

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Pressley	Date of report: 14/03/2023	Ref: 69254/OUT
Registration: 18/01/2023	LDFC: 09/03/2023	Expiry Date: 15/03/2023
Site Visit: 02/02/2023	Site Notice: 16/02/2023	Press Date: 02/02/2023
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: DEPA
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Outline application for erection of 2 no. detached dwellings with details of access, layout and scale (appearance and landscaping matters reserved)

Location: Land adjacent to 100 Bury New Road, Radcliffe, Bolton, BL2 6QB

Description

The application relates to a site located off Bury New Road. The site fronts Bury New Road, and is sited to the west of a detached two storey dwelling house. To the north is the converted Ainsworth Mill with a public house and residential properties running eastwards along Bury New Road. To the west and south is open land. The site is located within the Green Belt.

Outline permission is sought for two detached two storey properties, with access, layout and scale to be considered. Appearance and landscaping matters are reserved for future approval. The dwellings would be located centrally within the site with two access points from Bury New Road, one for each unit. The proposed layout shows a parking area at the front, private amenity space to the rear and refuse storage at the side.

The application is a resubmission of outline application 63611 which has now lapsed.

Relevant Planning History

56933 - Change of use of land to metal recycling/storage (Sui Generis) and siting of 2 no. containers and refurbishment of existing temporary building for office use - Withdrawn by Applicant 17/02/2014

63611 - Outline - Erection of 2 no. detached dwellings with details of access, layout and scale (reserved matters for appearance and landscaping) - Approve with Conditions 07/03/2019

Publicity

Neighbour letters sent - 25/01/2023

Press notice - 02/2/2023

Site notice - 16/02/2023

No representations received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Conditions in relation to submission of details at reserved matters and submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - no response

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - Conditions in relation to submission of a preliminary risk assessment, site investigation, detailed risk assessment and remediation

strategy. Comments in relation to EV charging points and an informative in relation to the Control of Noise regulations.

Waste Management - no response

Planning Policy Manager - no response

United Utilities (Water and waste) - comments made in relation to United Utilities property, assets and infrastructure and the requirement for developers to contact prior to commencement of any works on site.

Request for SUDs

Bolton MBC - no response

Pre-start Conditions - Agent has agreed with pre-start conditions

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
H1/2	Further Housing Development
H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
HT2/1	The Strategic Route Network
HT6/2	Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN1/1	Visual Amenity
EN5/1	New Development and Flood Risk
EN7	Pollution Control
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
SPD16	Design and Layout of New Development in Bury
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions

Issues and Analysis

The following report includes analysis of the merits of the application against the relevant policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP) together with other relevant material planning considerations. The policies of the UDP that have been used to assess this application are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and as such are material planning considerations. For simplicity, just the UDP Policy will be referred to in the report, unless there is a particular matter to highlight arising from the NPPF where it would otherwise be specifically mentioned.

Equality Act 2010: All planning applications are considered in light of the Equality Act 2010 and associated Public Sector Equality Duty, where the Council is required to have due regard for:

The elimination of discrimination, harassment and victimisation;

The advancement of equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it;

The fostering of good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it; which applies to people from the protected equality groups.

Human Rights: All planning applications are considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Under Article 6 the applicants (and those third parties who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end full consideration will be given to their comments.

Article 8 and Protocol 1 of the First Article confer a right to respect private and family life and a right to the protection of property, ie peaceful enjoyment of one's possessions which could include a person's home, and other land and business assets.

In taking account of the Council policy as set out in the Bury Unitary Development Plan 1997 and all material planning considerations, it is concluded on balance that the rights conferred upon the applicant/ objectors/ residents/ other interested party by Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol may be interfered with, since such interference is in accordance with the law and is justified in the public interest. Any restriction of these rights posed by refusal/ approval of the application is legitimate since it is proportionate to the wider benefits of such a decision, is based upon the merits of the proposal, and falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town & Country Planning Acts.

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes (without prejudice to any other obligation imposed on it) a duty upon the Council to exercise its functions and have due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of its functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area. In so doing and on making planning decisions under the Town and Country Planning Acts, the material Planning considerations shall have due regard to the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and its implications in the exercise of its functions.

