



## MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 6 SEPTEMBER 2022  
VIA A DIGITAL MEETING FACILITY

---

**Committee Members Present:**

Councillor N Hampshire (Convener)  
Councillor L Allan  
Councillor C Cassini  
Councillor D Collins  
Councillor J Findlay  
Councillor A Forrest  
Councillor N Gilbert  
Councillor C McGinn  
Councillor S McIntosh  
Councillor J McMillan  
Councillor C Yorkston

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor C McFarlane

**Council Officials Present:**

Mr K Dingwall, Service Manager – Planning  
Ms E Taylor, Team Manager – Planning Delivery  
Mr D Taylor, Planner  
Ms S McQueen, Planner  
Mr C Grilli, Service Manager – Governance  
Mr M Greenshields, Senior Roads Officer  
Mr G McLeod, Transportation Planning Officer  
Ms S Cheyne, Projects Officer - Landscape  
Mr R Yates, Transportation Planning Officer  
Ms P Gray, Communications Officer

**Clerk:**

Ms B Crichton

**Visitors Present/Addressing the Committee:**

Item 2: Mr P Pritchett, Mr D Ratcliffe, Mr W Lowe, Mr J Kinna, and Mr P Coll  
Item 3: Mr C Wright and Mr R Barker

**Apologies:**

Councillor K McLeod

**Declarations of Interest:**

Item 2: Councillor Allan

**1. MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING, 16 AUGUST 2022**

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting, subject to a correction noted by Councillor McIntosh.

**2. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 21/00872/P: ERECTION OF TWO FLATS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS, GARDEN GROUND OF 6 THE HAWTHORNS, GULLANE**

A report was submitted in relation to Planning Application No. 21/00872/P. Stephanie McQueen, Planner, referred to an email submitted by the applicant's agent to all Committee Members: she noted that some of the distances quoted between the existing trees and proposed trees and the proposed flatted building were greater than was quoted on the application drawings; she confirmed for the benefit of Members that 47 scots pine trees and one other tree would be removed; and she confirmed that the same number of trees would be planted as would be removed. She also confirmed that Condition 19 would require that failed trees be replaced in perpetuity. Ms McQueen then presented the report, summarising the key points. She confirmed that Gullane Area Community Council were consulted on the application but no response was received from them. The report recommendation was to grant consent.

Officers responded to questions from Members. Responding to questions from Councillor Findlay, Sarah Cheyne, Projects Officer – Landscape, advised that the trees were described as being in weakened and deteriorating condition due to being very thin and there not being much of a crown on them. They were planted very close together and the usual thinning of trees had not occurred. She was surprised none had been lost to storm Arwen, and thought it would be likely that they would be impacted in the future. Ms McQueen said that proposals were not considered to be an over development with regards to the size of the house plots and associated garden ground, and because road services had raised so concern over vehicle movements or parking.

Responding to a question from Councillor McMillan on need, size and amenity, Ms McQueen advised that planners considered the site's suitability in terms of policy, such as DP7, including how the site would fit in the surrounding area; she noted that the proposed development would be of a similar size to other plots along the street and would be in keeping with the built form of the locality.

Councillor McIntosh asked about the assessment of vehicle movements. Graeme McLeod, Transportation Planning Officer, advised that the assessment mainly concerned whether the development satisfied parking standards for the four dwellings. Considerations in terms of site access related to visibility to and from the access point; as long as the planting allowed visibility between someone exiting the application site and someone entering the lock-up garage, this would not present a conflict. Additional vehicle movements did not cause concern in terms of road safety as speeds would be low. Ms McQueen acknowledged there would be an increase in vehicle movements but did not determine that this would be to a harmful degree to neighbouring properties.

Responding to questions from Councillor McGinn, Ms McQueen advised that a construction method statement would be agreed with road services. She also advised that proposed conditions did not stipulate submission of details of the ongoing management of the trees to the planning authority, and this would go through the usual enforcement process. Keith Dingwall, Service Manager – Planning, pointed out that the tree plan stated that an inspection would be carried out on a yearly basis by a qualified arboriculturist, and so the Planning Committee should consider whether it was also necessary to require the council to inspect the area.

Responding to further questions, Ms McQueen advised that TPO 42 would remain in place to cover the existing trees that were not proposed to be felled, but would not cover new planting. However, it would be possible to seek to modify the existing TPO to include the new tree planting, in consultation with landscape officers.

Councillor McGinn suggested that the annual tree inspection report be made available to the council for oversight, and Mr Dingwall would provide a form of words for a revised condition.

