

# Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

## Planning Committee

HELD AT 6.00 PM ON WEDNESDAY 27 JULY 2016

DIDCOT CIVIC HALL, BRITWELL ROAD, DIDCOT, OX11 7JN

### Present:

Felix Bloomfield (Chairman)

Joan Bland, Anthony Dearlove, Jeannette Matelot, Toby Newman, David Nimmo-Smith, Richard Pullen, David Turner, Margaret Turner and Ian White

### Apologies:

Margaret Davies tendered apologies.

### Officers:

Paul Bowers, Rob Cramp, Sharon Crawford, Paula Fox, Nicola Meurer and Marc Pullen

### Also present:

Councillors Lorraine Hillier and Stefan Gawrysiak

### 49    **Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest**

Councillor Anthony Dearlove declared that in relation to application P15/S2902/O, he would be stepping down from the committee and speaking on behalf of Didcot Town Council.

Councillor David Nimmo Smith declared that in relation to application P16/S0720/FUL, he chaired the Henley town council planning committee when it considered this application and would therefore not take part in the discussion nor voting for this item.

### 50    **Minutes of the previous meeting**

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the meetings held on 15 and 29 June as correct records and agree that the Chairman sign these as such.

### 51    **Urgent items**



Listening Learning Leading

None.

## **52 Applications deferred or withdrawn**

None.

## **53 Proposals for site visit reports**

None.

## **54 P15/S2902/O - Land to the north east of Didcot**

Councillor Anthony Dearlove stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item.

The committee considered application P15/S2902/O for outline planning permission with details of the means of access only to be considered for a new and integrated neighbourhood to the north east of Didcot of up to 1880 homes (with up to 40% affordable housing) and comprising: (i) two new primary schools; (ii) a new secondary school; (iii) a new leisure/sports facility and sports pitches, including a pavilion; (iv) a neighbourhood centre comprising: a 1500 sq.m Class A1 (shop) use; up to 5 units, each up to 200 sq.m, of small flexible units within Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 or A5; a Class A4 or A3 or mixed use public house/restaurant; a Class C1 hotel; and a Class D1 non-residential institutional use (for example a crèche or children's day nursery); (v) a new community hall; (vi) a Class C3 residential extra care housing facility; (vii) new areas of green infrastructure including amenity green space, allotments and children's play areas; and (viii) a comprehensive suite of other supporting town-wide and site-specific associated infrastructure on land to the north east of Didcot.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

The officer detailed updates since publication of the agenda concerning the completion of a S106 agreement (as attached in the addendum report), and other items to be included in the Recommendation which will include:

- Twenty five per cent affordable housing.
- An affordable housing mix of at least 25% affordable rented and the remaining intermediate/shared ownership up to 75%.
- No cap on affordable rented housing tenure should additional funding become available to increase affordable rented.
- A matrix approach to contributions applied in the event of an increase in large market homes. Housing mix to be agreed in the S106.
- S106 and S278 infrastructure as identified in the report and as updated by the addendum.
- An additional circa £38,000 for strategic transport.

Other updates included:

- We will seek lifetime homes by condition.
- The maintenance amounts will need to be made available and passed on to the organisation(s) taking on the open space.
- A commitment to ongoing discussions on the community centre with the applicants.

Anthony Dearlove, a representative of Didcot town council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Travel and rurality impacts;
- The safety risk of having an access onto the B4016 where there is a 60mph speed limit; and
- Although Didcot town council did not object to the application in principle, they felt that it should be refused until the above concerns are addressed.

Gordon Rogers, a representative of Long Wittenham parish council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The significant impact of traffic in an area where there are tailbacks at peak times already;
- The proposed relief road at Culham is a least ten years away;
- Local bus services have had subsidies withdrawn; and
- The access points should be redesigned.

Dr Nick Hards, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The proposed conditions are not adequate to deal with surface water flooding.

Kevin Wilkinson, a representative of HarBUG, spoke to the application. His speech included the following:

- A proposal for a premium cycle route from the development to the town facilities; and
- A request to upgrade current routes.

Steven Brown, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. His speech included the following:

- The development has undergone rigorous viability testing;
- There have been only 29 objections;
- Significant contributions will be made to the busy road network; and
- Overall, it is a sustainable, mixed use development with schools, open space and leisure facility.

