

Minutes of a Meeting held in the Conference Room, Riverside, Lowestoft
on **Tuesday, 13 March 2018 at 6.00pm**

Members Present:

J Groom (Chairman), S Allen, P Ashdown, N Brooks, J Ceresa, M Cherry, Y Cherry, G Elliott, T Goldson, R Neil, M Pitchers, C Rivett and J Smith.

Officers Present:

M Gee (Planning Officer), P Perkin (Development Management Team Leader), I Robertson (Area Planning and Enforcement Officer), P Rowson (Planning Development Manager) and S Carter (Democratic Services Officer).

In attendance:

Councillors P Light, J Murray and D Ritchie.

Suffolk Coastal District Councillors S Bird, C Blundell, P Dunnett, J Fisher, A Fryatt, S Harvey, C Hedgley, M Jones, D McCallum, and M Newton.

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, the Chairman reminded those present that the Conference Room was fitted with a hearing loop and he advised that additional members of the public were observing the meeting via live broadcast in the café area.

Councillor Groom also extended a warm welcome to the members of Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee who were in attendance to observe the meeting.

1 APOLOGIES / SUBSTITUTES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Graham.

Councillor Y Cherry attended the meeting as a Substitute for Councillor Graham.

2 MINUTES

(a) Planning Committee meeting on 16 January 2018

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

(b) Planning Committee meeting on 13 February 2018

RESOLVED

That, subject to the 'preferred options draft' in the last paragraph on page 9 being amended to read the "Regulation 19 publication draft", the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Ceresa declared a Local Non Pecuniary Interest in Item 8 – DC/17/3519/OUT – Land at Church Lane, Carlton Colville, Lowestoft, as being Ward Member.

Councillor Ceresa declared a Pecuniary Interest in Item 10 – DC/18/0312/FUL – 21 Kirkley Cliffe Road, Lowestoft and Item 11 – DC/18/0329/LBC – 21 Kirkley Cliffe Road, Lowestoft, as she was related to the applicant. She advised that she would leave the meeting during the consideration of these items and take no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

Councillor Ceresa declared a Local Non Pecuniary Interest in Item 12 – DC/18/0320/FUL – 32 Grosvenor Road, Lowestoft, as being County Councillor for the area.

Councillor Pitchers declared a Local Non Pecuniary Interest in Item 10 – DC/18/0312/FUL – 21 Kirkley Cliffe Road, Lowestoft, Item 11 – DC/18/0329/LBC – 21 Kirkley Cliffe Road, Lowestoft, and Item 12 – DC/18/0320/FUL – 32 Grosvenor Road, Lowestoft, as being Ward Member.

Councillor Rivett declared a Local Non Pecuniary Interest in Item 8 – DC/17/3519/OUT – Land at Church Lane, Carlton Colville, Lowestoft, as being County Councillor for the area.

4 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

Councillor Ashdown declared that he had received communications in relation to Item 8 – DC/17/3519/OUT – Land at Church Lane, Carlton Colville, Lowestoft.

Councillor Elliott declared that he had received communications in relation to Item 8 – DC/17/3519/OUT – Land at Church Lane, Carlton Colville, Lowestoft.

With the agreement of the Chairman, Items 5, 6 and 7 on the Agenda were considered together, although Members were given the opportunity to ask questions and comment upon each report separately.

5 APPEAL DECISIONS REPORT

The reports of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management advised the Committee that four appeal decisions had been made in December 2017, three were dismissed and one allowed conditionally, and no appeal decisions had been made in January 2018

RESOLVED

That the reports concerning Appeal Decisions in December 2017 and January 2018 be noted.

6 DELEGATED CHIEF OFFICER DECISIONS

The reports of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management informed Members of all the Chief Officer delegated planning decisions made during December 2017 and January 2018.

RESOLVED

That the report concerning the Chief Officer Delegated Planning Decisions made during December 2017 and January 2018 be noted.

7 ENFORCEMENT ACTION

The report of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management provided Members with a summary of all outstanding enforcement cases sanctioned under delegated powers or through the Committee up until 27 February 2018. There were currently four cases.