Responding to questions from Councillor McMillan, Mr Dingwall advised that it was not within the gift of the planning process to cover the new trees with a TPO, but it would be possible to note that the Committee felt that TPO 42 should be reviewed to protect the new trees. Ms Cheyne said she would support the review of TPO 42, and felt that confirming the management of the woodland through the planning process would be beneficial. Mr Dingwall advised against requiring planting too early in the project to avoid damage caused by construction traffic. Ms McQueen advised that new planting would be carried out within the first planting and seeding season following removal of the existing trees.

Phil Pritchett, agent, spoke to the application. He noted that the trees to be removed were coming to end of their life and there was currently no management strategy in place. The government reporter had concluded in 2018 that the area would benefit from 48 scots pines being felled and replaced. New planting would enhance the tree belt, the gap in the tree cover would be filled, and a long-term management strategy would be provided; the woodland would not be managed without the proposal being approved. He said that the applicant would agree to further conditions, and would be happy to submit annual reviews to the planning authority. He highlighted that the application celebrated the tree belt and its importance to the area. Regarding vehicle movements, he noted that all cars would exit in forward gear, marking an improvement to safety. He felt there was no material consideration which would suggest refusal, and said the replacement trees would be an asset to the street. The applicant would be happy to submit tree reviews on an ongoing basis if required.

Mr Pritchett responded to questions from Members. He confirmed that a factor would be appointed because there were common grounds and a common parking area. He suggested that a sustainability plan could be put forward for the tree removal; he did not currently know what the state the trees were in or their suitability for potential uses, but would be happy to accept a condition that required investigation. He also advised that the applicant would be happy to sign up to a construction environment management plan and transport plan, but that such an exercise would be more meaningful once a contractor could have input into the plans.

David Ratcliffe spoke against the application. He said that neighbours felt the development was not right for the area. He noted the plot would go from having one house with four bedrooms to four properties with 14 bedrooms, directly impacting the amenity of his family home. The neighbourhood had started a separate legal process to enforce the title deeds of the property, which would prevent the owner from building on the land, sub-dividing the current house, changing the use of the garden area, and removing the garage. The title deeds also mandated that the owner uphold TPO 42 and TPO 138 and manage the woodland. He wished to outline the history of the council's attempts to protect the area, such as the addition of TPO 138 following numerous applications made by property developers. He pointed out that the tree report was created for Playfair Properties, of which the applicants were names as directors; the report had been produced only on visual inspection and was valid only until June 2022. He had also been made aware that the current owner had granted a security to the former owner which he speculated could protect their interest in any profit arising from the development.

William Lowe spoke against the application. He found the planning report to be imbalanced and felt it should have contained more debate, and said the statement that trees could not be seen from the Hawthorns was untrue. He also highlighted the significant visual impact the development would have on walkways connecting to Gullane Bents. He pointed to the presence of ivy climbing into the canopies as evidence that the current owner had not maintained the woodland. He gave an account of ways in which he felt the report had misrepresented Policy DP7; he felt that there would be significant impact on the privacy and the residential and visual amenity of current residents and said the proposals were out of scale with the area and constituted an overdevelopment. He asked the Committee to uphold the principles set by the previous refusals of applications to develop on the land, as this application was larger than previous applications. Residents were not confident that the woodland would be managed appropriately, and asked the Committee to have regard for the climate change directive in making their decision.

Phil Coll spoke against the application on behalf of Gullane Area Community Council. He said that scots pines could live up to 700 years, and said these were strong trees that had survived storm Arwen. Removal of trees would leave the remaining trees at risk from high winds. He noted that the trees had been planted as a windbreak in the first place, and this was still needed. He said it would take 30 years for new trees to reach the 55ft height of the current trees; a phased replacement would be more suitable, which had previously been recommended by East Lothian Council. He noted that the proposed new planting would not reach the height of the scots pines and would not be covered by a TPO. He pointed out that the planning decision was made after the expiry of the tree survey. He was disappointed that established trees could be targeted by developers and receive approval after the council had declared a climate emergency. He summarised that the community council supported those who opposed the tree felling.

