PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 31 August 2016

Present: Councillor Mrs Soyke (Chairman)
Councillors Noakes (Vice-Chairman), Backhouse, Bland, Mrs Cobbold, Dawlings, Hamilton, Heasman, Mackonochie, Munn, Podbury, Sloan and Mrs Thomas

Officers in Attendance: Stephen Baughen (Building Control & Development Manager), Cheryl Clark (Democratic Services Officer), Margaret Parker (Development Planner - KCC Highways), Jo Smith (Lawyer), Ellen Gilbert (Principal Planning Officer) and Mark Stephenson (Principal Conservation Officer)

Other Members in Attendance: Councillors McDermott, Dr Hall and Holden

APOLOGIES

PLA44/16 Apologies for absence were recorded from Councillor Reilly.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

PLA45/16 No declarations of interest were made. However, Councillor Dawlings made the following statement in respect of applications 16/503953 and 16/503954.

"Deliberations on the development of a Community Centre in Cranbrook have been taking place for many years. I have followed these as a resident of the Benenden & Cranbrook Ward. More recently I have followed these closely as a Member for the Benenden & Cranbrook Ward. Plans for the re-development of the Cranbrook Engineering site and the need to both preserve and demolish buildings have also been the subject of much local debate; the issue of the demolition of local heritage buildings on this site has already been considered by the Planning Committee.

I have attended meetings where matters concerning the Community Centre and the Cranbrook Engineering site have been discussed. I have listened to the differing views expressed. I have not expressed any views on the planning application and am confident I am able to assess the application wholly objectively."

DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING (IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROTOCOL FOR MEMBERS TAKING PART IN THE PLANNING PROCESS, PART 5, SECTION 5.11, PARAGRAPH 6.6)

PLA46/16 All members of the Committee present advised that they had been lobbied by objectors to the applications and Councillor Hamilton advised that she had also been lobbied by a supporter.

SITE INSPECTIONS

PLA47/16 The Chairman confirmed that members of the Committee had visited the site earlier that day in respect of applications 16/503953 and 16/503954.

TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING DATED 17 AUGUST 2016

PLA48/16 RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting dated 17 August 2016 be
noted as a correct record.

REPORTS OF HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES

PLA49/16  The Chairman confirmed the running order of applications as set out in the agenda.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 16/503953 - FORMER CRANBROOK ENGINEERING SITE AND WILKES FIELD, STONE STREET, CRANBROOK

PLA50/16  Planning Report and Presentation - The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application 16/503593 and this was summarised at the meeting by Mrs Gilbert, Principal Planning Officer and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

Updates and additional representation - Since publication of the agenda report, the presenting officer updated as follows:

i. A representation had been received from a relatively new owner of the Tanyard Dental Practice. This raised queries over ownership of a portion of the Wilkes Field but officers were satisfied that the application had been properly submitted based on the evidence available. Also it was not the responsibility of the Council to make a definitive decision on land ownership matters. Land ownership was a private matter between the parties concerned and not for consideration by the Planning Committee. Officers also confirmed that on the basis of the information available that the applicants had correctly complied with the relevant application notification process, which had also been queried.

ii. Further correspondence had been received from 2 Parish Councillors and from a Borough Councillor raising a number of questions. These included emails which had also lobbied members of the Committee. The presenting officer anticipated responding to these issues after they had been raised at the meeting by the registered speakers, who included Councillor Dr Hall and Parish Councillor Hartley.

iii. The application was subject to an updated set of conditions, as tabled and circulated at the meeting.

Registered Speakers - There were 8 members of the public, the Chairman of Cranbrook & Sissinghurst Parish Council and 2 Ward/Borough Councillors who had registered to speak in accordance with the Constitution rules.

i. Dr J Temple, a resident of Cranbrook objected to the application and her main points included the following:
- This committee decision would impact for generations to come and she questioned the benefits it would provide to the residents of the town, other than the provision of high density housing.
- This was the only site in the centre of the Town which could have been used for retail and business purposes to counter increasing out of town competition. It was therefore a missed opportunity, providing only one additional shop.
- No affordable housing was included in the proposal.
- Protections provided by the planning decision in November 2015 would be lost.
- No developer financial contributions would be provided.
- The viability assessment was secret and having been checked by an un-named independent assessor, could not be challenged on
the assumptions made, in particular those made for predicted house prices.