RESOLVED

That the report detailing the outstanding Enforcement Matters up to 28 February 2018 be received.

8 DC/17/3519/OUT – LAND AT CHURCH LANE, CARLTON COLVILLE, LOWESTOFT

The Development Management Team Leader presented the application which sought approval for outline planning permission for residential development including access roads. The outline application was for up to 78 dwellings including 35% affordable housing, open space, a car parking area for the church, and improvements to the local roads and footpath network. A decision had been deferred at the last meeting of the Committee to allow for a site visit; that had taken place on 7 March 2018 and the notes of that site meeting had been circulated to Members and were tabled at the meeting.

Members were shown an aerial view, photographs and location plans of the site and its surrounds including additional views of the footpath on the western boundary, the Grade II* listed church from several directions, views of the church from Mutford Lane, drone photographs supplied by Carlton Colville Town Council and a slide of the indicative layout which also showed the proposed open space and car parking for the church. Additional slides indicated that some dwellings would be located a further distance from the trees in Chapel Road and gave illustrations of the relationship between existing dwellings and the proposed houses.

The Development Management Team Leader drew attention to a number of issues relating to the defined settlement limit and policy DM01, and the fact that the applicant had argued that the Council did not have the necessary five year housing land supply. He confirmed that the site had been considered at the preferred options stage of the draft plan but rejected due to the setting of the church and the proposals in the draft plan, due to be considered by Council on 21 March 2018, would overcome the marginal shortfall of land supply. The setting of the listed church had high significance as a heritage asset and great weight was placed on that by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Council's Senior Design and Conservation Officer considered the proposal would have a negative impact on the setting of the church. It was considered that the location of the proposed open space would not mitigate the impact of the development. There were some benefits with the provision of new housing including affordable housing but those benefits would not outweigh the harm and refusal was therefore recommended.

The Development Management Team Leader confirmed that recommendations 1 and 2 stood but, as previously reported, recommendation 3 was to be deleted if Members were to support refusal.

Mrs J Tyler – Carlton Colville Town Council

Mrs Tyler advised that Carlton Colville Town Council continued to recommend refusal in accordance with their written consultation responses. She highlighted comments made with regard to the Council's policies and section 9 of the NPPF relating to urban sprawl which was contrary to policy. Policy CS11 dealt with brownfield sites which should be used first for development prior to any greenfield sites and there were plenty of brownfield sites on the Council's register. The Grade II* listed church should enjoy what was remaining of its natural setting and this heritage asset should be recognised and looked after. The tower was part of the original 13th century church and few of that type were remaining in the country. The setting of such an important monument should not be destroyed. Mrs Tyler also expressed concern over the likely additional flooding from the clay field and safety of access points onto the highway. Would the development integrate in accordance with paragraph 61 of the NPPF, no it would not.

Ms E Castleton and Mr M Sherlock - Objectors

Ms Castleton explained she was a resident in Carlton Colville and was speaking for herself and on behalf of other residents against the proposed development. The high levels of the proposed houses would dominate and overshadow the existing bungalows, the current footpaths were inadequate, and the additional footfall and traffic would create a perilous situation with people already needing to walk on the road. Existing flooding issues were already causing immense problems in Chapel Road and sewage had been coming up into residents' toilets. There was a total lack of infrastructure and the local school was full. There was no justification to build family homes when there were insufficient schools, doctors and dentists. People would cut through the old village resulting in additional traffic which would make things even more dangerous.

Mr Sherlock drew attention to the iconic view from the path across a typical Suffolk flat landscape and towards the church. The area and open space had been enjoyed by families through the generations. He addressed issues in the heritage document and made particular reference to wheelie bins and modern extensions. The proposal would not fit in with the Local Plan. The motto of the Royal Anglian Regiment of 'speed the plough' would no longer be there.

