

Report to: PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 29 July 2015

Report from: Assistant Director of Housing and Built Environment

Application Address: 56 Alma Terrace, St Leonards-on-sea, TN37 6QT

Proposal: Proposed demolition of chalet bungalow and garage and construction of 10 No. new dwellings with associated off-street parking.

Application No: HS/OA/15/00211

Recommendation: Grant Outline Planning Permission

Ward: SILVERHILL
File No: AL80056
Applicant: Mr Zender per Elevations Design Ltd Junction House 1 Sedlescombe Road South St Leonards on Sea, East Sussex. TN38 0TA

Interest: Not freeholder
Existing Use: Single dwellinghouse

Policies

Hastings Local Plan 2004: NC8, NC9, DG1, DG2, DG3, DG11, DG24 and DG27

Conservation Area: No

National Planning Policy Framework: Sections 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11

Hastings Planning Strategy: DS1, FA2, SC1, SC2, SC3, SC4, SC7, EN1, EN2, EN3, H1, H2, H3, and T3

Hastings Local Plan, Development Management Plan, Revised Proposed Submission Version: LP1, DM1, DM3, DM4, DM6, HN7 and HN8

Public Consultation

Adj. Properties: Yes

Advertisement: Yes - General Interest

Letters of Objection: 68

Petitions Received: 2

Application Status: Not delegated - Petition received

Summary

The application site relates to 56 Alma Terrace, St Leonards-On-Sea. This is a detached bungalow property within substantial grounds. The applicant has submitted an outline planning application with all matters reserved to redevelop the site for 10 houses. They have submitted indicative drawings to show that the development can be adequately achieved on site whilst providing sufficient parking, garden space and drainage amongst other considerations.

They have also demonstrated that a development can be compatible with the local character of the area, will not harm neighbouring residential amenities, will not result in poor highway safety, can provide decent accommodation, will not harm biodiversity or trees and can adequately provide for surface water drainage.

I recommend that planning permission is granted subject to conditions and a s106 legal agreement.

The Site and its Location

The application site relates to 56 Alma Terrace, St Leonards-On-Sea. This is a detached bungalow property within substantial grounds. There is a small flat roofed garage in the western corner of the site. The site is addressed as Alma Terrace, which is to the west of the site, but it also bounds Burry Road to the north with an access on this side. The site otherwise bounds 100 Burry Road to the north-east (another detached bungalow with a substantial garden), properties on Vale Road to the south-east (on the other side of a small natural valley) and 55 Alma Terrace to the south-west.

Along the southern boundary are well established mature trees which form part of the woodland gardens of properties on Vale Road. There is a mixture of hedges and trees along all other boundaries. The garden has some unkempt elements but is otherwise well maintained given the size of the site and its recent vacancy.

The site slopes downward from northwest to southeast under a gentle gradient until it falls away more steeply towards the southeast boundary - particularly in the eastern corner of the site.

The local area is made up of residential properties which vary in type and size including terraced houses, bungalows, detached two-storey houses and semi-detached properties.

Alma Terrace itself is a cul-de-sac leading straight to the application site - but with a pedestrian access only. The site is otherwise served by Burry Road which has a high volume of on-street parking and this leads on to Alma Villas which is a very narrow road.

Details of the Proposal and Other Background Information

This is an outline planning application with all matters reserved for the erection of 10 dwellings and associated off-street parking. As all matters are reserved, the applicant is seeking approval for the principle of the development only and would submit full details of the scheme if and when they receive outline planning permission. In order to establish whether this application can be approved, the applicant has submitted an indicative layout of the site and indicative designs of the houses in order to demonstrate that the proposed development can work on site.

Specific issues in relation to trees and the amount of off-street parking were raised early on and the applicant has amended their indicative layout plan to show that the development can be moved further from trees along the south-eastern boundary and how they can accommodate more parking. The application has been assessed on these amendments.

Previous Site History

There are no relevant planning permissions for this site.

The applicant did engage in pre-application discussions prior to submitting this planning application. They were informally advised that the redevelopment of the site for more housing is acceptable in principle but that they should consider providing more than the seven units proposed at the time to ensure a more efficient use of the land. The applicant was otherwise advised to consider typical planning matters such as the impact on neighbouring residents, compatibility with the surrounding area, parking provision and the impact on biodiversity.

