

<b>Application Number</b>	09/1026/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	16th November 2009	<b>Officer</b>	Miss Catherine Linford
<b>Target Date</b>	11th January 2010		
<b>Ward</b>	Romsey		
<b>Site</b>	81a Greville Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3QJ		
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of two 2-bedroom flats on land to the rear of 81 and 81a Greville Road with access from Rustat Road.		
<b>Applicant</b>	Teresa Barns 137 Coleridge Road Cambridge CB1 3PN		

---

## **1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

- 1.1 81a Greville Road is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling situated on the junction of Greville Road and Rustat Road. The application site is part of the rear gardens of 81 and 81a, which fronts onto Rustat Road, and includes a parking area used by the occupiers of these two dwellings. Immediately to the south of the site there is a public pathway that leads out onto Corrie Road; opposite on the west side of the street is the Carter cycle bridge over the railway bridge. The site has a 19.5m frontage to Rustat Road, and steps in behind 81 where the length reduces to 15.5m. The site is 6m deep behind 81a and a maximum 11.5m deep behind 81. The surrounding area is exclusively residential, with a mixture of styles of dwellings. The area predominantly consists of semi-detached and terraced dwellings, but there are blocks of flats a little to the south in Rustat Road, on the opposite side of the road.
- 1.2 The site does not fall within a Conservation Area.

## 2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application seeks planning permission for a two-storey building, to provide two 2-bed flats (one on each floor). Four car parking spaces would be provided on the site (one for each of the flats, and one for each of the two existing houses: 81 and 81a). Bicycle and bin storage would be provided for both the existing houses and the proposed flats.
- 2.2 The ground floor of the building would be L-shaped in plan, with the first floor being rectangular in plan, overhanging the ground floor. The ground floor flat would be accessed from the southern side, via a pathway from Rustat Road, and the first floor flat would be accessed from the same position via an external staircase. Private amenity space would be provided for both of the proposed flats; a very small garden for the ground floor flat and an elevated private terrace for the first floor flat.
- 2.3 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
1. Design and Access Statement

## 3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/90/1007	EXTENSION TO DWELLING (ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION). (AMENDED BY LETTER DATED 10.09.91 AND ACCOMPANYING DRAWINGS)	REF Appeal allowed

## 4.0 PUBLICITY

- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| 4.1 Advertisement:                      | No  |
| Adjoining Owners:                       | Yes |
| Site Notice Displayed:                  | No  |
| Public Meeting/Exhibition (meeting of): | No  |
| DC Forum (meeting of):                  | No  |

## 5.0 POLICY

### 5.1 Central Government Advice

- 5.2 **Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005):** Paragraphs 7 and 8 state that national policies and regional and local development plans (regional spatial strategies and local development frameworks) provide the framework for planning for sustainable development and for development to be managed effectively. This plan-led system, and the certainty and predictability it aims to provide, is central to planning and plays the key role in integrating sustainable development objectives. Where the development plan contains relevant policies, applications for planning permission should be determined in line with the plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 5.3 **Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (2006):** Sets out to deliver housing which is: of high quality and is well designed; that provides a mix of housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of tenure and price; supports a wide variety of households in all areas; sufficient in quantity taking into account need and demand and which improves choice; sustainable in terms of location and which offers a good range of community facilities with good access to jobs, services and infrastructure; efficient and effective in the use of land, including the re-use of previously developed land, where appropriate. The statement promotes housing policies that are based on Strategic Housing Market Assessments that should inform the affordable housing % target, including the size and type of affordable housing required, and the likely profile of household types requiring market housing, including families with children, single persons and couples. The guidance states that LPA's may wish to set out a range of densities across the plan area rather than one broad density range. 30 dwellings per hectare is set out as an indicative minimum. Paragraph 50 states that the density of existing development should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring replication of existing style or form. Applicants are encouraged to demonstrate a positive approach to renewable energy and sustainable development.
- 5.4 **Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions:** Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.
- 5.5 **Circular 05/2005 - Planning Obligations:** Advises that planning

obligations must be relevant to planning, necessary, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respect.