Councillor P Light – Ward Member

Councillor Light drew attention to the arguments that had been made and the concerns that had been raised over the loss of views of the church, an important listed building and the effects on the community. There had been regular flooding in the area and water had been within millimetres of living accommodation; additional buildings and concrete would only increase the risk of surface flooding. Councillor Light believed the site meeting was not needed to meet the shortfall of homes in the Council's area as he was of the view that brownfield sites and other plots in Carlton Colville could be built on. The proposal was overdevelopment with no facilities and would not enhance the town. Transport would be

needed to get to shops and services and there would be a loss of privacy to existing houses. Lack of footpaths and narrow roads would result in safety issues.

Mr E Gilder - Applicant

Mr Gilder stated that the outcome of the application seemed to depend on the view of the setting of the church. He advised that until the late 1960s, there had been no development but the number of buildings in the vicinity had increased over the years, with the last development of extra bungalows in 2014. The purpose of the church was not affected by its setting; the building was located in a changing landscape and it served people not fields. The proposal in the outline application included upgraded footpaths, car parking and zebra crossing provision. It added housing to the current land supply and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money for infrastructure. The Prime Minister had recently highlighted the need for focus on the provision housing delivery; Councils needed to perform, not just grant permissions, and have a track record of delivery of homes in their areas. Mr Gilder confirmed that every consent that had been granted to Badgers in the last 10 years was either built, under construction or proceeding. In response to the national housing crisis, this application would make homes available. He commended the application to Members as the housing would be delivered.

Questions to Applicant

Members raised questions with regard to reducing the height of the land and if that would detract from the viability of developing the site, mitigation against flooding and its prevention, and bungalows along the eastern and southern boundaries.

Mr Gilder advised that the land levels could be reduced by 1.6m; it would be practical near the road but any further re-grading might be a mammoth exercise. The provision of some bungalows could be considered as an alternative to lowering the land and Mr Gilder confirmed that layout would obviously be discussed in the future, if permission was granted. It was a requirement of all new developments to ensure there was no extra water run-off. Investigations had shown that there was a permeable layer of sand below the clay and they were confident the site could be adequately drained, not adding any water to off site flows.

Debate

Members expressed the view that, whilst being sympathetic to what the developers were proposing, consideration needed to be given as to how the proposal would affect the Grade II* listed church and the views of Historic England. It seemed that the proposal would result in high level harm to the church setting which was significant grounds to refuse the application. Comment was made that the land was outside of the physical limits and it had been rejected in the forthcoming draft local plan that was due to be considered by Council the following week. Looking at various impacts affecting other built up areas, it was considered that the application should be rejected. Much had been made of the five year housing supply and its calculation but the proposal contradicted and conflicted with the Council's policies.

The Committee supported the officer's recommendation in that the harm caused to the setting of the church, and the conflict with the Council's policies and plan, was not outweighed by the benefits and it was unanimously

RESOLVED

That permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The site lies in open countryside outside the physical limits defined by Development Management Policy DM01. Development Management Policy DM22 states that housing development will not be permitted in the open countryside except where it can be demonstrated to be essential for an agricultural or forestry worker to live at or close to a workplace, where housing would meet an identified local housing need, where it would constitute infill development or where the proposal would replace dwellings affected by coastal erosion. The proposed development does not fall into any of these categories and is therefore contrary to Policies DM01 and DM22.
2. The site is within the setting of the Church of St Peter a Grade II* listed building. The proposed development would result in the loss of the last component of the rural setting of the church and have a negative impact on the setting of the church contrary to paragraphs 14, 131, 132 and 137 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CS17 and Policy DM30. The benefits of the proposal are not considered to outweigh the harm that would be caused.

The meeting was adjourned at 6.42pm for three minutes to allow members of the public to leave the Conference Room.

9 DC/17/5381/COU – MILL HOUSE, MILL LANE, SOUTH ELMHAM ST JAMES

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer presented the application which sought approval for a change of use of two former agricultural buildings situated within the residential curtilage of Mill House for the purpose of carrying out small pet cremations. One of the buildings would house the machinery for carrying out the process and the second building would be used as an office/reception/waiting area.

The application was before Committee due to a conflict with the Local Plan and also as a result of Member call-in.