Principle (Residential)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) should be treated as a material planning consideration and it emphasises the need for local planning authorities to boost the supply of housing to meet local housing targets in both the short and long term. The Framework maintains the emphasis on identifying a rolling five year supply of deliverable housing land.

Bury's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment sets out the latest housing supply position, which is made up of sites that have an extant planning permission and sites that have potential to obtain planning permission in the future. This shows that there are a number of sites within the Borough with the potential to deliver a significant amount of housing. However, not all of these sites will contribute to the five year supply calculations as many sites will take longer than five years to come forward and be fully developed (e.g. some large sites could take up to ten years to be completed). As such, latest monitoring indicates that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land and this needs to be treated as a material factor when determining applications for residential developments.

The National Planning Policy Framework also sets out the Housing Delivery Test, which is an assessment of net additional dwellings provided over the previous three years against the homes required. Where the test indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75%) of the housing requirement over the previous years, this needs to be taken into account in the decision-taking process. The latest results published by the Government show that Bury has a housing delivery test result of less than 75%, and therefore, this needs to be treated as a material factor when determining applications for residential development.

Therefore, in relation to the proposed dwellings, paragraph 11d) of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless:

- i. The application of policies in the Framework that protect areas, or assets of particular importance, provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or

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

Therefore, in this case the 'titled balance' applies and planning permission should be granted unless the above points Para 11(d) i or ii apply.

Policy H1/2 states that the Council will have regard to various factors when assessing a proposal for residential development, including whether the proposal is within the urban area, the availability of infrastructure and the suitability of the site, with regard to amenity, the nature of the local environment and the surrounding land uses.

The site is located adjacent to the urban boundary, on a brownfield site with residential properties to the east and north east. A converted mill is located to the north. The proposed development would not conflict with the surrounding land uses and would be located in a sustainable location with regard to public transport and services. Therefore, the proposed development would be acceptable in principle and would be in accordance with Policy H1/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.

Principle (Green Belt)

Paragraphs 147 and 148 state that inappropriate development in the Green Belt is by definition, harmful and should not be approved except in Very Special Circumstances (VSC). Planning Authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. VSC will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 149 of the NPPF states that the construction of new buildings would be inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- (a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- (b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- (c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- (d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- (e) limited infilling in villages;
- (f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- (g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

Paragraph 150 of the NPPF also confirms that certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:

- a) mineral extraction;
- b) engineering operations;
- c) local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
- d) the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;

- e) material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and
- f) development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.

Policy OL1/2 states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate development, unless it is for one of more of the following purposes: agriculture and forestry essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, for cemeteries, and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings, provided that this would not result in a disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling, or, in the case of replacement existing dwellings, the new dwelling is not materially larger than the one it replaces; limited infilling in existing villages.

The site is situated in the Green Belt but is considered to be previously developed land, immediately adjacent to a built up area that is 'washed over' by the Green Belt.

The site is not infill but would be considered as the complete redevelopment of previously developed land as set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF. As this is the case, it further sets out criteria by which any proposal would be assessed - would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green belt than the existing development.

The applicant has set out justification for the development within a supporting statement. The applicant highlights that there is no definition of openness within the NPPF, and references a number of cases where the concept of openness has been debated. The applicant highlights that the 'lack of built development is one commonly cited meaning when referencing openness. Dove J observed however in *Lea Valley Regional Park Authority v Epping Forest DC* however *'that if openness is taken simply to mean the absence of development, then all development will "in truth" have an impact on openness.*

The applicant's statement also references the judgement of *Turner v SoS for Communities and Local Government* (2016) it was ruled that *'The word "openness" is open textured and a number of factors are capable of being relevant when it comes to applying it to the particular facts of a specific case. Prominent among these will be factors relevant to how built up the Green Belt is how built up it would be if redevelopment occurs (in the context of which, volumetric matters may be a material concern, but are by no means the only one) and factors relevant to the visual impact on the aspect of openness which the Green Belt presents'.* This point is further argued in *Samuel Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster) v North Yorkshire County Council* (2018) where it is concluded that a number of different factors are capable of being relevant to the case and continues by stating that *'The first part of the question posed by the preamble in paragraph 90 – whether the development would "preserve" the openness of the Green Belt – cannot mean that a proposal can only be regarded as "not inappropriate in the Green Belt" if the openness of the Green Belt would be left entirely unchanged. It can only sensibly mean that the effects on openness must not be harmful – understanding the verb "preserve" in the sense of "keep...safe from harm" – rather than "maintain (a state of things).'*

