

**STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

7 March 2019

Application No:	SMD/2018/0614	
Location	Land at Caverswall Old Road, Forsbrook	
Proposal	Outline application for residential development with access (all other matters reserved0	
Applicant	Mr N Walker	
Agent	Sammons Architectural	
Parish/ward	Forsbrook	Date registered 10/12/18
If you have a question about this report please contact: Jane Curley tel: 01538 395400 ex 4124 Jane.curley@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk		

REFERRAL

This is a major application which is locally contentious

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The application site lies on the edge of and to the north of Forsbrook. It consists of an overgrown field with established trees mainly around the perimeter and along Caverswall Road. To the south the site borders existing residential development and to the east it adjoins open fields. The northern and western boundaries are defined by Caversall Old Road and Caverswall Road respectively with open countryside beyond.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

3.1 This is an outline application seeking consent for residential development on the site with approval of access also sought at this stage. All other matters are reserved for subsequent approval. The supporting documentation refers to access being proposed using an existing access off Caverswall Old Road however no formal plan of access is provided. This matter is discussed in more detail in the Officer section below.

3.2 An Illustrative Plan accompanies the application showing how the site could be developed with up to 12 units (2365-02B)

3.3 The application is accompanied by a Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Planning, Design and Access Statement, Preliminary Ecological Assessment and a letter from SCP Transport Planners.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

5. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

5.1 The Development Plan comprises of:

- Saved Local Plan Proposals Map / Settlement Boundaries (adopted 1998).
- Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted March 2014)

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (1998)

5.2 Development boundaries within the 1998 Adopted Local Plan are still in force until such time as they are reviewed and adopted through the site allocations process. Following consultation last year a Preferred Options Site Allocation DPD is currently out for consultation.

Adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy DPD (26th March 2014)

5.3 The following Core Strategy policies are relevant to the application:-

- SS1 Development Principles
- SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- SD1 Sustainable Use of Resources
- SD3 Carbon-saving Measures in Development
- SD4 Pollution and Flood Risk
- SS6C Rural area strategy
- DC1 Design Considerations
- DC2 Heritage
- C1 Creating Sustainable Communities
- NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources
- T1 Development and Sustainable Transport
- T2 Other Sustainable Transport Measures

Local Plan process

5.4 The Council agreed to publish the Local Plan Submission Version for representations in February 2018. At this point, the Council agreed that the Local Plan was “sound”. Formal representations were then invited from residents, businesses and other stakeholders to provide them with the opportunity to support or challenge the soundness or legal compliance of the Local Plan. This stage in the process followed three previous public consultations since 2015 which had informed the preparation of the Local Plan alongside a comprehensive evidence base.

5.5 In June 2018, the Council subsequently agreed to submit the Local Plan Submission Version to the Secretary of State for examination. An examination in public was held in November 2018 to determine whether the Local Plan is sound and legally compliant. Subject to the findings of the appointed inspector, the Local Plan is expected to be adopted later in 2019. At this point, it will supersede the adopted Core Strategy and become part of the statutory development plan for the District.

5.6 In this context, the Council's position on the weight to be given to the policies contained in the Local Plan Submission Version in terms of the three criteria set out in Paragraph 48 of the NPPF is as follows:

- The stage of preparation – the Local Plan is now at an advanced stage of preparation as the Council has submitted it to the SoS for examination
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies – this varies depending on the policy in question. The Officer Comments section of this report identifies the level of outstanding objections to each policy and recommends the amount of weight to be given to them at this stage in the process
- The degree of consistency of policies with the NPPF – given that the Council has submitted a Local Plan that it considers to be sound, all policies are deemed to be consistent with the NPPF.

Emerging Policies

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:

Policy SS1 Development Principles

Policy 1a Presumption in favour of sustainable development

SS2 Settlement Hierarchy

SS10 Other Rural area strategy

Policy H1 New Housing Development

Policy H3 Affordable housing

Policy DC3 Landscape and settlement setting character

National Planning Policy NPPF

National Planning Policy Guidance

6. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Press Notice expiry date: 21st January 2019

Site Notice expiry date: 31st January 2019

Local residents have been notified by letter.

33 letters of objection raising the following main issues:-

- Roads not suitable for more traffic
- Adverse impact on wildlife
- Rain water run off already an issue; will result in increased flooding
- Homes should be delivered in more accessible locations
- Loss of Green belt
- Should be developing brownfield land
- Not safe for pedestrians. There are no pavements and/or street lighting
- Contamination on site from previous waste
- Value of houses will suffer
- Loss of privacy

11 Letters of support raising the following main points:-

- The site was previously a brownfield
- There is a severe shortage of houses and this would provide homes
- The site is an eyesore as it is

- Too many people do not see the bigger picture
- The proposal will result in highway improvements which will benefit not only the new houses but all road users

One letter NEITHER for nor against. Comments that the good trees on the site must be retained. Second, pavements must be provided on the full length of the road frontages. And third, the road is obviously inadequate; the junction of the two existing roads must be improved as a minimum.