## 5.6 **East of England Plan 2008**

SS1 Achieving sustainable development  
T9 Walking, cycling and other non-motorised transport  
T14 Parking  
ENV6 The historic environment  
ENV7 Quality in the built environment

## 5.7 **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003**

Planning Obligation Related Policies

P6/1 Development-related Provision  
P9/8 Infrastructure Provision

## 5.8 **Cambridge Local Plan 2006**

3/1 Sustainable development  
3/4 Responding to context  
3/7 Creating successful places  
3/10 Subdivision of existing plots  
3/11 The design of external spaces  
3/12 The design of new buildings  
4/4 Trees  
5/1 Housing provision  
8/6 Cycle parking  
8/10 Off-street car parking

Planning Obligation Related Policies

3/7 Creating successful places  
5/14 Provision of community facilities through new development  
10/1 Infrastructure improvements (*transport, public open space, recreational and community facilities, waste recycling, public realm, public art, environmental aspects*)

## 5.9 **Supplementary Planning Documents**

**Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction:** Sets out essential and recommended design

considerations of relevance to sustainable design and construction. Applicants for major developments are required to submit a sustainability checklist along with a corresponding sustainability statement that should set out information indicated in the checklist. Essential design considerations relate directly to specific policies in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Recommended considerations are ones that the council would like to see in major developments. Essential design considerations are urban design, transport, movement and accessibility, sustainable drainage (urban extensions), energy, recycling and waste facilities, biodiversity and pollution. Recommended design considerations are climate change adaptation, water, materials and construction waste and historic environment.

**Planning Obligation Strategy:** provides a framework for securing the provision of new and/or improvements to existing infrastructure generated by the demands of new development. It also seeks to mitigate the adverse impacts of development and addresses the needs identified to accommodate the projected growth of Cambridge. The SPD addresses issues including transport, open space and recreation, education and life-long learning, community facilities, waste and other potential development-specific requirements.

## 5.10 Material Considerations

**Cambridge City Council (2004) – Planning Obligation Strategy:** Sets out the Council's requirements in respect of issues such as public open space, transport, public art, community facility provision, affordable housing, public realm improvements and educational needs for new developments.

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)**

- 6.1 No Objection: The parking area must be hard paved from the edge of the public highway.

### **Head of Environmental Services**

- 6.2 No Objection: An informative is recommended relating to housing standards

## **City Council's Arboriculture Officer**

- 6.3 No Objection: The quality of the existing trees is poor, and they should not constrain development. However, landscaping should be provided.
- 6.4 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

### **7.0 REPRESENTATIONS**

- 7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:
- 1 William Smith Close
  - 2 William Smith Close
  - 79 Greville Road
  - 77 Greville Road
  - 86 Greville Road
- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:
- Impact of additional traffic
  - Flats would be out of character
  - Overshadowing
  - Overlooking
  - Noise from additional residents
- 7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

### **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

- 8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:
1. Principle of development
  2. Context of site, design and external spaces
  3. Residential amenity
  4. Refuse arrangements
  5. Car and cycle parking
  6. Third party representations
  7. Planning Obligation Strategy

## **Principle of Development**

- 8.2 The provision of extra housing in the City is supported in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) maintains that proposals for housing development on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining land uses. This proposal for two additional dwellings would be compatible with adjoining land uses, but whether the proposal is appropriate also needs to be tested against other policies in the development plan
- 8.3 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

## **Context of site, design and external spaces**

- 8.4 Policy 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that residential development within the garden area or curtilage of existing properties will not be permitted if it will:
- a) Have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, loss of light, an overbearing sense of enclosure and the generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise nuisance;
  - b) Provide inadequate amenity space, or vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties;
  - c) Detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area;
  - d) Adversely affect the setting of Listed Buildings, or buildings or gardens of local interest within or close to the site;
  - e) Adversely affect trees, wildlife features or architectural features of local importance located within or close to the site; and
  - f) Prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider area of which the site forms part.
- 8.5 Parts a), b), c) and e) are relevant to this application. Parts b) and e) will be discussed here, with the other relevant sections discussed under their specific headings.
- 8.6 This area is exclusively residential in character, with differing styles of housing, but the dominant form of housing is semi-detached and

terraced dwellings. There are however a number of blocks of flats situated a little south along Rustat Road, on the opposite side of the street, which make up Rustat Avenue and Rustat Close.