It is argued by the applicant that, in the light of the above and other rulings. 'inappropriateness' means the effects on 'openness' must not be harmful. The case of *Euro Garages v SoS* (May 2018) states *'that it is the openness of the Green Belt that must be considered, not the site as such'.* It goes on to state that *'for there to be a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt there must be something more than just change to the environment'.*

The site is bordered by solid timber fencing on three sides and is used for parking. There are however are currently no buildings on the site. The proposed two dwellings will no doubt

result in a change to the environment and would have a greater impact on the site itself than the current development (parked cars, hardstanding and boundary fencing). However, the proposal would not encroach into the open countryside and extend from what is a previously developed site and in the context of the immediate surroundings (adjacent dwelling and large converted mill across Bury New Road). The applicant argues that in accordance with the judgements detailed above, this visual context is equally as important as the spatial context and should be given due consideration. Certainly long range views from the east and north would be restricted by existing buildings. Views of the development from the west would be set against the adjacent house and from the south, against the mill across the road.

The applicant also argues that the development should be considered in the context of the Green Belt as a whole (60% of the Borough) and not just the individual site. When the proposal is considered against the Green Belt as a whole the applicant considers that the proposal's impact will be negligible particularly given the proposal will utilise a small, previously developed site, which is located on a busy main road. The applicant considers that the proposal will not result in encroachment into the open countryside and nor will it result in the unrestricted sprawl of the built up area as the site is already surrounded to the north, east and west by built form, which would therefore comply with the purposes of the Green Belt set out in Paragraph 138 of the NPPF.

Given the matters above, and the case presented it is considered that given the nature of this particular scheme, and the context of the site, the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the Green Belt, and would be considered, on balance, to be acceptable and complies with paragraph 145 of the NPPF and UDP Policy OL1/2.

Layout and Design

H2/1 - The Layout of New Residential Development and H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, provides the assessment criteria for detailed matters relating to height, appearance, density and character, aspects and finish materials. Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design seeks to ensure that any proposals would not have an adverse impact on the particular character and townscape of an area.

The appearance and landscaping are matters for future approval, however in terms of general layout, situated immediately adjacent to the neighbouring dwellinghouse, the two houses would sit relatively comfortably on the site with adequate space around them. Set back from the Bury New Road but reflecting the linear residential street pattern, with sufficient parking, refuse storage and private amenity space, the layout of the proposed dwellings is considered acceptable. Any future plans for boundary landscaping would improve the setting of the development. The proposal complies with the NPPF and UDP Policies H1/2, H2/1, H2/2 and EN1/2 in relation to siting and layout.

Permitted Development

It is considered reasonable, given the nature of the site, that the 'permitted development' right for future residents be removed in order to control any future development on the site in the interests of visual amenity and the Green Belt.

Residential Amenity

UDP policies H2/1 and EN1/2 and requires consideration of various factors relating to built design, including the relationship of the proposal to the surrounding area and impact on residential amenity. There are no adopted aspect standards for new build residential properties however, Supplementary Planning Document 6 provides guidance on aspect standards between residential properties and as such, would be a reasonable guide in this case.

The nearest dwelling is the applicant's dwelling (No. 100 Bury New Road) which is located immediately to the east, with other residences further down Bury New Road. The proposed dwellings would be sited behind the principal front elevation of this dwelling, but would

project beyond the rear elevation by approximately 7 metres. The nearest proposed dwelling would be sited a minimum of approximately 3.2 metres of the shared boundary with No. 100 (which is staggered) and 6.2metres from the side elevation of No. 100.