Forsbrook Parish Council

The area is home to an active badger sett. Two residents have evidence of the sett being active as they feed the badgers on a regular basis. Owls use the mature trees adjoining the site as an area to hunt. Bats are present in the area due to the mature trees. The thick bramble coverage of the land affords cover for many small bird species and the relevant insects needed to support them. The hedgerows adjoining the site are ancient and an important feature of the lane, they are present on the old ordnance survey maps of the area dating back 100's of years.

The width of Caverswall Road and Caverswall Old Road is not wide enough for the current flow of traffic from three schools, Foxfield Steam Railway, and Heath House Farm. The two latter businesses are currently actively looking to increase their foot fall which will only add to the congestion in the area. The speed limit on the Caverswall Old Road is "national speed limit" the egress from the site would be on a blind bend. There is no pavements on Caverswall Old Road and the pavements on Caverswall Road are in a terrible state with the County Council saying they have no money to repair them. The situation where the traffic emerges from Caverswall Road onto Uttoxeter Road is already a very dangerous situation with cars parked outside Rogers and Brock (Vets). The cars are people using the train's station who do not want to pay to park. These cars are parked here are a dangerous situation every time (twice an hour) the train barriers drop in that cars are left sitting on the train crossings. An extra two cars per 18 houses would result in excessive demand on two rural lanes.

The land adjoins green belt.

The site is an old "Marl Hole" used to accommodate the spoil etc. from many old building projects in the area. Old shoes and several other items have been found on the site which was tipped several years ago.

The site due to its nature of thick brambles and loose soil type (due to the tipping) affords a good area where water can "Percolate" through rather than flooding the highway.

Flooding is a constant problem on both Caverswall Road and Caverswall Old Road. This is partly due to the tarmacking of the car park at Foxfield and inadequate / no drainage. Further down the road near to its junction with Uttoxeter Road the highway regularly floods due to the inadequate drains. The sewage system for the houses on Fairfield's are already "piggy backed" onto the main sewage system.

There is no need for any more houses to be built in Forsbrook Parish as the St Modwen development will meet the demand required in SMDC local plan.

The junction of Caverswall Old Road and Caverswall Road is a very dangerous junction in that you cannot enter the junction alongside another car. At school times the lane is gridlocked, as it is used as a rat run to avoid Cheadle Road / Uttoxeter Road which are also gridlocked at that time.

Caverswall Parish Council

Object raising the following issues:-

a) Highways issues - the current speed limit on Caverswall Old Road is national speed limit the egress from the site would be on a blind bend. The width of Caverswall Road and Caverswall Old Road is not wide enough for the current flow of traffic from three school, Foxfield Steam Railway, and Heath House Farm. The two latter businesses are currently actively looking to increase their foot fall which will only add to the congestion in the area. There is no footpath on Caverswall Old Road and on Caverswall Road the footpaths are in very poor condition and under the current economic climate SCC are unable to repair these. If each of the 18 properties has two vehicles this would result in excessive demand on two rural lanes Traffic that emerges from Caverswall Road onto Uttoxeter Road is already a very dangerous situation it is very near to the train level crossing with barriers dropping twice an hour. Vehicles park on this road near to the Vets, Rogers and Brock. These vehicles belong to people using the train station who do not want to pay to park on the railway carpark thus narrowing the road.

b) Rural/conservation issues - understand that there are active badger setts on the site and that local residents have evidence of the activity. In addition mature trees on the adjoining site are used by owls as a hunting area. Bats are also known to be present in the area. The current rough land has a thick coverage of brambles etc which affords cover for many small bird species and the relevant insects needed to support them. The hedgerows adjoining the site are ancient and an important feature of the lane, they are present on the old ordnance survey maps of the area dating back 100s of years.

c) The land is adjoining the green belt. Inappropriate and over development of the land. The land is an old landfill site and it is not known what items were dumped on the site and could mean that the land is contaminated.

d) Concerns of whether the drainage system would be able to cope with the extra demand.

Regeneration Officer

In order to assess the economic impact of this development, we have relied upon the data supplied by the applicant and used the Council's approved multipliers to prepare these comments.