- Members might have been told that they had to accept this proposal for Cranbrook to be able to obtain a Community Centre but she claimed this was not true.

ii. Mr C Andrews, a resident of Frittenden and property owner in Sissinghurst, objected to the application as it ignored so many established planning policies and his main points included the following:

- He resented paying for a large community centre, which was not needed and had not been voted for. The Parish Poll in March 2016 proposed paying for the Community Centre out of the Parish Precept but was defeated. Supporters on the Parish Council claimed sufficient funds could still be raised but he considered that residents would end up paying both for the project and its ongoing maintenance. He was also concerned that the Vestry Hall would have to be sold to raise money for the new centre.
- He repeated concerns over the lack of benefits for ordinary people particularly affordable housing for young people. He quoted prices from a recent development in Sissinghurst of between £335k and £500k. He suggested that the prices in Cranbrook would be similar and he could not therefore comprehend the viability and lack of profit issues indicated in the report based on 28 new houses.
- As an alternative, he considered that the Local Heritage Assets (LHAs) could have been converted to provide a community facility using available heritage grants, and without additional cost to residents. The area on Wilkes Field could then have been used for affordable housing.
- He quoted from a recent article in a local newspaper, which claimed that local heritage, art galleries and museums were more attractive to tourists than shopping or community centres.
- He suggested that the current proposal would benefit the developer to the detriment of local residents.

iii. Mrs E Wood, a resident of Cranbrook, objected to the application and her main points included the following:

- She had consulted with several hundred local residents and whilst there was agreement that the site needed to be redeveloped, she considered it was a missed opportunity for real regeneration because who would visit a town for one extra shop, 28 expensive houses or an oversized and unviable Community Centre. The proposal would fail to stimulate or sustain the local economy and would therefore fail to meet the needs of the town. Businesses were currently unable to find suitable premises and young professionally qualified people were leaving because of the lack of affordable housing. She suggested that an alternative scheme providing versatile enterprise space at ground floor level with one or two bed flats over would be more appropriate. Currently the scheme only seemed to help fill the TWBC housing quota.
- She questioned why the Library was shown as occupying a significant part of the Community Centre, when they had pulled out of the scheme.
- She also questioned the use of the Community Centre as a
conference and business centre due to tax and VAT issues.

iv. Councillor Hartley, a resident of Cranbrook and Parish Councillor spoke in a personal capacity as an objector and his main points included the following:

- The report indicated the recommendation was a finely balanced judgement and the key issue seemed to be whether the public benefit in receiving land on which to build a community centre, outweighed the loss of some of the heritage assets on the site. In his opinion this was not proven as there was no evidence of any legal agreement within the agenda report confirming the grant of land to the Parish. Contrary to the officer view, he considered this was a valid and material planning consideration. He doubted that the Parish would be able to raise the millions needed to deliver the community centre. There was a risk that the landowner could withdraw the offer of the land, the LHAs would already have been lost and there would be no public benefit at all.
- He therefore reiterated part of the previous speaker’s suggestion to reconsider redevelopment of the LHAs for community use.

v. Mr D Rivers, Project Manager from ROI Projects, Agent to the applicant, supported the application and commended the very thorough report produced by planning officers. His main points included the following:

- Considerable time and effort had been put into developing this important site over the previous 10 years and in his view the current proposal was the best possible deliverable solution.
- The objectors had the opportunity but had failed to come up with a practical alternative for the LHAs, and without development, these buildings would continue to decay as evidenced by the nearby Providence Chapel, a Grade II Listed building.
- Subject to approval of this application, the Canterbury Architectural Trust would be charged with fully recording the assets during the demolition phase, ensuring provision of a detailed historical archive for the future.
- Any building materials reclaimed would be used in the restoration of the Listed Building and in construction of the new contiguous frontage to Stone Street.

vi. Mrs V Summers from Age Concern Cranbrook & District, supported the application and her main points included the following:

- A modern community centre was required to replace the premises and facilities lost when the former Council Office was closed and subsequently demolished. The new centre was crucial to provide all manner of support, information and services to the elderly, and other community groups.
- They had been consulted by the Parish Council and considered that the current proposal provided sufficient space and facilities to satisfy the need commensurate with an increasingly elderly population as well as for all other areas of the community.

vii. Mrs C Beech, Principal, High Weald Academy, supported the application and in addition to the need for redevelopment as part of a wider strategy for the area, her main points included the following:

- The proposed Community Centre would be able to provide
accommodation for all manner of facilities and support services for children, young people and families. These were not currently available in Cranbrook and required travel to other towns such as Tunbridge Wells and Maidstone.