Jonathan Kinna spoke against the application. He was mostly troubled by the removal of the 48 trees, which were covered by a TPO and were part of an environmental corridor which provided amenity to neighbours and to the community who used the paths. He referred to the council's 2020 climate change strategy, which included a plan to plant 2,000,000 trees over a 10-year period, and was therefore bemused that this application would receive officer approval. He highlighted previous applications to develop on the land which had been refused, including those refused on appeal. He also noted issues with the requirement for like-for-like replanting; the proposals were for smaller species of trees which would not be covered by a TPO. He referred to the destruction of the woodland with two thirds of the trees being felled. He felt that the proposals constituted an overdevelopment, and was concerned about further applications being made when no TPO was in place. He asked the Members to vote to save the trees.

Councillor Findlay, Local Member, asked whether the Committee would be happy to overturn a TPO which had been upheld in the past by the Planning Committee and the Scottish Government. He said the loss of the trees would significantly impact on the area, and represent a loss to visual amenity. He felt that four residences on the site was an overdevelopment. He said that this would destroy the broader environmental corridor, and was interested to find out whether the Committee was prepared to uphold the principles of the declared climate emergency. He would not support the officer recommendation.

Councillor McFarlane, Local Member, was not supportive of the recommendations due to the site's previous planning history and the significant local objection.

Councillor Forrest felt that the proposals represented an overdevelopment and that the parking would not be adequate. He said the decision might have been different if there had

been a will to manage the woodland in the past. He would not support the officer recommendation.

Councillor McIntosh felt there was an absence in the report of recognition of the carbon impact of the tree cutting, both in terms of the release of carbon and because it could take a decade or longer before new trees would take in carbon at the same rate; she hoped that this could be taken on board for future reports. She felt that the replanting plan was impressive, and the mix of trees would improve biodiversity and add amenity and nature value. She was undecided on the application.

Councillor McGinn commented on the time it would take for the replanted woodland to have the kind of visual amenity desired, but was pleased that the development would promote a long term management plan of the area. He was concerned about the level of development, the increase in traffic, and the difficulties in making deliveries to and from the site. He would not support the officer recommendation.

Councillor McMillan referred to the expert views on the trees, the impact of replanting on the soil, and community members highlighting the windbreak provided by the trees. A visit had left him with a clear impression of the visual amenity from the coast side, and felt that the character of the area would be adversely impacted by the development. He would not support the officer recommendations.

The Convener felt that to do nothing on the site would be damaging to the trees, leading to an eventual loss of the tree belt. He pointed to other developments across the county which had similar open spaces, and noted that the proposals were in line with the local development plan. He also thought that the reporter would be likely to reject the council's position on appeal if refused. He said that the area would eventually have an attractive tree belt. He understood the concerns of the residents of the Hawthorns and that more movement would be created on the street, but highlighted that the transportation officer did not have concerns about safety. He would support the officer recommendation as he thought the woodland would be enhanced by the proposals.

Mr Dingwall proposed some wording for new and amended conditions. It would not be necessary to impose a condition to produce a construction methods statement as this was covered in proposed condition 3. He recommended amendments to condition 19, which would add to the first paragraph "On completion of replacement planting, the applicant shall notify the planning authority within 21 days of that planting". A second sentence in the final paragraph which would read, "In this regard, the annual inspection shall be submitted annually to the council's planning authority for a period of 10 years following the planting of the new trees. The report shall be submitted within 21 days of the inspection being undertaken and shall include recommendations for any trees that need to be replaced". He also recommended an additional condition:

Prior to the commencement of the development, a sustainability tree removal plan shall be submitted to and approved by the planning authority to recommend measures for the sustainable removal and possible reuse of all of the trees to be felled. The trees shall thereafter be removed in strict accordance with the removal plan.

Reason:

To mitigate the environmental impact of the development.

The Convener proposed amending the proposed conditions per Mr Dingwall's suggestions. Councillor Cassini seconded this proposal.

Mr Dingwall then confirmed the wording for two reasons for refusal should the Committee vote to refuse the application.

The Convener then moved to the vote on the report recommendation, to grant consent, taken by roll call:

For:	4	(Councillors Hampshire, Cassini, Gilbert, and Yorkston)
Against:	6	(Councillors Collins, Findlay, Forrest, McGinn, McIntosh, and McMillan)
Abstentions:	0	

## **DECISION**

The Committee refused planning consent for the following reasons:

1. The proposals would be an overdevelopment of the site, harmful to the character and amenity of the area, contrary to Policy DP7 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.
2. The proposals would result in the loss of a considerable number of trees that make a significant positive contribution to the setting and amenity of the area, contrary to Policy NH8 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.