Details of Consultations

The **Local Highway Authority** has raised no objection subject to conditions and contribution towards improved cycle facilities. Their comments are discussed in more detail in the 'parking and highway safety' considerations below but I do not consider their suggested condition is appropriate. This is an outline planning application and fixing the position of the access is not appropriate given that approval of the access is not being sought at this stage. The suggested contribution is acceptable.

The **Waste & Streetscene Services Officer** has raised no objection but requests the access be of sufficient size to allow the use of a 26t refuse collection vehicle.

Southern Water has raised no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions (condition 5 & 7) and informatives to ensure adequate drainage infrastructure is installed and to ensure the protection of existing infrastructure.

The **Borough Arboriculturalist** has raised no objection subject to a condition securing planting along the boundaries of the development site. (condition 1)

The **Lead Local Flood Authority** initially raised objections to the proposed development due to a lack of information regarding surface water drainage. Following discussions with the applicant, a drainage strategy was provided and the LLFA no longer have any objections subject to conditions. (conditions 5 and 6)

The **Natural Environment & Resources Manager** has raised no objection subject to conditions. (condition 8)

Two petitions (with 14 and 225 signatories) and 68 letters of objection have been received against the development proposals. Concerns include:

- Overdevelopment - too many houses are proposed.
- Poor highway safety - both during construction and post-development due to poor access arrangements and increased traffic movements.
- Inadequate parking provision and loss of on-street parking on surrounding roads.
- Restricted access for emergency services.
- Restricted access for refuse and other commercial vehicles.
- Impact on neighbouring residential amenities - including noise and disturbance, loss of

privacy and loss of light.

- Impact of the design on the character and appearance of the area.
- Development out of scale with existing area.
- Impact on protected species and other biodiversity.
- Impact on local schools.
- Surface water flooding.
- Increased pollution.
- Impact on trees.

The following other matters have been raised but are not considered material to the determination of the planning application:

- Asbestos - if this is present on site the developer has a legal duty to handle and dispose of it correctly and as such this is not a planning consideration.
- Confusion regarding the address of the site and how it differs from the location of the indicative access - the fact the site is addressed as Alma Terrace has no bearing on the determination of the application and whether the access from Burry Road is acceptable or not. Although access is not being approved at this stage, the applicant has indicatively shown access from Burry Road. This is a perfectly legitimate approach and the acceptability of the indicative access, despite the fact it is from Burry Road and not Alma Terrace, has been assessed on its own merits.
- The development will devalue existing properties - case law on this matter is clear and the value of people's properties cannot be taken into account in determining a planning application.
- Boundary and land ownership disputes - the applicant has adequately shown that the application is within the land associated with 56 Alma Terrace. Residents to the rear of the site on Villa Road have raised issue with the boundary with their properties. This is a matter they will have to take private legal advice on and discuss with the land owner directly.
- Lack of pre-application consultation / request for public meeting - there is no legal requirement for a developer to consult the wider public on a planning application of this type before it is submitted and it did not meet the threshold for a Planning Forum.
- Possible alternative uses - only the proposal submitted is under consideration. Local residents may have their own views on what they consider more appropriate development but this does not form part of the application assessment.
- High volume of objections - the number of objections to an application is not a material consideration it is the content of the objections and how much weight can be given to them that is assessed.
- Concerns regarding petition procedures - the first petition submitted against this application was rejected as it was not submitted in the correct format. I can understand the frustration at this, given that over 200 signatures had been obtained, but contrary to the concerns raised by local residents the procedures for submitting a petition enforce the democratic process as they ensure that objections to the application are submitted in a fair and transparent way for all parties involved.

Planning Considerations

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise".

The main policies/guidance that apply are policies SC1, SC7, EN1, H1, H2 and T3 of the Hastings Local Plan: The Hastings Planning Strategy (HPS) and policies DM1, DM3, DM4 and HN8 of the Hastings Local Plan: Development Management Plan (DMP). Others apply and are listed above.