In response to members' questions, the officer came back with the following points:

- The most up-to-date flood zone assessment was carried out;
- Conditions 26 – 28 concerning flooding will be worded very carefully. Some works will need to be completed at the outset.
- There will be a £500k contribution to cycle route improvements on site – it would be very difficult to justify significant off-site works; and
- The County Council have applied for funding for the Ladygrove and Northern Perimeter Road junction.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion included the following points:

- 25% affordable housing is disappointing;
- Transport solutions and infrastructure should be in place before commencement;
- Drainage and traffic conditions should be strongly upheld; and
- The proposal fits in with the strategic growth pursued by the Council.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to delegate authority to the head of planning to grant outline planning permission for application P15/S2902/O, subject to:

- i. The completion of a S106 agreement to include:
  - a. 25% Affordable Housing
  - b. An affordable housing mix of at least 25% affordable rented and the remaining intermediate/ shared ownership up to 75%
  - c. No cap on affordable rented housing tenure should additional funding become available to increase affordable rented.  
A matrix approach to contributions applied in the event of an increase in large market homes. Housing mix to be agreed in the s106S106 and S278 infrastructure as identified in the report as updated by the addendum. An additional sum, circa £38 thousand for strategic transport
- ii. The following conditions:
  1. Approved plans and document list.
  2. Approved land uses (as per masterplan).
  3. Commencement time limit.
  4. Time limit for submission of first reserved matters.
  5. Time limit for submission of remaining reserved matters.

Restrictions:

6. Details of works to gas pipeline
7. No built development to be occupied in flood zones 2 and 3 and no raising of levels unless agreed.
8. Buffer zones either side of watercourses.
9. Hours of construction.
10. Public rights of way - no materials to be deposited, no construction vehicles, no residential or commercial access on any public right of way (PROW).
11. No construction vehicles to use any PROW.
12. No residential or commercial access along any PROW.
13. No gates access open across any PROW.
14. Lifetime homes and wheelchair housing (CSH4).

Pre commencement conditions:

15. Phasing plan.
16. Submission of a site-wide masterplan, development brief and delivery strategy.
17. Submission of a housing delivery document.
18. Open space and community facilities delivery plan (OSCP).
19. Design brief and design codes for character areas
20. Design code for residential areas including principles for secure by design.
21. Construction management plan (CMP).
22. Construction environmental management plan for biodiversity (CEMPB).  
Overarching strategy and detail with phases.
23. Landscape, environment and ecology management plan (LEMP) –  
overarching strategy and management /maintenance of Ladygrove Brook, Moor Ditch and the 10 meter buffer zone.
24. Written scheme of archaeological investigation (WSI) to be submitted.

25. Staged programme of archaeological mitigation in accordance with WSI.
26. Intrusive investigation for contamination to be carried out.
27. Submission of a drainage strategy and programme for on and off site works.
28. Studies of water supply infrastructure to be carried out.
29. Surface water drainage scheme and works to be submitted and carried out.
30. Details of levels across the site.

Details to be submitted with reserved matters:

31. Details of access and pedestrian access and crossings.
32. Details of surface and foul drainage to comply with drainage strategy.
33. Details of levels.
34. Details of watercourse crossings to be submitted.
35. Design statement demonstrating compliance with design brief/code.
36. Hard and soft landscaping scheme to comply with LEMP, design brief/code.
37. Replacement planting if damaged/destroyed in five years.
38. Tree protection scheme.
39. Landscape management and maintenance plan.
40. Details of electric vehicle charging points (residential and non-residential).
41. Energy and sustainable design standards non –residential buildings.
42. Noise impact assessment and mitigation measures for non-residential uses with reserved matters.
43. Hours of operation for non-residential uses with reserved matters.
44. Details of lighting for non-residential uses with reserved matters.
45. Detailed specifications for social and community facilities including allotments, community centre, pavilion, playing fields, play areas, tennis courts and MUGA.
46. Accessible toilet to be provided in neighbourhood centre / supermarket.

Prior to occupation:

47. Means of enclosure implemented before occupation.
48. Roads/footpaths to be completed before use / occupation.
49. Cycle parking for non-residential uses.
50. (Travel Plan unless prepared by Oxfordshire County Council.)

## **55 P15/S3767/FUL - South Stoke Primary School, The Street, South Stoke**

The committee considered the application P15/S3767/FUL for the retention of an existing Multi-use Games Area in the school playground with proposed modifications at South Stoke primary school, The Street, South Stoke.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

John Verrill, a representative of South Stoke parish council, spoke objecting to the application.

Linda Gatto and Janet Jones, two local residents, spoke objecting to the application.

Amanda Rogers and Phil Wortley, the head teacher and a local resident, spoke in support of the application.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to grant planning permission for application P15/S3767/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development to be undertaken in accordance with approved plans.
2. Proposed modifications to the MUGA be completed within 4 months.
3. Approval of paint samples and specifications by the local planning authority prior to work commencing.