- She anticipated potential benefits such as increased provision for adult education and literacy, IT training, youth clubs, as well as facilities for inter-generational and multi-cultural activities.

viii. Councillor Rook, a local business owner and Parish Councillor had registered to speak in a personal capacity. He read a statement from Helen Grant MP who was unable to attend the meeting in person but who wholeheartedly supported the proposal. She had canvassed local opinion and found widespread support for the proposed development and the provision of a Community Hub. She advised that the former Cranbrook Engineering site was considered an eyesore by many people, they felt that the town was declining and that something had to be done to increase the town’s long term commercial sustainability. Demand for a Community hub was also very strong.

ix. Councillor Veitch, Chairman of Cranbrook & Sissinghurst Parish Council supported the application on behalf of the Parish Council. Her main points included the following:
- It was not unusual for development in the centre of a historic town to be controversial. A minority of the Parish Council did not support the proposal, and were also speaking at this meeting.
- She advised that a new community centre had started as a Millennium project and the current design was the result of much review, consultation and expertise since. It reflected many elements of the Cranbrook townscape and its unique landmarks. She particularly liked the use of the twitterns and the increased pedestrian access linking Stone Street, the High Street and the Frythe.
- She endorsed the Agent’s comments on the re-use of materials and supported a community centre proposal that was flexible enough to accommodate potential changes in the needs of the community.
- Many daytime users of the community centre were already based in the centre of Cranbrook or would be able to walk so existing car parking would be sufficient. Any increased need for parking would be during evenings and weekends when there was less demand and ample parking space. There were 500 spaces in Cranbrook of which 350 were in the Regal Park.
- She confirmed that the Parish Council had no intention of selling the Vestry Hall.

x. Councillor Dr Hall, also a Parish Councillor, spoke as a Borough Councillor for the Ward of Benenden & Cranbrook and objected to the application. She reiterated the main points made in statements by the previous objectors, which included the following:
- Concern that the proposal failed to provide a mixed development and would result in a public burden rather than public benefit.
- The defeat of the Parish Poll which had sought to increase the precept.
- That only residential or commercial use of the LHAs had been
considered as part of the viability assessment and not community use.

- If this planning application were approved, she doubted the ability of the Parish Council to raise the £4M needed to build the community centre.
- In the meantime the LHAs, which the Conservation Officer had confirmed had high significance, would be demolished and lost. Restoring the LHAs for community use would not have cost anything as they would have been liable for heritage funding.
- She highlighted the particular policies sacrificed in favour of the proposal: CP4 Heritage Assets, CP6 Affordable Housing, CP7 Employment Opportunities, section 106 monies, NPPF paragraphs 14.2 and 14.4 footnote 9.
- She considered it was better to refuse or to defer an application if there were any doubts as the applicant always had another chance by appeal or further application.

xi. Councillor Holden, a County Councillor, spoke also as a Borough Councillor for the Ward of Benenden & Cranbrook and supported the application. His main points also reiterated and highlighted many previous comments and included the following:

- Cranbrook had lacked a Community centre with the facilities of an appropriate scale since the former Council offices were demolished and this proposal could repair the community and remove a longstanding eyesore on an urban, brownfield site.
- The NPPF did not say development could not take place but required that the benefit outweighed the harm and that the development had to take account of its setting within the AONB, the Conservation Area, and the Limits to Built Development.
- Agreement had already been reached to demolish the LHAs if a suitable proposal for development be approved and in summary, he therefore urged completion of this process for the overall benefit of Cranbrook.