- The new householders occupying each new house will spend some of their income locally through shopping and use of local services. National research has identified that 34% of all household expenditure is spent at district level or below. For this development of 14 units this is calculated at £131,432 per year.
- Each new house will generate direct jobs within the construction industry or associated supply chain, of which 25% are likely to be locally based. Indirect Jobs are also generated by local spend in shops and services. This is calculated at an additional local job for every seven new homes. Using these multipliers the development will generate 15 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs.
- The development will also generate approximately £2,571.94 council tax for the area per annum.

Operations Manager -Waste

Comment that whilst unlikely that there will be an issue with space for wheeled bins for each property the main concern would size of the turning point for refuse vehicles, the surfacing of the road and whether it will be adopted by the highways. Refuse vehicles would not drive

over block paving and if the road was un adopted we would like indemnity from the developer against damage to the road by our vehicles.

Environmental Health Officer

Recommends refusal

Ecology Officer

Awaited

Project Officer – open spaces

As the threshold for contributions is 20 dwellings, we will not be seeking any from this proposed development.

Local Highway Authority

Recommend refusal – Firstly the traffic generated by the proposed development would be likely to result in an increase in highway danger due to increased use of the existing junction of Caverswall Road/Caverswall Old Road which is geometrically substandard in that:

- the junction is of insufficient width to accommodate vehicular movements.
- the entry radii are insufficient to accommodate the swept path of all vehicles.

Secondly the traffic generated by the proposed development would be likely to result in an increase in highway danger due to increased use of the existing Caverswall old Road which is geometrically substandard in that it is of substandard width to accommodate two way traffic flow.

Thirdly the proposed development fails to demonstrate the provision of adequate visibility at the proposed access and fourthly the proposed development fails to demonstrate safe and reasonable pedestrian routes.

Local Lead Flood Authority

Advise that the site is located within Flood Zone 1. Recommend refusal on grounds that no Drainage Strategy is provided for this major development

SCC – Mineral Authority

No objection. Advise that the site involves only 0.58 ha of land and is in close proximity to existing houses, so it is considered that it would not be practical or environmentally acceptable to work any underlying mineral resources.

Education Authority SCC

Excluding the 4 RSL dwellings from secondary only, a development of 10 houses including 4 RSLs could add 4 Primary School aged pupils and 2 Secondary School aged pupils. There are projected to be insufficient places to accommodate the children generated by the development at the two schools.

The education contribution for a development of this size would be as follows;

4 Primary School places (4 x £11,031 = £44,124) and 2 High School places (2 x £16,622 = £33,244). This gives a total request of £77,368 for up to 14 dwellings.

The above comments are based on a development providing 14 dwellings including 10 houses and 4 RSL houses. If the number of houses or total dwellings increases, or the number of RSL properties reduces, a revised contribution will be necessary.

The above contribution is based on the cost multipliers published in the current EPOP which are subject to change.

Severn Trent Water

No objection subject to drainage condition

Police Architectural Liaison Officer

No objection.

7. OFFICER COMMENT AND PLANNING BALANCE

7.1 As with all applications, the LPA is required to determine this application in accordance with the Development plan, unless there are material circumstances which indicate otherwise and in determining these applications, it shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, in so far as material to the application and to any other material considerations.

7.2 Core Strategy Policy SS1a establishes a 'Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development' in line with the National Planning Policy (herein referred to as the NPPF) where: (1) planning applications that accord with policies within the Core Strategy will be approved without delay and (2) where there are no relevant policies or they are out of date, the Council will grant planning permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise considering:-

- I. Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole, or,
- II. Specific policies in within the NPPF indicate that development should be restricted

7.3 This site lies within the Green Belt. Its development for housing represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Policy SS6C and paragraph 143 of the NPPF confirm that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Para 144 confirms that LPA's should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very Special Circumstances' it says will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In this case in addition to definitional harm there would be very significant harm to openness and permanence, the Green Belts essential characteristics. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Furthermore the proposal would conflict with one of the main purposes of including land within the Green Belt, namely that of preventing encroachment into open countryside. The totality of Green Belt harm is very significant. It must be given substantial weight.

7.4 There is reference in the submitted Planning Statement (PS) to the site being previously developed although no further explanation is given. There is some reference in the letters of representation to a former brickworks and landfill on the site. The Environmental Health Officer also refers to these former uses. However there is no evidence of any buildings on the site. Having regard to the definition of previously developed land in the NPPF, in this

case the view taken is that any remnants of buildings/structures have blended into the landscape such that the land is now greenfield land.