## **56 P16/S0720/FUL - 345 Reading Road, Henley-on-Thames**

Councillor Joan Bland, one of the local ward councillors and Councillor David Nimmo-Smith stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item.

The committee considered application P16/S0720/FUL for a redevelopment to form 53 assisted living extra care apartments for older people including communal facilities, associated car parking and landscaping at 345 Reading Road, Henley-on-Thames.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Julian Brookes, Mayor and Chair of Henley town council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The application is contrary to the Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan, specifically policies HO4 and HO5; and to economic growth;
- Over 300 affordable homes are needed in the area to meet the needs of those who cannot afford to live in the area, including those who either wish or have to move on from the Henley YMCA;
- The 16-29 age group is under-represented in the area and the 66-90 age group is over-represented – housing therefore needs to be provided to cater for the former group to retain them and bring them to the area; and
- There is full employment in the area, so the employment aspect of the site should be given negative weight.

Jim Munro, Trevor Howell and Jennifer Wood, three local residents, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included the following:

- The air source heat pump is very noisy and should be checked;
- The mix of housing does not meet the reach of different income groups and is therefore contrary to policy;
- Remaining sites in the neighbourhood plan will need to overcompensate for the lack of affordable housing; and
- No CIL contributions will open the floodgates to prospective developers proposing care homes.

Martin Brown, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. His speech included the following:

- The applicants identified a need for extra care assisted living and are the leading developer of care homes;
- 17 new jobs will be created;
- Homes like this will put less pressure on hospitals;
- There is a projected increase of 355,000 of households with a member over the age of 65 per year;
- The applicant has offered a voluntary community contribution; and
- There are no technical reasons not to approve the application.

Stefan Gawrysiak, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The Henley and Harpsden neighbourhood plan require 40% affordable housing for all new developments;
- No CIL contributions;
- 12,179 people have voted for the Neighbourhood Plan;
- John Howell MP has stated that the application conflicts with national and district policies;
- There is a demographic imbalance, which needs to be addressed; and
- Two further similar developments are proposed in the area.

Joan Bland, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included the following:

- There are two care homes in Henley and two in Wargrave with vacancies.

Lorraine Hillier, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion included the following points:

- Although the committee expressed some concerns about the conflict with the objectives of the adopted neighbourhood plan, there is no allocation for the specific type of housing in the plan;
- The development would release properties further down the housing ladder;
- Concern that the application does not meet housing needs; and
- Planning harm was not identified that could form the basis of a refusal reason.

A motion, moved and seconded, to refuse the application was declared lost on being put to the vote with the Chairman's casting vote.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was declared carried on being put to the vote with the Chairman's casting vote.

**RESOLVED:** to delegate authority to the head of planning to grant planning permission for application P16/S0720/FUL, subject to:

- i. The prior completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure contributions as detailed in the officer's report.
- ii. The following conditions:
  1. Commencement three years- full planning permission.
  2. Approved plans.

3. Restriction on use - class C2.
4. Slab and ridge levels to be agreed.
5. All sample materials to be agreed.
6. Sample wall panel of materials to be agreed.
7. Landscaping (access/hard standings/fencing/walls) to be confirmed.
8. Tree pits to be agreed.
9. Vision splay to be agreed.
10. Car parking details.
11. Travel plan.
12. Construction travel management plan to be agreed.
13. Surface water drainage works to be agreed.
14. Decontamination works to be verified by the Council.
15. External lighting to be agreed.
16. Air quality modelling and mitigation to be agreed.
17. Protection of trees during development.
18. Access details.
19. No surface water drainage to the highway.
20. Cycle parking details.
21. Bins storage details.
22. Noise controls.
23. Foul drainage works.
24. Ecology mitigation.
25. Hours of construction.

## **57 P16/S1138/FUL - Park Farm, Waterstock**

The committee considered application P16/S1185/FUL for two new dwellings at Park Farm, Waterstock.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Michael Tyce, a representative of Waterstock parish council, spoke objecting to the application.

Charles Robinson, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to grant planning permission for application P16/S1138/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years – full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Sample materials required (all).
4. Construction traffic management plan.
5. Provision of parking and turning facilities.
6. No conversion of garages.

7. Withdrawal of permitted development rights (Part 1 Class A) – no extensions etc.
8. Withdrawal of permitted development rights (Part 1 Class E) – no outbuildings etc.