Matters of Clarification by Officers, Committee Members’ Questions to Officers and Committee Member Discussion:

i. Mrs Gilbert responded to a number of the points raised by speakers.

ii. With reference to the need for a community hub she confirmed that the Wilkes Field site had already been allocated for the provision of a community facility in accordance with the Council’s recently adopted Site Allocations Local Plan. Core Strategy Policy 12 advised that a site would be allocated for a community facility. The relevant principles for the use of the site had therefore been established by virtue of this allocation and there was no requirement to demonstrate the need for the hub.

iii. The Council’s Conservation Officer and the Urban Designer had indicated that the density of the proposal and the provision of footpaths reflected the medieval character of the town. Comments in this respect were included in the agenda report.

iv. Viability assessments in respect of any planning applications were always provided on a confidential basis and the summary officer comments were provided within paragraph 10.05 of the agenda report. Officers were satisfied that the consultants were entirely independent, had questioned assumptions where appropriate and provided a thorough and comprehensive report as required.
v. The building proposed for the community hub was a flexible space and the report provided only an indication of the potential users and these would change over time. Withdrawal of the library at this stage was not therefore an issue but to provide further assurances, officers had included condition no (39) in the updated list of conditions tabled. This required a management plan, which in addition to listing users would also include operational matters such as hours, bookings and complaints procedures.

vi. Retention of the LHAs as part of the development had been considered by the consultant as part of the viability assessment but as a result the project would not have been viable.

vii. She reiterated the officer conclusion that on balance the considerable public benefit of a community centre outweighed the harm.

viii. Land ownership was not a material consideration and if the gifting of the site did not take place, this did not mean that a community centre could not still be built on the site or occupied under a different arrangement.

ix. On the question of size, if a revised proposal for a smaller building were to be submitted in the future, this would be assessed on its own merits. In the meantime, the Committee was required to consider the application on the basis that it was currently presented.

x. Councillor Sloan referred to paragraph 7.27 regarding developer contributions. As the proposal was only narrowly considered viable, the suggested level of contributions at £100k seemed to him to be a huge subsidy. Mrs Gilbert advised that the contributions originally sought by KCC had changed since the pre-application stage but even so as confirmed in paragraph 10.132 onward, the margin was still sufficiently fine to render the scheme unviable unless the developer were to resort to ‘value engineering’. This was further explained by Mr Baughen referencing paragraphs 10.135 and 10.136. It involved making savings in building costs, which would not be considered acceptable if it were to impact on the overall quality of scheme, which in itself was a key consideration in this location.

xi. Councillor Munn commended officers on the level of detail provided by the report. He asked whether there had been any negotiation on the level of affordable housing as suggested in paragraph 7.65. Mrs Gilbert advised that Housing Policy did allow negotiation to take place but in this case there had not been negotiation for viability reasons.

xii. Councillor Backhouse questioned whether “building C“ could still be retained as it had appeared to be in very poor condition when viewed on the site visit. Mrs Gilbert advised that officers were satisfied with the consultants technical reports submitted (listed under paragraph 8.0 of the report). Mr Stephenson added that in spite of water ingress, the basic structure was still sound and although expensive, refurbishment was possible.

xiii. Councillor Hamilton acknowledged the considerable time and effort bringing the proposal to this stage. She currently favoured deferral but wanted to hear further Committee member views and asked for officer comment on the exceptional circumstances quoted in the reasons for recommendation. Mr Baughen referred to the NPPF paragraphs 116 (AONB), 133, 134 and 135 (Heritage Assets) that were quoted. The reasons for the recommendation summarised the public benefits over the loss of the heritage assets, and this was explained at length in paragraphs 10.32 of the agenda report onwards. In summary these were both Borough wide and site specific and
included the provision of a new community hub and site specific infrastructure, removal of underground tanks and run down buildings, renovation of a Grade II Listed Building, provision of 28 houses, a shop and infill of the gap in the frontage of Stone Street.

xiv. Councillor Bland reflected that part of the benefit was actually only the donation of a site for a civic centre in return for sacrificing affordable housing and £100k of section 106 monies. He also raised the issue of additionally saving buildings “A” and “D” but again Mr Baughen repeated that to retain these LHAs and bring them into use for another purpose was considered to make the whole project unviable.

xv. Councillor Podbury felt that the community hub was extremely large for only 3800 electorate and wondered if further large scale local development was in the pipeline to justify it. Mrs Gilbert advised there was a planning application for residential development at Brick Kiln Farm and residents there would also benefit from additional facilities at Cranbrook. The size of the community centre, however, was not dependent on that additional development. Mr Baughen clarified that the allocation within the Council’s agreed Development Plan was for between 200 and 250 new dwellings on the land adjacent to the Crane Valley.

xvi. Councillor Mrs Thomas was concerned over contamination. She suggested that the proposals were premature if funding had not yet been secured for the community hub. Mrs Gilbert confirmed that proposed condition no. (5) would provide a strengthening of the position dealing with the land contamination and confirmed that the Council did not pay for works to deal with contamination. Mrs Gilbert also repeated earlier comments relating to the users of the hub and funding, and suggested that the planning permission might well act as a catalyst for fund raising.