7.5 The applicant's Agent agrees that the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that very special circumstances are required (para 5.3 of Planning Statement). However in paragraph 5.4 of the PS the Agent refers to paragraph 11 of the NPPF and the 'significant and demonstrable' test. However, in this case that is not the correct application of the Framework. Paragraph 11 read with Footnote 6 is very clear that the tilted balance does not apply where policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance, such as land designated as Green Belt, provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed. That is the case here. There is no tilted balance.

7.6 The Agent considers that loss of openness would be minimal. However, covering an undeveloped field with houses would, in Officers opinion, clearly, significantly compromise the openness and permanence of the Green Belt; its essential characteristic. The Agent also says that none of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt would be harmed. That is not accepted either. The development of this field with housing would result in conflict with one of the main purposes of the Green belt, that of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The Agent also refers to the fact that this site has been promoted as a potential housing allocation in earlier versions of the emerging Local Plan. However it has not been taken forward in the Submission version which was the subject of an Examination in Public in November last year. In any event given the stage that the Plan has reached, only limited weight can be given to it.

7.7 The very special circumstances put forward by the applicant are set out in para 5.17 of the PS. They are listed to be;

- a) the Council's poor record of providing a supply of deliverable housing land and its current inability to demonstrate a 5 year supply
- b) the fact that there are no allocated sites in Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook solely for new residential development
- c) the lack of windfall opportunities; more Green Belt land needs to be released
- d) Policy R2 is out-of date
- e) in the two previous public consultations on the Local Plan in 2015 and 2016 the application site was part of a proposed site which proposed to remove it from the Green Belt and finally the Council's 2015 Green Belt Review identified that development of this site would have only a limited impact on Green Belt policies and could be considered for release from the Green Belt.

7.8 None of these considerations either individually or collectively are considered to clearly outweigh the totality of Green Belt harm such that Very Special Circumstances exist. Indeed Members will note that some of these arguments have been put forward in respect of other applications involving housing on Green Belt, demonstrating that they are neither unusual nor exceptional. Furthermore, the NPPF is clear that although normally the absence of a 5 year supply and out of date policy triggers the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the 'tilted balance', that does not apply where there is conflict with Green Belt policy. It therefore follows that this cannot represent 'Very Special Circumstances'.

7.9 In the absence of very special circumstances there is strong conflict with Policy SS6C and the NPPF and an objection in principle to housing development on this site.

Access

7.10 Approval of access is sought at this stage. The Planning Statement refers to access being taken from Caverswall Old Road and that an existing access approx. 40m from the junction with Caverswall Road would be used (para 5.38). However although approval of access is sought, no formal plan is submitted to show the access detail other than the Illustrative Plan which shows that use is not made of the existing access. The applicant's Agent has been asked for clarification.

7.11 The application is accompanied by a letter from SCP Transport planners. It says that the proposed scheme is small scale but that the existing access on Caverswall Old Lane is not suitable to accommodate even a small development due to the lack of width on Caverswall Old Road and limited visibility. It confirms that the local roads adjacent to the site are relatively narrow and do not benefit from footways. It also comments that forward visibility is in places also somewhat limited and says that as a consequence vehicle speeds were found to be reasonably slow. It further comments that it found a particular concern regarding the junction of Caverswall Road with Caverswall Old Road where the carriageway width was restricted to such a degree that simultaneous turning movements could not be made. The letter then goes on to conclude that the limited development proposal can be safely accommodated onto the local highway network and that the potential junction improvement would represent a material safety improvement.

7.12 The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has carefully considered the application. It recommends refusal of the application on a number of grounds. Firstly the fact that increased use of the substandard Caverswall Road/Caverswall Old Road junction would be likely to result in an increase in highway danger; secondly an increase in highway danger due to an increased use of Caverswall Old Road which is also geometrically substandard; thirdly lack of adequate visibility at the proposed access and fourthly failure to provide safe and suitable pedestrian access. The LHA also comments that no detail of the proposed access is provided despite approval of access being sought; neither are any details of the proposed road/junction improvements shown albeit that they are referred to in the Planning Statement.

7.13 There is the other matter of course that were these improvements to be put forward they are likely to raise other issues in terms of tree and hedgerow loss, impact on the rural character and appearance of the site. However as they do not form part of the application they are not considered further at this stage.

7.14 For the reasons given above however, there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. A safe and suitable access for all users has not been demonstrated. There is conflict with Policies DC1 and T1 and the NPPF.

Biodiversity

7.15 A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal is submitted with the application. The comments of the Ecology Officer are awaited and will be reported at the meeting.

Contamination

7.16 The Environmental Health Officer recommends refusal of the application. He advises that the site is on part of an area used as a former brick works/marl pits. The Marl pits he says were later filled with waste of unknown origin and are a known historic landfill.