As explained above, this is an outline application with all matters reserved. The applicant is therefore not seeking approval of the access, layout, appearance, scale, or landscaping of the development but they would like to establish whether developing 10 houses on site would be acceptable in principle. In order to establish whether the principle of development is acceptable, the applicant has provided an indicative drawing showing the layout of the development and the design of the houses. This drawing can be used to assess the impact on the character and appearance of the area, the standard of the accommodation proposed, the impact on neighbouring residential amenities, highway safety and parking related matters, the impact on protected species and biodiversity (including trees) and flooding and surface water drainage issues. These considerations will help determine whether the development is acceptable.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

The indicative drawings show 8 semi-detached and 2 detached houses in parallel formation - units 1 to 6 on the southern half of the site and units 7 to 10 on the northern half. The buildings have all been shown as two storey as a mixture of three and four bedrooms.

The proposed units would add to the variety of housing available in the local area and, as such, the proposal is considered compatible with the predominantly mixed residential use.

The scale of the houses is consistent with the local area (which is predominantly two-storey) and the appearance of the houses is influenced by some of the elements in the terraced and semi-detached houses in the area - particular the use of bays and gable roofs. The use of materials is also consistent with local vernacular with the applicant showing brick facing elevations and tiled roofs. Although approval of the design is not being sought the applicant has shown that appropriately designed houses can be achieved.

The layout of the development does not flow from any established building lines. The development is not an extension of the terraced row on Alma Terrace for example. This is not necessarily a criticism as the existing house, to a certain degree, has existed in isolation to its surroundings by not conforming to any existing patterns and being screened with boundary fencing and vegetation.

This development would maintain boundary treatments and vegetation along Burry Road could be maintained where possible and enhanced. Although there would be more built form within the site, the development can be considered as visually separate from the established rows of terraces and line of detached houses. The current indicative layout would essentially form its own spur off Burry Road and although it would change the local area it would certainly not harm its character and appearance. The proposed houses would add to and complement the local area.

The applicant has sufficiently demonstrated that development can be provided without harming local character.

Standard of accommodation proposed

The applicant has shown 10 houses as a mixture of 8 x three bedroom properties and 2 x four bedroom properties. The houses are indicative only, but the applicant has shown that decent accommodation can be achieved on site.

Policy DM3 of the DMP sets minimum floorspace figures that should be achieved for new houses. For a 4 bedroom property this should be 106m² and for a 3 bedroom property the space should be 93m². The indicative houses are 130m² for the four bedroom properties and 92m² for the three bedroom properties. The 4 bed properties clearly exceed the minimum requirements but the 3 bed properties fall short by 1m². I do not consider that this shortfall is detrimental as the room sizes are decent and the houses are well laid out. Additionally, although the 3 bed houses fall short of the requirements of policy DM3 they are within the range set out in the Government's nationally described space standards where two-storey 3-bedroom dwellings should be between 84m² - 102m² depending on the number of people that would live in the property. This proposal falls within that range.

Although I find the indicative houses acceptable, larger houses could be proposed at the detailed design stage, if considered necessary.

The applicant has shown that all properties can achieve gardens of at least 10m in length.

All properties would benefit from good levels of sunlight and daylight.

Overall a development of 10 houses could achieve a good level of accommodation.

Impact on neighbouring residential amenities

The layout of the development is not being approved at this stage but the applicant has provided sufficient evidence to explain how 10 houses would relate to existing neighbouring properties.

The site is bounded by residential development on three sides and is opposite a row of terraced houses on Burry Road but it is not considered that there will be any harm to neighbouring residential amenities.

The properties on Vale Road to the southeast are more than 40m from the nearest proposed house. It is typical for properties which face back-to-back to be separated by at least 21m and the indicative scheme would far exceed that. An element of screening is also provided by the trees and vegetation along the south-east boundary which would offer further obscuring. Given the distances involved it is not considered that the proposed development would cause any adverse overlooking to residents on Vale Road and it certainly wouldn't result in a loss of light or overshadowing.

To the north-east of the site is 100 Burry Road. This is a detached bungalow that has a 45m garden. The indicative layout shows that plots 1 and 10 would be closest to the boundary with 100 Burry Road but given the separation distances it is not considered that there would be any loss of light or overshadowing. Neither of the two properties is orientated towards 100 Burry Road either so there will be no harm from overlooking.