### **3. PLANNING APPLICATION 22/00651/AMM: APPROVAL OF MATTERS SPECIFIED IN CONDITIONS OF PLANNING PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE 14/00903/PPM - ERECTION OF 87 HOUSES AND ASSOCIATED WORKS, LAND AT AREA 4, LAND TO SOUTH, EAST AND WEST WALLYFORD**

A report was submitted in relation to Planning Application No. 22/00651/AMM. David Taylor, Planner, presented the report, summarising the key points. The report recommendation was to grant consent.

Officers responded to questions from Committee Members. Councillor McIntosh asked about sequencing in terms of the provision of play areas. Mr Taylor responded that play areas had been considered as part of the previous planning permission in principle application. An agreement was reached following consultation with the council's amenity officers that a smaller number of larger play areas would have value for a wider range of age groups. Play areas had been installed or were in development on other sites, including to the rear of the primary school. There was also a community woodland 400m from the site which could facilitate informal play.

Chris Wright and Ryan Barker were present on behalf of Dandara, applicant. Responding to a question from Councillor McGinn, Mr Barker advised that the developer would enter into a development management scheme and sign up to a factoring agreement, and Dandara would look to use a strategic property management company called Hacking and Paterson.

The Convener asked whether there was a phased plan for landscaping, as there had been issues on other sites where this aspect of the development had been left very late. Mr Barker confirmed that through the construction management plan, the landscaping would be completed in accordance with the phasing of the application site.

Responding to a question from Councillor Cassini, Mr Barker advised that amenities such as shopping facilities were not provided on the site. He advised that the construction of infrastructure, such as roads and sewers, would begin from November 2022, the first foundations would be laid in January 2023, and the first sale was expected in August 2023. It was expected that work on the site would continue until December 2025. Mr Taylor advised that although the site did not provide shopping facilities, a nearby site had been approved that would bring forward these amenities.

Councillor McGinn commented on the scale and high standard of the development, and welcomed other parts of the site coming forward which would provide amenities for residents. He highlighted that there was cross-party support to look at the provision of primary care facilities within the area. He said this need could not be ignored any longer and expressed disappointment that the Scottish Government was not yet in a position to support this. He also commented that the new travel hub was thriving.

Councillor Forrest commented that the site had been well thought through with different house types. He agreed that medical facilities were badly needed. He also wished to see a push forward on the wider site for retail facilities. He would support the application.

Councillors Cassini and McIntosh would support the application, and highlighted that due process was underway in producing a report on the provision of primary care at the Riverside Medical Practice in Musselburgh. Councillor McIntosh also highlighted that a target of a 20% reduction in car journeys was ambitious, but having facilities nearby would reduce distances travelled by customers. She would support council officers exploring the dedication of more spaces to car clubs with electric cars, to encourage people to give up their second cars. She would also support development of comfortable bus shelters with electronic information available.

The Convener commented on the good footpath links between the site and schools, and on the attractiveness of the developments. He also commented on the need for further primary care for a population which had grown immensely in the west of the county, and noted that the overall masterplan did have space for such a facility. He welcomed Dandara as a new developer to East Lothian.

The Convener moved to the vote on the report recommendation, to grant consent, taken by roll call. This was agreed unanimously.

## **DECISION**

The Committee agreed to grant planning consent, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 No development shall take place on site unless and until final site setting out details have been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.

The above mentioned details shall include a final site setting-out drawing to a scale of not less than 1:200, giving:

- a. the position within the application site of all elements of the proposed development and position of adjoining land and buildings;
- b. finished ground and floor levels of the development relative to existing ground levels of the site and of adjoining land and building(s). The levels shall be shown in relation to an Ordnance Bench Mark or Temporary Bench Mark from which the Planning Authority can take measurements and shall be shown on the drawing; and
- c. the ridge height of the proposed houses shown in relation to the finished ground and floor levels on the site.

Reason:

To enable the Planning Authority to control the development of the site in the interests of the amenity of the area.

- 2 Notwithstanding that which is stated on the drawings docketed to this approval of matters specified in conditions, a detailed specification of all external finishes of the houses of the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority prior to the use of the finishes in the development. The external finishes of the houses shall be in accordance with a co-ordinated scheme of materials and colours that shall be submitted to

and approved in advance by the Planning Authority. This co-ordinated scheme shall in detail promote render as the predominant finish to the walls of the houses, with a use of more than one render colour and with a strongly contrasting difference in the colours such that they will not each be of a light colour. All such materials used in the construction of the houses shall conform to the details so approved.

Reason:

To ensure the development is of a satisfactory appearance in the interest of the amenity of the locality.