7.17 The applicant has not address this matter nor provided any information with regard to contamination and the suitability of the site. The EHO recommends refusal on the basis of

insufficient information being supplied to demonstrate that the potential contamination on the site is in fact understood and can be overcome to deliver a suitable and viable development.

7.18 The EHO raises similar concerns about noise from not only the road but also the garden centre activities. In the absence of a specific Noise Assessment it is not possible to assess whether these concerns can be satisfactorily mitigated.

7.19 In the absence of this information there is conflict with SD4 which seeks to ensure that the effects of pollution are avoided or mitigated and the NPPF.

Affordable housing

7.20 In accordance with Policy H2 the applicant is offering that 33% of the total number of dwellings would be affordable units, secured through a Section 106 Obligation. With this in place there would be compliance with Policy H2.

Developer Contributions

7.21 As advised above Staffordshire County Council, School Organisation are requesting a financial contribution to mitigate the impact on school capacity arising from this development. This would also need to be secured through the Section 106 Obligation.

Drainage and Flood Risk

7.22 The site lies within Flood Zone 1 which is land least at risk of flooding. However no Drainage Strategy was submitted with the application. In the absence of this it is simply not possible to assess whether an acceptable means of drainage can be provided which does not pose a flood risk either on site or elsewhere. These concerns have led the Local Lead Flood Authority to recommend refusal of the application.

7.23 In the absence of a satisfactory Drainage Strategy there is conflict with Policy SD4 and the NPPF which requires LPA's to ensure that, when determining planning applications new development does not increase flood risk

8. PLANNING BALANCE

8.1 Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

8.2 As set out above there is significant conflict with that part of Policy SS6c relating to the Green Belt. There are also conflicts with Policies T1, SD4 and DC1. The NPPF is a material consideration of weight in the determination of this application. It sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking it says at paragraph 11 that where those policies which are the most important for determining the application are out of date (as in this case because the Council can not demonstrate a 5 year deliverable supply of housing) planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed. Footnote 6 confirms that such policies include those relating to the Green Belt. As discussed above Green Belt policy does, in this case provide a clear reason for refusal. There is therefore no 'tilted balance' and the application should be refused.

8.3 The proposal would deliver economic benefits through the construction of the dwellings and once completed through extra spending power in the local economy and increased Council tax receipts. Moderate weight is attached to this. The provision of housing including

affordable housing in circumstances of a chronic housing under supply attracts very significant weight. However the harm occasioned to the Green Belt would be very substantial. The proposal would also have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and no evidence is provided to demonstrate that development on this site would not increase flood risk on the site itself or elsewhere or that potential contamination and noise issues can be satisfactorily addressed. There is a strong conflict with Policies SSC 6, DC1, T1 and SD4 of the Development plan. There are no material considerations that indicate that planning permission should be considered other than in accordance with the Development Plan. A strong recommendation of refusal is therefore made.

9. RECOMMENDATION

A. That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

- 1. This is a greenfield site situated within the Green Belt. The development of the site for housing represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is harmful by definition. The development would, in addition significantly compromise openness by replacing open fields with a housing estate. Openness and permanence are, the NPPF confirms, the essential characteristics of the Green Belt. The fundamental aim of Green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Furthermore there would be conflict with one of the main purposes of including land within the Green Belt namely that of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Local Planning Authorities are required to give substantial weight to any harm to the Green Belt. It is not considered that the other considerations put forward by the applicant amount to the very special circumstances to clearly outweigh the totality of harm to the Green Belt in this case. It is for these reasons that the proposal is contrary to Policy SSC6 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy Development Plan Document and national advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 2. In the absence of a Drainage Strategy and details of the means for the disposal of surface water discharge it is not possible to assess the flood risk posed from the proposed development. The proposed development may present risks of flooding on –site or off-site if surface water run-off or other external flood risk is not effectively managed. There is as such conflict with Policy SD4 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy Development Plan Document and national advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 3. Although approval of access is sought, no plan is provided detailing the proposed access arrangements. Notwithstanding this it is considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety due to increased use of the substandard Caverswall Road/Caverswall Old Road junction and Caverswall Old Road which is also geometrically substandard. Furthermore the application fails to provide adequate visibility or a safe and suitable pedestrian access. As such there is conflict with Policies T1, DC1 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy Development Plan Document and national advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 4. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that potential contamination and noise constraints that may affect the development are fully understood nor that they can be satisfactorily addressed to deliver and suitable and viable development. As such there is conflict with Policy SD 4 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy Development Plan Document and**

national advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.

- B. In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/in formatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Head of Development Services has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's Decision.