## **58 P15/S4367/FUL - South Woden, Manor Road, Goring**

The committee considered application P15/S4367/FUL for a new house in the grounds of the main residence at South Woden, Manor Road, Goring.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Officer updates:

- There is a correction in the planning history part of the report; application P13/S0127/FUL does not relate to this application but to a neighbouring property.
- There are two recommended extra conditions related to details of external lighting and foul drainage.

Matthew Brown, a representative of Goring parish council, spoke objecting to the application.

Ashley Maltman, an agent for some local residents, spoke objecting to the application.

Lisa Jackson, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to grant planning permission for application P15/S4367/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years – full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Sample materials required (all).
4. No windows, doors or other openings.
5. Withdrawal of permitted no development rights – no extensions.
6. Retain triangular window to Bedroom 2.
7. Turning car parking area.
8. No garage conversion into accommodation.
9. Passing way to be provided prior to occupation.
10. Details of external lighting to be submitted.
11. Foul drainage details to be submitted.

## **59 P16/S1150/FUL - Bromsgrove, Croft Road, Goring**

The committee considered application P16/S1150/FUL for a new house with linked garage block (with ancillary roof accommodation) at Bromsgrove, Croft Road, Goring.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Matthew Brown, a representative of Goring parish council, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to grant planning permission for application P16/S1150/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years – full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Schedule of materials required to be submitted for all external materials used.
4. Vision splay dimensions - measuring 2m by 2m shall be provided to each side of the access.
5. Turning area and car parking – to be implemented as on plan and laid out in accordance with highway standards and to comply with SUDs.
6. New vehicular access – to be implemented in accordance with highway standards.
7. No surface water drainage to highway.
8. Landscape implementation – in accordance with landscaping scheme 143.1B.
9. Protection of trees during development.
10. Tree protection – full arboricultural watching brief to be carried out during the period of construction works by a professionally competent arborist.
11. The garage accommodation hereby approved shall not be converted into accommodation without the without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.
12. Existing garage to be demolished prior to commencement of this development.

## **60 P16/S1280/FUL - Land to the rear of 9 Thame Road, Towersey**

Councillor Ian White, one of the local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item.

The committee considered application P16/S1280/FUL to erect a detached two-bedroom bungalow with access, parking and amenity space on land to the rear of 9 Thame Road, Towersey.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Mark Davis, a representative of Towersey parish council, spoke objecting to the application.

Jake Collinge, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

Ian White, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee considered the proposed application to be cramped and an overdevelopment of the site, providing inadequate amenity space.

A motion, moved and seconded, to refuse the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning permission for application P16/S1280/FUL, due to the following reason:

The proposed dwelling would result in a cramped and contrived form of development and would represent an overdevelopment of the site. As such, the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area and would be contrary to policies H4, G2 and D1 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan and policy CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy.

The meeting closed at 9.20 pm

Chairman

Date

**Didcot North East P15/S2902/O – Addendum to Report**

**Further Neighbour representations:**

Two further representations have been received

- i) A neighbour is querying the scale and height of properties in relation to residential properties to the south
- ii) Didcot Netball Club have asked if netball facilities will be available on this site

Officer response i) The design codes will examine the relationship of the new development to existing properties. With regard to southern boundary and the dwellings south of the northern perimeter road, care will need to be taken that the scale is appropriate in character. However the nearest residential properties are 30m from the boundary of the site (not including the highway) and accordingly there is unlikely to be any un-neighbourliness to properties to nearby residential properties

Officer response ii) The leisure centre will be subject to a separate planning application which will detail the facilities to be provided. The Leisure Service advise that the facility mix for the leisure centre is still being considered and the design of the facility is not yet complete. However the desire for additional netball facilities in Didcot by this club is acknowledged and reflected in the current draft of South's leisure facilities strategy. Options are currently being explored.

**Clarification and corrections**

Para 2.1 – Clarification that the footpath passes over the top of the A4130, the Ladygrove Brook is under Hopkins Bridge

Para 3.8 – Reference should be to B4016

Para 7.4 – In addition add the following sentence after 'weight' in the fifth line. The site is liable to flood in parts however the scheme has been designed to accord with the relevant advice and guidance for development in area liable to flood. The scheme meets the sequential tests in the NPPF and the uses in the planning practice guidance and is considered acceptable.