55 Alma Terrace is adjacent to the south-west boundary. The indicative layout shows plots 6 and 7 closest to this property. Neither property is orientated to cause overlooking and the vegetation and trees along the boundary will add to the sense of separation. Plot 6 is positioned so that there would not be any significant loss of light or overshadowing. Whilst plot 7 would be likely to lead to some overshadowing in the early part of the day - particularly during summer months - overall the proposed property is suitably distanced from the boundary with 55 Alma Terrace and I do not consider that there would be a detrimental impact in terms of overshadowing or loss of light.

The properties opposite the Burry Road boundary are suitably distanced from the site and will not be harmed by the development.

The applicant has adequately demonstrated that 10 houses can be provided on site without there being adverse harm to neighbouring residential amenities.

Highway safety and parking

This is one of the application's most contentious issues. Many local residents have cited concerns with the adequacy of the access, problems with the existing roads and on-street parking pressures. They strongly believe that this development will result in significant detriment to highway safety. From my site visits, I have some sympathy with the local residents. Alma Villas is a very narrow road, for example. There are also parking pressures along Burry Road but I do not consider that it is at capacity or that this development would have severe impacts in order to refuse the application. This opinion is shared by the Local Highway Authority (LHA) who have raised no objection to the development.

Shortly after the application was initially registered the LHA commented that the development would not provide for enough parking - as 25 spaces would be required in accordance with the ESCC parking calculator. Although this is an outline application only, the onus still falls with the developer to demonstrate that sufficient parking can be provided and as such a revised plan was submitted showing 2 parking places per property and an additional 5 parking space for visitors. The LHA are satisfied that sufficient parking can be provided.

Despite sufficient parking being provided within the development, there are still strong objections due to a perceived impact on existing on-street parking, the position of the access and problems with traffic flows. The LHA have provided a very detailed response in relation to these concerns. Some of their comments include:

- There is an existing access to the site. Although it appears unused it could be brought back into use at anytime, without planning permission. The parking situation is therefore already reduced.
- Objections suggesting that the access will reduce parking hold little weight as: 1 - Burry Road is an adopted road and is not designated or allocated for residents' parking, it is required to allow traffic to flow without obstruction and 2 - the creation of the access onto Burry Road does not in itself require planning permission.
- The creation of a larger access into the site will provide an area for vehicles to pass by and also turn around - a feature currently absent in Burry Road and one that will improve traffic flow.
- The access is not being approved at this stage and improvements can be made to it as part of a subsequent detailed application.
- The parking is sufficient. It is in accordance with the ESCC parking calculator and census data shows that Silverhill ward has low levels of car ownership. Based on census and site specific evidence, it is not considered that the development will result in over-spill to the existing roads and as such will not exacerbate the existing parking demand.

- The development will result in a very low level of additional vehicle movements - likely to be around 5 trips per day per unit. During peak hours there are likely to be 1-2 arrivals and 2-3 departures. This is by no means excessive.
- Construction traffic is likely to cause some disruption but this can be controlled with a suitable condition regarding site management.
- It is agreed that Alma Villas is unsuitable for through traffic but it is unlikely the residents of this development will use it more than once before realising it is a difficult route to access. The route is self-enforced and residents will be more likely to use Burry Road
- Burry Road can be heavily parked and although there have been attempts to prove the contrary, there are expected to be opportunities for vehicles to pass to ensure traffic can flow.

In summary, there will be an increase of traffic from the 9 additional units of around 40-50 trips over the course of the day, with around 5 in each peak period. The proposed development should not introduce more parked vehicles in the adopted highway or result in additional public service vehicles as they already have to access this area. What the scheme does provide is a suitable area for turning larger vehicles and not just those serving the proposed development, but those accessing this section of Burry Road in general.

There are travel options in this area for buses, cycling and walking as well as driving. This suggests that all journeys from this site will not necessarily be made by private car, especially if it is more convenient to walk or cycle to access local shops or travel to school, for example. The fact is that there are choices and having these available can influence the way residents travel.

