitches shall be occupied until the existing pitches highlighted for relocation on drawing PLM-1018-01, Rev E (Proposed Site Plan) have been permanently removed.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and amenity.

- 13) A scheme for the provision of electric vehicle charging points (EVCP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the first use of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of climate change and lowering pollution levels.

SCHEDULE

The Park operator must:

- 1) Ensure that all chalet/caravan users have a current signed agreement covering points (a) to (e) in condition 4 of the planning permission; and

- 2) Hold copies of documented evidence of the chalet/caravan users' main residence and their identity; this may comprise of utility bills, Council Tax bill, passport, driving licence or similar document; and
- 3) On request, provide copies of the signed agreement[s] to the Local Planning Authority; and
- 4) Require chalet/caravan users to provide new documentation if they change their main residence; and
- 5) Send all written communications to the main residence of the chalet/caravan user; and
- 6) Not allow postal deliveries to the chalet/caravan or accept post on behalf of the chalet/caravan users at the park office; and
- 7) Ensure that each chalet/caravan is to be used for holiday use only and that no chalet/caravan is occupied as a sole or main residence, or in any manner which might lead any person to believe that it is being used as the sole or main residence, of the user or occupant; and
- 8) Adhere to a code of practice as good as or better than that published by the British Homes and Holiday Parks Association.

The Council's approach to the application

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), July 2018 the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and creative way by offering a pre-application advice service, where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome and as appropriate, updating applicants / agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the Committee and promote the application.

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.

The conditions set out in the report may be subject to such reasonable change as is necessary to ensure accuracy and enforceability.