No. 100 has a single window within the gable that faces towards the site however this appears to be a secondary window, and as it is not located on a principal elevation less weight is afforded to it's protection. Whilst the nearest proposed dwelling would project beyond the rear elevation of No. 100, due to the above distances to the side boundary and side gable the nearest proposed dwelling would not impact on a 45 degree line as taken from the mid-point of the nearest ground floor window of No. 100. As such the proposal complies with the intentions of SPD 6 in relation to overbearing relationships on habitable room windows.

Whilst no floor plans have been submitted, it will be possible to site principal habitable room windows on the front and rear elevations of the proposed dwellings and a separation of 7 metres (approximately 7.6 metres) between any rear first floor habitable room windows and the directly facing rear boundary is achievable. A 2 metre fence is also shown on the proposed site layout which would prevent direct overlooking into the adjacent gardens.

Given the nature of the site and restrictions that would prevent undue overlooking, there are no residential amenity issues arising. The proposal is acceptable and complies with the NPPF and UDP Policy H2/1 in this respect.

Access, Parking and Servicing

The proposed access points for each house onto Bury New Road are appropriate with adequate visibility. Two parking spaces are proposed for each unit and there is sufficient space for turning within the site. Refuse storage and collection arrangements, from Bury New Road, are acceptable and comply with UDP Policy H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development .

Reserved Matters

The appearance of the development and landscaping are reserved for future approval.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

The Local Planning Authority worked positively and proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 Applications for approval of reserved matters must be made not later than:
 - the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the grant of outline planning permission; and
 - that the development to which the permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason. Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

- 2 Before the development is commenced, the applicant shall submit detailed plans and particulars to the Local Planning Authority, and obtain their approval under the Town and Country Planning Acts, of the following reserved matters; appearance and the landscaping of the site.

Reason. To ensure the satisfactory development of the site and because this application is in outline only.

- 3 This decision relates to drawings numbered 01 A, 02 B, 03 A and MMG.TS.01 and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.

Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to the policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan listed.

- 4 The proposed dwellinghouses shall be no higher than the adjacent property at 100 Bury New Road as indicated in streetscene elevation plan 03 A.

Reason. In the interests of visual amenity pursuant to the NPPF and UDP Policies EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design.

- 5 The following highway aspects shown indicatively on approved plan reference 02 Revision B shall be submitted on a topographical survey of the site and adjacent adopted highways at first reserved matters application stage:

- Vehicular access arrangements to both dwellings utilising the existing access to the westerly dwelling and existing shared access to the easterly dwelling from Bury New Road;
- Provision of 2.4m x 59m visibility splays at each junction with Bury New Road and adequate visibility at the back edge of the footway, with no obstructions above the height of 0.6m within them and on land within the applicant's control;
- Provision of turning facilities within the curtilage of each dwelling in order to enable vehicles to enter and leave each hardstanding, including that of No. 100 Bury New Road, in a forward gear;
- Hardstandings in porous/permeable materials and/or measures to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the adopted highway, incorporating the demarcation of the limits of the adopted highway;
- Provision of bin storage arrangements within the curtilage of each dwelling in accordance with Waste Management's 'Guide to Refuse Collection Requirements & Storage Methods for New Developments'.
- Provision of parking facilities within the curtilage of each dwelling in accordance with the maximum standards in SPD 11 - Parking Standards in Bury.

The details subsequently approved shall be implemented before the dwellings are first occupied.

Reason. To ensure good highway design, the intervisibility of the users of the site and the adjacent highways, adequate off street car parking provision, adequate bin storage arrangements clear of the adopted highway and to minimise the standing and turning movements of vehicles on the highway, all in the interests of road safety and pursuant to the NPPF and UDP Policies H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development, HT6/2 - Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict and EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design.