- 3 Other than in exceptional circumstances where the layout or particular building type does not permit, the residential units shall be orientated to face the street. Notwithstanding that shown on the docketed site plan where a building is located on a corner of more than one street, it shall have enhanced gable(s) to ensure it has an active elevation to each street it faces;

Reason:

In the interests of ensuring active frontages and to enhance character and appearance of the area.

- 4 Prior to the occupation of the last residential unit hereby approved, the proposed access roads, parking spaces and footpaths shall have been constructed on site, in accordance with the docketed drawings. Those areas of land shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose than for accessing and for the parking of vehicles in connection with the residential use of the houses and shall not be adapted or used for other purposes without the prior written approval of the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To ensure that adequate and satisfactory provision is made for access and for off-street parking and bicycle parking in the interests of road safety.

- 5 Notwithstanding that shown on drawings docketed to this approval of matters specified in conditions, a scheme of landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development which shall include full details of all new tree and shrub sizes, species, habitat, siting, planting distances and a programme of planting within the application site. Thereafter the scheme of landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with that approved landscaping scheme unless otherwise agreed by the Planning Authority.

All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the completion of the development or occupation of any house hereby approved, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar species and final size, unless the Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason

In order to ensure the implementation of a landscaping scheme to enhance the appearance of the development in the interests of the amenity of the area

- 6 All of the landscaping as required by condition 5 above shall be implemented, maintained and managed in accordance with management details to be provided by the landscaping scheme unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

In order to ensure the maintenance and management of the landscaping scheme to enhance the appearance of the development in the interests of the amenity of the area.

- 7 Notwithstanding that shown on the drawings docketed to this approval of matters, all semi private and defensible spaces in front of or to the side of dwellings and to the side of parking courtyards shall be enclosed by walls/hedges/fences/ or railings to define areas of private space from public space.



Details of the form and appearance of all boundary treatments, including those enclosing the rear gardens of the houses, shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the first house. A timetable for the provision of those boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in advance by the Planning Authority and shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the timetable so approved, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To ensure the satisfactory provision of appropriate boundary enclosures and in the interest of safeguarding the privacy and amenity of future residents of the development.

- 8 Prior to commencement of development, a Factoring Plan shall be submitted clearly indicating the different responsibilities for long term maintenance including: private and shared private areas, factored areas, and prospectively adoptable roads.

Reason

In order to ensure the implementation and maintenance of a scheme to enhance the appearance of the development in the interests of the amenity of the area.

- 9 The development shall comply with the following transportation requirements:

i) all access roads shall conform to ELC Standards for Development Roads in relation to road layout and construction, footways & footpaths, parking layout and number, street lighting and traffic calming measures. This shall also comply with Design Standards for New Housing Areas Supplementary Planning Guidance 2020;

ii) vehicle access's to private parking areas (i.e. other than driveways) shall be via a reinforced footway crossing and have a minimum width of 5.5 metres over the first 10 metres to enable adequate two way movement of vehicles;

iii) driveways shall have minimum dimensions of 6 metres by 3 metres. Double driveways shall have minimum dimensions of 5 metres width by 6 metres length or 3 metres width by 11 m length. Pedestrian ramps to houses may encroach by up to 300mm on the width (but not the length) provided they are no greater than 150mm in height above the adjacent driveway surface;

iv) within residential private parking areas the minimum dimensions of a single parking space shall be 2.5 metres by 5 metres. All visitor parking spaces within these areas shall be clearly marked for visitors with the remaining private parking spaces allocated to individual dwellings;

v) cycle parking for dwellings without private back garden with a gate (e.g. flats/mid-terraces), shall be included at a rate of 1 space per dwelling. This shall be in the form of a lockable room or shed; and

vi) wheel washing facilities must be provided and maintained in working order during the period of construction of the site. All vehicles must use the wheel washing facilities to prevent deleterious materials being carried onto the public road on vehicle tyres;

Reason

In the interests of pedestrian and road safety

- 10 A visibility splay of 4.5 metres by 70 metres shall be provided and maintained on each side of each of the proposed access junctions from the application site such that there shall be no obstruction to visibility above a height of 1.05 metres measured from the adjacent carriageway level within the area defined below:-

a) A line 4.5 metres long measured along the access road from the nearside edge of the main road carriageway.

b) A line 70 metres long measured along the nearside edge of the main road carriageway from the centre of the access road in both directions.

c) A straight line joining the termination of the above two lines.