In terms of the loss of parking caused by the creation of the access, this can be looked at by comparing it with the existing site arrangement which is an informal gate. Should this existing access be utilised there would be the equivalent of 2 spaces lost as a result of the existing property using the existing access. The layout shown on the plan indicates a 13m wide bellmouth which is an equivalent of 3 spaces (the average car parking space is 4.5m long). This possible reduction in on-street parking is not considered detrimental and, as suggested by the LHA, the access arrangement can be revised in any detailed submission which may reduce the width of the access further.

Ultimately the applicant has demonstrated that a proposed development of 10 houses would not result in any detrimental parking problems or highway safety concerns.

Biodiversity and trees

The ecological and arboricultural matters have been considered by the Environment & Natural Resources Manager and the Borough Arboriculturalist. Neither of them has raised an objection to the development.

The ecology report submitted with the application fulfils the requirements under national and local policy to consider biodiversity in applications. The report is a preliminary ecology survey which identifies that no protected species were noted on site. Some objection correspondence has attempted to suggest that there are protected species on site but no evidence has been provided of this. What is more likely is that protected species cross the site. Whilst the applicant's ecologist did not find evidence of this, they have acknowledged the possibility and made recommendations for this to ensure species are not harmed during the construction phase.

Similarly some objectors have noted protected species within their own gardens. This does not prove that protected species are on the application site and, as noted by the applicant's ecologist, in terms of amphibians for example, there is poor connectivity between the site and appropriate habitat so it is not considered that any protected species exist on site.

To ensure that the development is built with ecology protection in mind the Environment and Natural Resources Manager has suggested that a condition be in place for a Construction Environmental Management Plan (Biodiversity) in line with British Standard BS42020 Biodiversity – Code of practice for planning and development. The applicant will also need to consider biodiversity improvements like those suggested by their ecologist if and when the move forward to a detailed submission.

The Borough Arboriculturalist initially raised concerns about the proximity of the development to trees along the south-eastern boundary. The applicant submitted a revised indicative layout showing the development further from these trees. The Borough Arboriculturalist is now satisfied with this arrangement.

Some of the trees on the site have been protected since the application was submitted and whilst some of these may need to be removed to provide the access the Arboriculturalist is satisfied that suitable replacement planting can be achieved on site. This can be secured by condition.

Although more information on these matters would be expected as part of any detailed submission, the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated that development can be accommodated without harm to protected species or significant harm to trees.

Flooding and drainage

The application is not within flood zone 2 or 3 but the applicant does have to demonstrate that surface water can be managed appropriately. In this respect the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) were consulted and came back with early comments that a surface water drainage strategy would be required. This is an outline planning permission only so it is difficult to comment on drainage matters when there is no set design but the applicant produced a strategy and, through further discussions with the LLFA it has been agreed that a development of 10 units on site can be achieved with appropriate surface water management. The applicant has submitted drawings showing how this drainage can work but full details of this will need to be submitted as part of any detailed application and the drainage will need to ensure it doesn't increase the flow through the Southern Water network which discharges into the gardens south of the site on Vale Road.

Other

Local residents have raised concerns about increased air pollution. Possible dust pollution during construction can be controlled by an appropriate condition. Pollution otherwise can take many forms - i.e. smells, noise and light but, given the small scale of the development it is not considered that this development will exacerbate any pollution problems.

Policy H3 of the HPS required all housing developments to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing, however, following guidance published by the Government in 2014 the Council can only pursue affordable housing on schemes over 10 units or where the floor space exceeds 1000sqm. In this instance only 10 houses are proposed and the total floorspace is below the 1000sqm threshold. A contribution towards affordable housing is therefore not required at this time. The design of the housing is not being approved at this stage and, if the houses were to increase in size, and this may be required to address the

size of the units that currently fall short of the required minimum, then affordable housing may be pursued as part of any detailed submission.

The proposed development is below the threshold for contributions towards schools and libraries. It is therefore not considered to have a significant impact upon local schools.