- 6 No development shall commence unless and until a 'Construction Traffic Management Plan' (CTMP), has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and shall confirm/provide the following:

- Photographic dilapidation survey of the footways and carriageways abutting the site in the event that subsequent remedial works are required following construction of the development and as a result of statutory undertakers

- connections to the site;
- Access route for all vehicles to the site from the Key Route Network and any temporary works required to facilitate access for ground works/construction vehicles;
- If proposed, details of site hoarding/gate positions clear of required visibility splays onto Bury New Road;
- The provision, where necessary, of temporary pedestrian facilities/protection measures on the adopted highway;
- A scheme of appropriate warning/construction traffic speed signage in the vicinity of the site and its access onto Bury New Road;
- Confirmation of hours of operation and number of vehicle movements;
- Arrangements for the turning and manoeuvring of vehicles within the curtilage of the site and/or measures to control/manage delivery vehicle manoeuvres;
- Parking on site or on land within the applicant's control of operatives' and construction vehicles, together with storage on site of construction materials;
- Measures to ensure that all mud and other loose materials are not spread onto the adjacent adopted highways as a result of the groundworks operations or carried on the wheels and chassis of any vehicles leaving the site and measures to minimise dust nuisance caused by the operations.

The approved plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and the measures shall be retained and facilities used for the intended purpose for the duration of the construction period. The areas identified shall not be used for any other purposes other than the turning/parking of vehicles and storage of construction materials. All highway remedial works identified as a result of the dilapidation survey shall be implemented prior to the development hereby approved being brought into use.

Reason. Information not submitted at application stage. To mitigate the impact of the construction traffic generated by the proposed development on the adjacent residential streets, and ensure adequate off street car parking provision and materials storage arrangements for the duration of the construction period and that the adopted highways are kept free of deposited material from the ground works operations, in the interests of highway safety pursuant to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design and HT6/2 - Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict.

- 7 No development shall commence unless and until:-
- A contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment report to assess the actual/potential contamination and/or ground gas/landfill gas risks at the site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority;
 - Where actual/potential contamination and/or ground gas/landfill gas risks have been identified, detailed site investigation and suitable risk assessment shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;
 - Where remediation/protection measures is/are required, a detailed Remediation Strategy shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason. The scheme does not provide full details of the actual contamination and subsequent remediation, which is required to secure the satisfactory development of the site in terms of human health, controlled waters, ground gas and the wider environment and pursuant to National Planning Policy Framework Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

- 8 Following the provisions of Condition 7 of this planning permission, where remediation is required, the approved Remediation Strategy must be carried out to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority within agreed timescales; and A Site Verification Report detailing the actions taken and conclusions at each stage of the remediation works, including substantiating evidence, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development

being brought into use.

Reason. To secure the satisfactory development of the site in terms of human health, controlled waters and the wider environment and pursuant to National Planning Policy Framework Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

- 9 Prior to the commencement of development, details relating to the proposed areas of hardstanding and all boundary treatment for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details only shall be implemented as part of the approved development.

Reason - To secure the satisfactory development of the site and in the interests of the visual amenities of the area pursuant to Policy EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design of Bury Unitary Development Plan.

- 10 Notwithstanding the terms of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as subsequently amended, no development shall be carried out within the terms of Classes A to G of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order, without the submission and approval of a relevant planning application.

Reason. To ensure that future inappropriate alterations or extensions do not occur pursuant to policies of the Unitary Development Plan listed.

- 11 No development shall commence unless and until surface water drainage proposals have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme should be in accordance with the submitted Surface Water Sustainable Drainage Assessment and must be based on the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance and be designed in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015). This must include assessment of potential SuDS options for surface water drainage with appropriate calculations and test results to support the chosen solution. Details of proposed maintenance arrangements should also be provided. The approved scheme only shall be implemented prior to first occupation and thereafter maintained.

Reason. The current application contains insufficient information regarding the proposed drainage scheme to fully assess the impact. To promote sustainable development and reduce flood risk pursuant to Unitary Development Plan Policies EN5/1- New Development and Flood Risk , EN7/3 - Water Pollution and EN7/5 - Waste Water Management and chapter 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change of the NPPF.

- 12 Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems. Surface water shall be drained in accordance with the hierarchy of drainage options in national planning practice guidance. In the event of surface water discharging to public sewer, the rate of discharge shall be restricted to the lowest possible rate which shall be agreed with the statutory undertaker prior to connection to the public sewer.

Reason: To secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution pursuant to Unitary Development Plan Policies EN5/1- New Development and Flood Risk , EN7/3 - Water Pollution and EN7/5 - Waste Water Management and chapter 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change of the NPPF.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HP 14/03/2023		DM 14/03/23	