- 8.7 The representations received have raised concerns that the proposed flats would be out of character with the area as the area predominantly consists of houses, with the flats of Rustat Avenue and Rustat Close part of a large development separated from the housing. I do not personally agree with this argument, as I do not believe the proposed building would be out of character with its surroundings. The proposed building is not a large block of flats, but is instead a two-storey building of a similar scale to a detached dwellinghouse. This detached form is not typical of the area, but as the area is mixed in character I do not consider a detached form to be unreasonable here. The proposed building is clearly not attempting to mimic any neighbouring buildings, but I do not consider this to be negative. Instead I feel that this contemporary building would work well in its context, and that it would have a positive impact on its setting.
- 8.8 The proposed building would be further forward in the street than the neighbouring property at 114 Rustat Road. On the east side of Rustat Road, south of this site, there is a fairly uniform building line, and the proposed building would be significantly closer to the road and forward of that building line. I am, however, of the view that the footpath immediately south of the application site and the entrance to the Carter cycle bridge opposite demarcate a distinct change in the street pattern and that there is therefore no need for this building to be set back as far from the street as 114. Indeed, almost opposite this site a terrace of houses in William Smith Close, which stands at 90 degrees to the road, comes very close to the carriageway. It is also relevant that 81a Greville Road is also much closer to the street than 114 Rustat Road. I am, therefore, of the opinion that new development on this site need not be set back from the road in the manner adopted by the houses to the south.
- 8.9 The proposal would result in the loss of some trees on the boundary between the site and the pathway. The City Council's Arboricultural Officer has commented on the application and has explained that they consider these trees to be of a poor quality, and that they should not constrain development. However, while they feel that some landscaping might be appropriate on the site, there is very little space to achieve much more than some sort of



boundary treatment, which, can be secured by condition.

- 8.10 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policy ENV7, and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

## **Residential Amenity**

### Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

#### *Overlooking*

- 8.11 The building has been carefully designed to minimise overlooking. On the north elevation (facing towards the rear of 81 and 81a Greville Road), at first floor level, there would be no windows, which could be seen out of. The access stair is so set in among the building that it provides very limited opportunity for overlooking. The north facing window to bedroom 2 (facing towards 81 and 81a), would be at a high level and be obscure glazed, and the terrace would be screened. In order to ensure this is so, I would recommend that details of the screening are requested by condition. The eastern elevation (facing towards the rear gardens of 79 and 77 Greville Road) would only contain bathroom windows at first floor level, which would be obscure glazed. This will mean that there would be no direct overlooking of 77, 79, 81 or 81a Greville Road.

- 8.12 The main windows serving the first floor flat would be situated on the east elevation (facing out onto Rustat Road) and the south elevation (facing out onto the pathway and onto the front garden of 114 Rustat Road). These windows do not create an overlooking issue as they would face out onto public highways (the road and pathway) and the front garden of 114 Rustat Road. Front gardens of properties are not protected to the same extent as rear gardens, and therefore I do not consider that the application is worthy of refusal on these grounds. The angles between these angles and windows in 114 are such that, again, I do not consider there to be an issue of overlooking of 114.

#### *Overshadowing and Enclosure*

- 8.13 The proposed building would be situated approximately 17.2 from the rear wall of 81a, and 13.5m from the rear wall of 81, as the parking area creates a gap between the two. This separation

distance and the orientation of the buildings (the proposed building would sit to the south of the existing houses on Greville Road) would mean that the proposed building would not overshadow or block light to the rear gardens of 81 or 81a. The parking area would have a roof, but this would be a light weight structure, which I do not believe would contribute to overshadowing.

8.14 The proposed building would lie almost due west of the rear garden of 79 Greville Road, and this would mean that the building would block some afternoon and evening sunlight from the ends of the rear garden of 79 and to a much lesser extent 77. I believe that this loss of light would be Given that the proposal is at least 14m from the house and is slightly set off the boundary I do not think that the loss of light to the end of the rear garden is such as to justify refusal of the application.

8.15 The proposed building would lie to the north of the front garden of 114 Rustat Road, separated by the pathway. Given the presence of the footpath and the space to the northern side of 114 I do not think that the building will have an adverse impact on that property, in terms of its presence, dominance or any sense of enclosure, despite the fact that it is only approximately 7m distant.

#### *Noise and Disturbance*

8.16 Concern has been raised about the noise and disturbance created by additional residents. The new dwellings will result in an increase in the number of people living here, and this will clearly have the potential for some increase in the noise and the number of movements to and from the area. However, the proposal is for just two flats, and I do not believe that the increase in noise or traffic would be at such a level to warrant refusal of the application.

8.17 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policy ENV7, and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

#### Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.18 Both flats would have private amenity space, with the ground floor flat having a small garden, and the first floor flat having a private terrace above part of the parking area. In my opinion the proposal

provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policy ENV7, and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

### **Refuse Arrangements**

- 8.19 Separate refuse storage is to be provided for each of the proposed flats and for each of the existing houses (81 and 81a). There is clearly sufficient space for this, but to ensure that this is adequate I recommend a condition requesting details of the bin storage.
- 8.20 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policy WM6 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

### **Car and Cycle Parking**

- 8.21 Appendix C (Car Parking Standards) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that at a maximum 1 off-street car parking space should be provided for each of the proposed and existing dwellings. Four parking spaces are proposed (one for each dwelling). This is within the standards and therefore I consider it to be acceptable.
- 8.22 Appendix D (Cycle parking spaces) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that at a least one secure, covered cycle parking spaces should be provided for each bedroom. Adequate cycle parking provision is to be provided, but the submitted plans do not show this to be secure or covered. I would therefore recommend that details of this provision are secured by condition.
- 8.23 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policies T9 and T14, and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

### **Third Party Representations**

- 8.24 The issues raised in the representations received have been discussed under the headings above.