The site itself comprised a residential property and a number of outbuildings, situated on the edge of the village of South Elmham St James and considered to be in open countryside due to the lack of access to services and facilities. Although the property adjoined the gardens of other residential properties, there was a generous gap of around 100 metres between dwellings. The workshop building was constructed in block work with corrugated metal sheet to the upper parts of the walls and roof. The proposal was to install a specialist pet cremation, low capacity, incinerator within the workshop building which would deal with a maximum of 15 small pets per week. This would include one alteration to the external appearance of the building by the provision of a flu which was proposed to be no more than 1m above the ridge. The second building was a substantial circular brick building, being a former mill structure, which would be repaired and be used for an office/reception/waiting area in association with the business. The proposal would not require any additional employees and it was expected that clients would bring deceased pets to the premises or a collection service would be offered.

Members were shown an aerial view, photographs and location plans of the site and its surrounds including views of the buildings and the overall setting.

Representations had been received, full details of which were contained in the report. Although the proposal was contrary to the aims of the Local Plan in terms of the location of this site and its proximity to a sustainable settlement, the Local Plan and paragraph 28 of the National Planning Policy Framework were both supportive of small scale activities which contributed to the local rural economy.

The Area Planning and Enforcement officer explained that the proposal was a small scale enterprise appropriate to its location and it had been demonstrated that the proposal would protect the amenities of the wider environment. The impacts of the proposal would be acceptable and adequately controlled by conditions. It was considered that the economic benefit and the employment opportunity to the applicants providing a service, for which there was a limited provision within the District, would outweigh the harm of policy conflict, and approval was being recommended.

Councillor D Ritchie – Ward Member

Councillor Ritchie confirmed that he had called-in the application due to the likely increase in traffic being against policy. However, it had now been made clear that there would be only 15 cremations per week resulting in a small increase in vehicle movements. Officers were now recommending approval and he supported the application. The proposal should be welcomed as a small business that would be providing a local service.

Mrs S Boatwright - Applicant

Mrs Boatwright thanked the Planning Officer for an excellent presentation of her proposal and the support from the Environmental Protection Officer following differing views from DEFRA. Bereavement affected people in different ways and this would give a personal service as opposed to vets providing a service once a week at a large facility with multi-chambers. The proposed individual attention for the loss of a pet would help people with the grieving process and also offer a local choice.

Questions to the Applicant

Members asked specific questions with regard to:

- Number of cremations per week.
- Visit per day.
- Size and type of incinerator/cremation.
- Cold storage.

Mrs Boatwright explained that machine would only cope with four cremations in one day, each cremation being undertaken individually and taking around two hours. Other similar providers had advised her that they usually dealt with in the region of 15 per week. It was necessary to provide cold storage in accordance with the APHO but it was not intended to

store pets, in what would be similar to a chest freezer. The size of the cold store would likely take two large dogs.

Debate

Members believed the proposal would be useful facility within in Waveney which currently had no similar service in its area. Following a proposal to support the application, which was duly seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED

That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved block plan and elevational drawing received on 20th December 2017 for which permission is hereby granted.
3. The 'barn' structure shall be used only for the purpose of a 'pet crematorium' and for no other purpose whatsoever, (including any other purpose in Class B2 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2005) or in any provision equivalent to that Class in a statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification.
4. The use hereby approved shall only operate using the plant specified within the application as being a Surefire SA50 / 0.6 manual load pet cremator.
5. The working hours in connection with the use hereby permitted, shall not be other than between 10.00 hours and 18.00 hours Monday to Saturday; and no work shall be carried out on Sundays, or Bank Holidays, or outside the specified hours, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
6. The number of cremations carried out per week shall not exceed 15. The owner shall maintain, and keep available for inspection at all reasonable times, an up-to-date record of all cremations.
7. The doors to the barn shall remain closed whilst the incinerator is in operation.

The Chairman announced that Items 10 and 11 would be taken together with voting on the resolutions being undertaken separately.

Having declared a Pecuniary Interest in Items 10 and 11 on the Agenda, Councillor Ceresa left the Conference Room at this point in the meeting prior to any discussion on the application.