Conclusion

This is an outline planning application with all matters reserved. The above discusses the acceptability of the principle of the development. Any specific issues - such as the appearance of the buildings, the implementation of green and sustainable design or the final drainage details - would all be dealt with as part of a detailed submission. Considering this, I am of the opinion that the applicant has adequately demonstrated that a development of 10 houses could be achieved on site and that these proposals are considered to comply with the development plan in accordance with Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. I therefore recommend that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and s106 legal agreement.

The Human Rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues.

Recommendation

- **That the Development Manager be authorised to issue planning permission upon completion of a S106 Agreement to secure a financial contribution towards cycle route improvements.**

A) Subject to A) above:

Recommendation

Grant Outline Planning Permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of the details of the layout, scale and external appearance of the building(s), the means of access thereto and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.
2. Plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to in Condition 1 above, relating to the siting, design and external appearance of any buildings to be erected, the means of access to the site and the landscaping of the site, shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority and shall be carried out as approved.
3. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
4. The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

5. Details of the proposed means of foul sewerage and surface water disposal/management shall be submitted with the details required in connection with conditions 1 above.
 - B) Development shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved under (i) and no occupation of any of the dwellings or flats hereby approved shall occur until those works have been completed.
 - (iii) No occupation of any of the dwellings or flats hereby approved shall occur until the Local Planning Authority has confirmed in writing that it is satisfied, that the necessary drainage infrastructure capacity is now available to adequately service the development.
6. Before the development hereby approved is commenced a maintenance and management plan for the entire drainage system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan should clearly state who will be responsible for managing all aspects of the surface water drainage system. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan.
7. Before the development hereby approved is commenced details of the measures to protect the public sewers during construction shall be submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
8. No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan for biodiversity (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP: Biodiversity shall include the following;
 - (i) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
 - a) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
 - b) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
 - c) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
 - d) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
 - e) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
 - f) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
 - g) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP: Biodiversity shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details and phasing agreed, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

9. The details required by condition 1 above shall include details of the suggested biodiversity enhancements measures outlined in the submitted ecological statements and reports (Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, dated February 2015 by the Mayhew Consultancy Ltd - ref EA/35215). The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
10. With the exception of internal works the building works required to carry out the development allowed by this permission must only be carried out within the following times:-

08.00 - 18.00 Monday to Friday
08.00 - 13.00 on Saturdays
No working on Sundays or Public Holidays.
11. Before the development hereby approved is commenced a construction and traffic management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan.

Reasons:

1. The application is in outline only.
2. The application is in outline only.
3. This condition is imposed in accordance with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.
4. This condition is imposed in accordance with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.
5. To prevent increased risk of flooding.
6. To prevent increased risk of flooding.
7. To prevent increased risk of flooding.
8. To protect features of recognised nature conservation importance.
9. To enhance features of recognised nature conservation importance.
10. To safeguard the amenity of adjoining residents. (Hastings Local Plan 2004 - Policy DG4).
11. In the interests of highway safety and to prevent disturbance to local residents through noise or other types of pollution during the construction of the development.

Notes to the Applicant

1. Failure to comply with any condition imposed on this permission may result in enforcement action without further warning.

2. Statement of positive engagement: In dealing with this application Hastings Borough Council has actively sought to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner, in accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
 3. The drainage details required by condition 5 should take into account the following comments from the Lead Local Flood Authority:
 - h) The proposed surface water discharge rate for the site and connection point to the existing sewer should be agreed with Southern Water.
 1. The surface water management proposal formulated for the detailed design stage should be supported by detailed hydraulic calculations. These calculations should take into account the connectivity of the different drainage features. They should show a 'like for like' discharge rate between the existing and proposed scenarios during the 1 in 1, 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 (plus an allowance for climate change) rainfall events. If it is not practical to limit the runoff volume to the existing, the excess volume during a 6 hours 1 in 100 years storm should be discharged at a rate of 2l/s/ha.
 4. In developing their detailed scheme the applicant should refer to the consultation response from Southern Water, dated 19 March 2015 (ref PLAN-009200).
 5. Consideration should be given to the provision of a domestic sprinkler system.
-

Officer to Contact

Mr S Batchelor, Telephone 01424 783254

Background Papers

Application No: HS/OA/15/00211 including all letters and documents