### **Planning Obligation Strategy**

- 8.25 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have

introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements.

8.26 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2004) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. The applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy. The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

### **Open Space**

8.27 The Planning Obligation strategy requires that all new residential developments contribute to the provision or improvement of public open space, either through provision on site as part of the development or through a financial contribution for use across the city. The proposed development requires a contribution to be made towards open space, comprising formal open space, informal open space and children's play areas. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows.

8.28 The application proposes the erection of three two-bedroom houses. One residential units would be removed, so the net total of additional residential units is two. A house or flat is assumed to accommodate one person for each bedroom, but one-bedroom flats are assumed to accommodate 1.5 people. Contributions towards children's play space are not required from one-bedroom units. The totals required for the new buildings are calculated as follows:

<b>Formal open space</b>					
Existing total bedrooms	New total bedrooms	Net additional bedrooms	Assumed net additional persons	£ per person	<b>Total £</b>
0	4	4	4	360	<b>1440</b>

<b>Informal open space</b>					
Existing total bedrooms	New total bedrooms	Net additional bedrooms	Assumed net additional persons	£ per person	<b>Total £</b>
0	4	4	4	306	<b>1224</b>

<b>Children's play space</b>					
Existing total bedrooms	New total bedrooms	Net additional bedrooms not in 1-bed units	Assumed net additional persons not in 1-bed units	£ per person	<b>Total £</b>
0	4	4	4	399	<b>1596</b>

8.29 Subject to the completion of the S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8 and 10/1.

### **Community Development**

8.30 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2004) requires that all new residential developments contribute to community development facilities, programmes and projects. This contribution is £1085 for each unit of one or two bedrooms and £1625 for each larger unit. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows:

<b>Community facilities</b>			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1085		
2-bed	1085	2	2170
3-bed	1625		
4-bed	1625		
<b>Total</b>			<b>2170</b>

8.31 Subject to the completion of the S106 agreement I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1.

### **Planning Obligation Strategy - Conclusion**

8.32 It is my view that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

## **9.0 Conclusion**

9.1 Despite the proposal promoting a slightly unusual physical form, I am of the opinion that this is a site where such a development can not only provide additional accommodation, but can also make a positive contribution to the streetscene. I have considered closely the issue of the physical proximity of the property to its neighbours, particularly to 79 Greville Road, and whether the proposal would have too great a presence in relationship to the rear garden. In my opinion, the proposal is not too dominant given the distances to the dwelling itself, and I am therefore of the opinion that having considered this and all other matters, the proposal is acceptable, and approval is recommended.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVE subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 01 July 2010 and subject to the following conditions:**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority in writing no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

3. Except with the prior agreement of the local planning authority in writing, there should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0700 hrs and 1900 hrs on Monday - Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays.

Reason: Due to the proximity of residential properties to this premises and that extensive refurbishment will be required, the above conditions are recommended to protect the amenity of these residential properties throughout the redevelopment in accordance with policies 4/13 and 6/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

4. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

5. No development shall commence until details of facilities for the covered, secured parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

6. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used for the screening of the terrace have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

7. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of the on-site storage facilities for waste including waste for recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheelie bins, recycling boxes or any other means of storage will be stationed and the arrangements for the disposal of waste. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and in accordance with policies 4/13 and 6/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

8. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.



Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

### **Reasons for Approval**

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions and following the prior completion of a section 106 planning obligation (/a unilateral undertaking), because subject to those requirements it is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies:

East of England plan 2008: ENV7

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P6/1, P9/8

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/12

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at [www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess) or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

Under Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972, the following are “background papers” for each report on a planning application:

1. The planning application and plans;
2. Any explanatory or accompanying letter or document from the applicant;
3. Comments of Council departments on the application;
4. Comments or representations by third parties on the application as referred to in the report plus any additional comments received before the meeting at which the application is considered; unless (in each case) the document discloses “exempt or confidential information”
5. Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Council Policy Document referred to in individual reports.

These papers may be inspected by contacting John Summers (Ext.7103) in the Planning Department.