10 DC/18/0312/FUL – 21 KIRKLEY CLIFFE ROAD, LOWESTOFT

The Planning Officer presented the application which sought approval for the construction of a first and second floor rear extension to provide a manager's living accommodation. The

proposal included the removal of the existing roof terrace, demolition of parapet walls and removed of an external staircase. The application was before Committee as it had been submitted by a relative of a Councillor.

Members were shown an aerial view, photographs and location plans of the site and its surrounds including views of the front and rear of the site and diagrams of the proposed extensions.

The Planning Officer explained that the property was a three storey Grade II listed building with single and two storey rear extensions, currently operating as tourist accommodation. The listing dated to 1993 and, as the birth place of Benjamin Britten, it appeared that the historical association might have been the prime consideration for its insertion on the list rather than the building's special architectural interest. An identical proposal had previously been submitted and approved, under DC/10/0991/FUL and DC/10/0992/LBC, although it appeared that those applications had never been implemented. They had subsequently expired.

The Planning Officer outlined the planning considerations and explained that the design was considered acceptable and accorded with the provisions of the adopted Local Plan. There would be no adverse impacts on the amenities of nearby residents, the visual amenities of the area or the general domestic street scene. Approval was therefore being recommended.

Questions

In response to a Member's question relating to the proposed metal pipework and, in the corrosive atmosphere of the seafront, if consideration could pragmatically be given to plastic, the Planning Development Manager explained that the appropriate metal should be used as it was a listed building and if painted appropriately, it should last a good period of time.

Following approval being proposed and duly seconded, it was

RESOLVED

That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until it has been completed in all respects strictly in accordance with the existing and proposed plans, Heritage Statement, Design and Access Statement, and Application Form, received 19/01/2018, for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.

11 DC/18/0329/LBC – 21 KIRKLEY CLIFFE ROAD, LOWESTOFT

The Planning Officer advised that Listed Building Consent was required as the planning application DC/18/0312/FUL was for the construction of first and second floor rear

extension to provide managers living accommodation, including the removal of roof terrace, demolition of parapet walls and external staircase. The building was a Grade II listed property and understood to be the birth place of Benjamin Britten.

The application was before Committee as it had been submitted by a relative of a Councillor.

Having considered this application in conjunction with DC/18/0312/FUL, it was

RESOLVED

That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until it has been completed in all respects strictly in accordance with the existing and proposed plans, Heritage Statement, Design and Access Statement, and Application Form, received 19/01/2018, for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.
3. Details in respect of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council as Local Planning Authority before the work is begun. The work shall be carried out in accordance with such approved details:
 - Joinery details @ full size, half full size or 1:5
4. All new external rainwater goods and soil pipes on the visible elevations shall be of metal, painted black.
5. In the event that any hidden historic features are revealed during the course of the works, work shall be suspended in the relevant area of the building and the Council shall be notified immediately. Provision shall then be made for their retention and/or proper recording as required by the Council.
6. Before any works are commenced, details of the following shall be submitted to and agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority:
 - A sample panel of brickwork
7. The position, type and method of installation of all new and relocated services and related fixtures (for the avoidance of doubt including communications and information technology servicing), or other appurtenances, shall be specified in advance of any work being carried out, and the prior approval of the Council as Local Planning Authority shall be obtained wherever these installations are to be visible, or where ducts or other methods of concealment are proposed. Any works carried out shall be in accordance with such approval.

Note: Councillor Ceresa returned to the Conference Room at 7.08pm.

12 DC/18/0320/FUL – 32 GROSVENOR ROAD, LOWESTOFT

The Planning Officer presented the application which sought approval for the replacement of existing windows to the front elevation with Upvc sliding sash windows. The application was before Committee as it had been submitted by a member of staff.

Members were shown an aerial view, photographs and location plans of the site and its surrounds including the current unsympathetic windows.

The Planning Officer explained that the site was located within the physical limits of Lowestoft, within the South Lowestoft Conservation Area. As a result of the property's location, replacement windows need to be assessed through a planning application, giving consideration to the prominence of the location, the historic and architectural value of the property and the value of the feature to be replaced. The existing windows were an unsympathetic replacement and having assessed the proposed replacement windows in accordance with the relevant planning document, the principle and detail of the development was considered to be acceptable and in compliance with relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework. Approval was being recommended.