xvii. Councillor Mackonochie ascertained that the Listed building that was to be renovated would be sold as a private dwelling.

xviii. Councillor Backhouse summed up his position advising that he found the arguments in favour of the development compelling both on a site specific basis and for the Borough as a whole. He noted the length of time, during which the site had deteriorated and having visited the site several times, he supported the proposal and recommended approval.

xix. Councillor Sloan felt that the comments from the Conservation and Urban Design Officers were particularly important and found the design sensitive and in keeping with the character of the area. He considered the lack of affordable housing and developer contributions were significant but overall felt able to support the officer recommendation and seconded the proposal.

xx. Councillor Munn commented on the difficulty of determining the application for such a large and complex site, which included as yet undeveloped green space as well as the run down contaminated areas and LHAs. He was particularly concerned that even as Borough Councillors and members of the Planning Committee they had still been unable to see any of the reports relating to the viability assessment. He was particularly concerned over the lack of affordable housing, s106 contributions.

xxi. Councillor Heasman was also extremely concerned about the same viability issues raised by Councillor Munn. Councillor Heasman explained that he came from a business background, where he would not have been expected to make a decision without considering all of the relevant financial information. Although he understood it was
accepted practice in relation to the Council's assessment of planning applications, he still found it personally very difficult to accept the viability assessment at face value. He also found it surprising that the Parish Council had not yet sorted out how they would be paying for the building of the Community Hub. He fully supported the redevelopment of the Listed Building and regretted that one of the LHAs known as ‘building A’ could not also have been retained.

Concerning the housing element, he had hoped for a more open mews style design approach and a greater mix of development than provision of just one shop. On the basis of his concerns he was unable to support the proposal.

xxii. Councillor Mrs Thomas was also concerned regarding the lack of affordable housing and that members were unable to see the viability assessment in view of the finely balanced financial position. She was also concerned that the developer might not stay around to build the Community Hub if the housing was built first.

xxiii. Councillor Mrs Soyke advised that she had practical experience of raising money for a village hall and found it was virtually impossible to start fund raising without planning permission being in place first. She also considered that it was beneficial to start with larger plans as it was always easier to cut back rather than to expand.

xxiv. Councillor Hamilton understood that the new roads would not be adopted by KCC and wondered how busy the Community Hub would be and whether any traffic management strategy was proposed. Mrs Parker clarified that the locus of the Highway Authority was on the public highway and they had no responsibility for parking on a private site. She commented that narrow access ways were unusual but not untypical of the centre of Cranbrook. She also commented that it was difficult to assess the parking demand until the users were known and that would change over time. She did however refer to the comments made by the Chairman of the Parish Council who had indicated that most demand was expected to be outside normal business hours when there was less pressure on parking. Ultimately, however, it would be down to the Parish Council to manage bookings for the use of the Community Centre and the consequent parking arrangements.

xxv. Councillor Dawlings stated that it was quite clear that this crucial area in the centre of the town needed redevelopment. Contrary to Councillor Heasman’s view, he thought the nature and layout of the housing proposed was very consistent with the character of Cranbrook. He also felt that the proposal would bring additional public and economic development to the area and therefore supported approval of the application.

Decision/voting - A motion having been proposed by Councillor Backhouse and seconded by Councillor Sloan, a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED - That application 16/503953 be approved, subject to the updated plans and conditions tabled at the meeting, and as restated below in full and additionally including the informatives.

(1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this decision.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town