**Community centre**

Paras 6.69 and 6.70: Clarification on the size of the community centre:

The total amounts referred to in this paragraph refer to volumes. To emphasise these dimensions relate to a community centre for 2500 people. In terms of area, a community centre for 2500 people should provide two halls 180 sq. m plus 100 sq. m (280 sq. m). However this development will not serve 2500 people but c. 4900 people. The centre should also provide at least two other meeting rooms, space for police and health professionals, a reception, admin office and first aid room, youth space, a commercial kitchen and café area, storage, toilets including baby changing,

disabled toilets, circulation area plus outside space. Having reviewed again, an appropriate community centre size would be 750 sq. m GIA plus outdoor space and parking. A site of around 0.5 ha is still appropriate however a smaller site of 0.45 ha would probably suffice allowing for 40 car parking spaces, delivery area etc. and a small outdoor space. The issues regarding viability are still relevant and officers will seek a larger site and centre when finalising the S106 agreement, however a minimum size of 504 sq. m will be secured.

### **Viability:**

The report states that officers will update on the viability and the final recommendation.

Para 6.22 sets out the applicants offer at the time of writing the report. Following further discussions including an assessment of growth the applicants have revised their offer to:

- 25% Affordable Housing
- AH tenure 25% affordable rented / 75% intermediate
- Value of Infrastructure 45,614,578 (equivalent to £24,263 per dwelling) plus monitoring fees

This would result in a current day deficit of c. £8.9 million.

The viability consultants DVS and Savills have discussed potential growth and also the timing by when any deficit would need to be eliminated to make the level of risk acceptable. On the basis of no growth in the first year and growth of 2.5% thereafter the deficit is eliminated halfway through the development. If the deficit is not eliminated halfway there is a disincentive to deliver the scheme. Therefore a larger deficit (or an increased cost of affordable housing) would be unacceptable to the applicants. Officer are therefore recommending that these heads of terms are agreed, subject to below.

The current position with a higher percentage overall but a lower percentage of rented actually reduces the amount of affordable rented units. A total of 470 affordable units would be provided and of these 118 would be rented (47 extra care and 71 general needs housing). To ensure that the amount of affordable rented could increase if external funding were available i.e. switch intermediate to affordable rented it will be important to ensure that there is no restriction on intermediate units becoming affordable rented. It is recommended that this is allowed for in the s106 so as to enable the council to better meet the housing needs of the district.

### **Housing Mix**

Further to Para 6.53, the following mix will be provided. The market mix complies with SHMA and the affordable mix is acceptable, in view of the welfare reforms referred to in para 6.51.

	Market	Affordable
1 bed	5.7%	32.6%
2 bed	26.7%	35.5%

3 bed	43.4%	29.3%
4 bed plus	24.2%	2.7%

## Infrastructure

Table 3 Infrastructure Items Total Values

This table replaces both Table 3 and Table 4 in the Committee report. All items to be indexed linked.

S106 with 25% affordable housing	
COUNTY	
Strategic transport contribution	£5,239,703
Other Highway works value	£8,535,501
Travel Plan and TRO	£372,505
TRO contribution	£10,101
PROW contribution towards Clumps	£124,695
Secondary education	£7,602,592
Primary education	8,781,972
Special needs education	£465,560
Monitoring	£16,879
DISTRICT	
Leisure centre	£2,882,864
Community Hall (value)	£1,365,442
Public Art – off site contribution	£193,332
Playing fields and Pavilion (value)	£2,265,802
Playing fields and pavilion maintenance	£3,547,014
Parks and landscaping (incl play areas)	£781,600
Parks and landscaping maintenance (incl play areas)	£681,905
Green Infrastructure corridors	£555,389
Green Infrastructure maintenance	£786,515
Nature park	£571,553
Nature park maintenance	£666,965
Allotments	£183,568
Monitoring	£16,879

Total District: £14,481,949 (excluding monitoring)

Total County: £31,132,629 (excluding monitoring)

Overall Total: £45,614,578 - equivalent to £24,263 per dwelling

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**To delegate to the Head of Planning to grant planning permission, subject to:**

- i) **The completion of a S106 agreement to include:**
- **25% Affordable housing**
  - **An affordable tenure minimum 25% affordable rented**
  - **No restrictions on tenure changes should additional funding become available to increase affordable rented**
  - **A matrix approach to contributions applied in the event of an increase in large market homes.**
  - **S106 Infrastructure as identified in the report as updated by the addendum**

ii) **The conditions listed in the report plus two further conditions:**

- **Details of works to gas pipeline**

- **Residential Properties Lifetime Homes – 10% market dwellings – all affordable dwellings with ground floor entrances**

**Also:**

**Condition 6 to include reference to ‘No raising of levels, unless agreed’**

**Condition 19 to include reference to ‘Principles for Secure by Design’**

**Condition 22 to include reference to ‘Management of Ladygrove Brook, Moor Ditch and 10 m buffer zones’**

This page is intentionally left blank