Questions

In response to a Member's question seeking clarification on the use of Upvc, the Planning Development Manager referred Members to the scoring system used which was outlined in paragraph 6.2 of the report. The proposed replacement windows were good, detailed replicas. He confirmed the scoring system would apply to all areas within Waveney.

There being no further discussion, it was unanimously

RESOLVED

That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in all respects strictly in accordance with:
 - Application form received 22/01/2018,
 - Photos received 22/01/2018 & 23/01/2018, showing proposed windows and existing property,
 - Site location plan received 23/01/2018,
 - Email titled 'Fwd: Sash photos planning ref DC/18/0320' received 31/01/2018,
 - Photos of proposed windows received 31/01/2018,
 - Email titled 'Fwd: Planning application at 32 Grosvenor Road, Lowestoft (DC/18/0320/FUL)' received 16/02/2018,

For which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.

3. The window frames hereby permitted shall be recessed in the window openings by 100mm in accordance with the details of the e-mail received 16th February 2018.

13 UPDATE REPORT UPDATE REPORT FOR DC/17/1680/ARM, APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS OF DC/01/0977/OUT (W17802) – OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR A MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING OF RESIDENTIAL, NEIGHBOURHOOD SHOPPING CENTRE, COMMUNITY HALL, PRIMARY SCHOOL, PLAY AREAS AND COUNTRY PARK – CONSTRUCTION OF 220 DWELLINGS INCLUDING ACCESS, APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE. LAND SOUTH OF HALL LANE, OULTON

The Development Management Team Leader presented the report, the purpose of which was to provide an update on progress with regard to the delivery of the country park.

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 14 November 2017, it had agreed to defer making a decision on the reserved matters application for Phase 2 of the Woods Meadow development following concerns that had been raised over the lack of progress and timescales for the delivery of the country park, as required by a Section 106 Agreement. Obligations in that agreement included requirements for the developer to:

- Submit a specification for the country park upon occupation of the first dwelling.
- Agree a mitigation strategy for the remediation of any known contamination within the country park prior to occupation of the first dwelling.
- Transfer the country park land to the District Council prior to the occupation of the first dwelling.

Officers had previously agreed an extension of time. However, the outstanding issues had not been resolved particularly with regard to potential contamination, the required mitigation measures and infrastructure to enable the development to be acceptable in planning terms with regard to access to open space. The breach of the Section 106 needed to be remedied and whilst the proposed layout for the current Phase 2 application was considered acceptable, the non availability of the required country park for residents made the scheme unacceptable.

At its meeting on 16 January 2018, an update report had been presented to Committee and the purpose of the progress report now before Members was to provide an update on the delivery of the country park. In summary, the situation had not significantly changed. Officers understood that the developer had only recently contacted the Environment Agency to review and comment on their consultant's assessment of the impact to groundwater from a former landfill site in the northern part of the site. As it stood, the Council's Environmental Health Officer still awaited the response of the Environment Agency. The report stated that it was difficult to determine timescales and how long the process might take; the estimated time for the Environment Agency's consultation could be up to two months. Following that, there would be further water sampling and analysis and the preparation of a detailed risk assessment. In view of the further actions necessary, it was not possible to move forward with the transferring of the country park land to the Council.

The Development Management Team Leader further advised that the Phase 2 application, which had not been determined, included access to the primary school which was under construction and due to open in September 2018. As a potential solution to enable the construction of an access road, the developer had submitted a separate application under DC/18/0114/ARM for the Phase 2 access roads only. That application had now been approved but contaminated land conditions had yet to be discharged.

As the provision of the country park was subject to contaminated land issues which were still ongoing, it was proposed that a further report be submitted to the Committee at its meeting in May 2018.

Members supported the officers' recommendation and unanimously

RESOLVED

That the content of the report be noted and that unless the matters relating to the Country Park transfer have been resolved thus enabling the Planning Committee to fully reconsider Application Ref DC/17/1680/ARM, an update report be presented to the May meeting of the Planning Committee.

The meeting concluded at 7.13pm.

Chairman