(2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

16/05/01 revision C (labelled ‘Block Plan’ but is location plan with site edged red)
16/05/03 revision J (Proposed Site Plan)
16/05/04 revision C (Lower Ground Floor Plan Community Centre)
16/05/05 revision D (Upper Ground Floor Plan Community Centre)
16/05/06 revision C (1st Floor/Roof Space Rooms and Roof Plan Community Centre)
16/05/07 revision D (Proposed Elevations Community Centre)
16/05/09 revision A (Proposed Sections Community Centre)
16/05/12 revision E (Proposed Site Plan Showing Lower Ground Floor Plan)
16/05/14 revision A (Proposed Site Plan Showing Pedestrian Routes)
16/05/15 revision C (Proposed Plans and Elevations Plot 26-28)
16/05/16 revision C (Proposed Plans and Elevations Plot 24-25)
16/05/17 revision B (Proposed Ground Floor Plan Plot 14-23)
16/05/18 revision C (Proposed First Floor Plan Plot 14-23)
16/05/19 revision B (Proposed Second Floor Plan Plot 14-23)
16/05/20 revision B (Proposed Roof Plan Plot 14-23)
16/05/21 revision B (Proposed Elevations Plot 14-23 Sheet 1 of 2)
16/05/22 revision A (Proposed Elevations Plot 14-23 Sheet 2 of 2)
16/05/23 revision A (Proposed Plans and Elevations Plot 10 - 13)
16/05/24 revision A (Proposed Plans and Elevations Plot 9)
16/05/25 revision F (Proposed Plans Plots 1-8)
16/05/26 revision D (Proposed Plans Plots 1-8)
16/05/27 revision F (Proposed Elevations Plots 1-8)
16/05/28 revision C (Plots 1-8 Stone Street and Courtyard Coloured Elevations)
16/05/36 revision D (Proposed Site Plan Showing Roof Plans and Bat Roosting Provisions)
16/05/37 revision B (Proposed Site Plan Showing Roof Plans and Bird Provisions) 16/05/38 revision A (Proposed Site Sections Sheet 1 of 3)
16/05/39 revision A (Proposed Site Sections Sheet 2 of 3)
16/05/40 revision A (Proposed Site Sections Sheet 3 of 3)
16/05/SK09 (amended plan – proposed first floor of unit 4 – Listed Building)
13/36/108 (Demolition Plan)

Reason: To clarify which plans have been approved.

(3) Within two months of the planning permission hereby granted being issued details of a scheme for the management and enhancement of the reptile receptor (translocation) site adjacent to Wilkes Field shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The receptor (translocation) site shall be managed in accordance with this scheme once approved unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the survival of a protected species.
Prior to the commencement of the development a Code of Construction Practice shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The construction of the development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved Code of Construction Practice and BS5228 Noise Vibration and Control on Construction and Open Sites and the Control of dust from construction sites (BRE DTi Feb 2003), unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The code shall include:

1. An indicative programme for carrying out the works
2. Measures to minimise the production of dust on the site(s)
3. Measures to minimise the noise (including vibration) generated by the construction process to include the careful selection of plant and machinery and use of noise mitigation barrier(s)
4. Maximum noise levels expected 1 metre from the affected façade of any residential unit adjacent to the site(s)
5. Design and provision of site hoardings
6. Management of traffic visiting the site(s) including temporary parking or holding areas
7. Provision of off road parking for all site operatives
8. Measures to prevent the transfer of mud and other materials onto the public highway
9. Measures to manage the production of waste and to maximise the re-use of materials
10. Measures to minimise the potential for pollution of groundwater and surface water
11. The location and design of site office(s) and storage compounds
12. The location of temporary vehicle access points to the site(s) during the construction works
13. The arrangements for public consultation and liaison during the construction works.

Reason: To avoid pollution of the site and surrounding area and in the interests of highway safety and the amenities of neighbouring residents.

The construction phase of the development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the following components of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority:

1) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
   - all previous uses
   - potential contaminants associated with those uses
   - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
   - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.

2) A site investigation, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be
affected, including those off site.

3) A remediation method statement (RMS) based on the site investigation results and the detailed risk assessment (2). This should give full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken. The RMS should also include a verification plan to detail the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the RMS are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

4) A Closure Report is submitted upon completion of the works. The closure report shall include full verification details as set out in 3. This should include details of any post remediation sampling and analysis, together with documentation certifying quantities and source/destination of any material brought onto or taken from the site. Any material brought onto the site shall be certified clean;

Any changes to these components require the express consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall thereafter be implemented as approved unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

(6) No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological monitoring (watching brief) to be undertaken by an archaeologist approved by the Local Planning Authority so that the demolition and buildings works are observed and items of interest and finds are recorded. The watching brief shall be in accordance with a written programme and specification which has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded during demolition of existing buildings and any alteration works to remaining buildings.

(7) No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of the following:

i) Archaeological field evaluation works in accordance with a specification and written timetable which has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; and

ii) Following on from the evaluation, any safeguarding measures
to ensure preservation in situ of important archaeological remains and/or further archaeological investigation and recording in accordance with a specification and timetable which has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded and that due regard is had to the preservation in situ of important archaeological remains.