Reason

In the interests of road safety.

- 11 A visibility splay of 2.5 metres by 70 metres shall be provided and maintained on each side of each of the proposed driveway access's which directly access onto the distributor road to the

north of the application site such that there shall be no obstruction to visibility above a height of 1.05 metres measured from the adjacent carriageway level within the area defined below:-

- a) A line 2.5 metres long measured along the access road from the nearside edge of the main road carriageway.
- b) A line 70 metres long measured along the nearside edge of the main road carriageway from the centre of the access road in both directions.
- c) A straight line joining the termination of the above two lines.

Reason

In the interests of pedestrian and road safety

- 12 A joint dilapidation survey of adjoining roads, to include all carriageways and footways adopted by East Lothian Council, shall be undertaken. Roads and footways affected by construction vehicle access shall be resurfaced/repaired by the developer in compliance with the Council's specifications and requirements at no cost to the Council as Roads Authority.

Reason:

In the interests of road safety.

- 13 All internal and external roadworks, including proposed access junctions and off-site works, shall be subject to Road Safety Audit. This process must be completed through Stages 1, 2, 3 & 4 (Preliminary Design, Detailed Design, Post Opening Audit & finally Post Opening Audit + 12 months) - The audit process shall be undertaken in accordance with GG 119 - Revision 2 Road Safety Audit Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 5, Section 2, Part 2, or as amended by latest version.

Reason:

In the interests of road and pedestrian safety.

- 14 Prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby approved a Quality Audit to independently assess walking, cycling, and road safety aspects within and around the development shall be submitted for planning authority approval. The Quality Audit will further provide details of signage to identify vehicular and active travel routes through the development. The Quality Audit will be reviewed after construction is substantially complete and the developer required to make good any issues.

Reason

In the interests of road and pedestrian safety.

- 15 A Travel Information Pack with information for residents to encourage use of sustainable modes of transport such as trains, buses, cycling and walking shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved. The Travel Information Pack will include local bus and train timetables, local cycling and walking maps, information on bike hire / car sharing, and shall include details of how it will be distributed to residents.

Reason:

In the interests of ensuring sustainable travel patterns in respect of the development.

- 16 In the event of the presence of any previously unsuspected or unforeseen contamination of the land on the application site being found, development shall not begin, or shall cease to continue, until a scheme to deal with contamination on the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The scheme shall contain details of the proposals to deal with contamination to include:

- 1 the nature, extent and type(s) of contamination on the site,
- 2 measures to treat/remove contamination to ensure the site is fit for the use proposed,
- 3 measures to deal with contamination during construction works,
- 4 condition of the site on completion of decontamination measures.

Thereafter any mitigation measures required shall be implemented as so approved.

Before any of the houses and flats hereby approved are occupied the measures to decontaminate the site shall be fully implemented as approved by the Planning Authority.

If no unexpected ground conditions are encountered during the development works then this should be confirmed in writing to the Planning Authority prior to occupation of the houses hereby approved.

Reason:

To ensure that the site is clear of contamination prior to the occupation of the houses

- 17 Prior to the commencement of development, details of the provision of new car charging points and infrastructure for them shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The details shall include a timetable for implementation. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the report so approved.

Reason:

To minimise the environmental impact of the development.

- 18 The drainage scheme as detailed on drawing number 22-029-20 Revision G, titled 'Drainage Layout', docketed to this planning permission shall be formed and available for use prior to any part of the development hereby approved coming into use, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Authority. Thereafter the drainage layout shall be retained unless otherwise agreed by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To ensure that the site is adequately serviced and that surface water and foul drainage from the site can be accommodated.

- 19 A Construction Method Statement to minimise the impact of construction activity on the safety and amenity of the area shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. The Construction Method Statement shall recommend mitigation measures to control noise, dust, construction traffic (including routes to/from site) and shall include hours of construction work and routing of traffic. The Construction Method Statement shall also make recommendations in respect of how pedestrians and school children can safely access the new school during construction works. It shall also provide details of utility/service drainage connections and the temporary measures that shall be put in place to control surface water drainage during the construction works. The Construction Method Statement shall also make recommendations in respect of how building materials and waste will be safely stored and managed on site.

Thereafter, the Construction Method Statement shall be implemented and complied with in accordance with the approved details for the period of construction of the development hereby approved.

Reason:

To minimise the impact of construction activity in the interests of the amenity of the area.

Signed .....

Councillor Norman Hampshire  
Convener of the Planning Committee