(8) No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of interpretation in accordance with a written specification and timetable which has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded in accordance with the NPPF.

(9) The approved development shall be carried out in such a manner as to avoid damage to the existing trees, including their root systems, and other planting to be retained by observing the following:

(a) All trees to be preserved shall be marked on site and protected during any operation on site by temporary fencing in accordance with BS 5837:2012, and in accordance with the approved Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Such tree protection measures shall remain throughout the period of demolition and construction.

(b) No fires shall be lit within the spread of branches or upwind of the trees and other vegetation;

(c) No materials or equipment shall be stored within the spread of the branches or Root Protection Area of the trees and other vegetation;

(d) No roots over 50mm diameter shall be cut, and no buildings, roads or other engineering operations shall be constructed or carried out within the spread of the branches or Root Protection Areas of the trees and other vegetation;

(e) Ground levels within the spread of the branches or Root Protection Areas (whichever the greater) of the trees and other vegetation shall not be raised or lowered in relation to the existing ground level, except as may be otherwise be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(f) No trenches for underground services shall be commenced within the Root Protection Areas of trees which are identified.
as being retained in the approved plans, or within 5m of hedgerows shown to be retained without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. Such trenching as might be approved shall be carried out to National Joint Utilities Group recommendations.

Reason: Pursuant to Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality.

(10) Prior to the commencement of the construction phase of the development hereby approved, a plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority to show how the construction phase of development will be carried out, detailing the order of works and a timescale for the works. This shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing programme unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning of the development.

(11) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development as set out in the approved phasing programme, above ground construction works shall not commence on each phase of the development until the following details relating to that phase have been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

External materials, including written details and samples. These shall include bricks, tiles and all other external finishing materials as well as hard surfacing and paving materials. The details shall also include a scheme of measures to ensure that materials salvaged from the demolition phase of development on the Cranbrook Engineering Site are re-used in the construction phase of the development;

Proposed chimneys, which shall be constructed from brick;

Boundary treatments including walls, fences and railings and other means of boundary treatment as applicable. The details shall include a plan indicating the positions, design, material and type of boundary treatment;

Other brick walls;

Other railings;

Windows including window glazing and including recess depths and dimensions and dormer windows;

External joinery (doors and windows);

Balconies and screens;

Secure cycle parking provision;

Dormer windows;

Street furniture;

Proposed public art on the Community Hub land.

Once approved the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details for that phase and completed prior to the first occupation of any of the residential units hereby approved within that phase, first use of the retail unit or Community Hub included in that phase, whichever is the sooner, unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of visual amenity to safeguard the appearance of the Conservation Area and the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and to secure a reasonable degree of privacy for occupiers of the proposed dwellings.

(12) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development as set out in the approved phasing programme a hard and soft landscaping scheme for that phase (taking account of the overall landscape strategy for the whole site indicated on the submitted drawing numbers 730/DHA 6 revision B, DHA 7 revision A and DHA 8 revision A) shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include an implementation timetable. The approved landscaping scheme shall be carried out fully in accordance with the timetable / approved landscaping scheme for that phase. Any trees or other plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives prior written consent to any variation.

Reason: In order to protect and enhance the amenity of the area.

(13) Prior to the commencement of the construction phase of the development as set out in the approved phasing programme, the following details shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

(i) A schedule of all proposed tree works, which shall include any works to trees adjacent to the site needed to facilitate the development hereby approved;
(ii) A Tree Protection Plan, which shall include protection of the existing hedgerow on the Wilkes Feld site; This Tree Protection Plan shall take account of the Tree Protection Plan required by condition 9 above;
(iii) An Arboricultural Method Statement, detailing all suitable methods required to ensure the effective protection of trees and the hedgerow to be retained, including but not limited to proposed methods for:

- Changes in level
- Construction of retaining features
- The location of site facilities
- The location of all drains and other services

(iv) The contact details of the arboriculturist to be appointed by the developer or his agents to oversee tree protection on the site, including the frequency of visits, and the reporting of findings.

The development of each phase shall be carried out in accordance with the approve details unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Pursuant to Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to protect and enhance the appearance and character of
Prior to the above ground construction phase of the development hereby approved, full details of existing and proposed ground levels and proposed finished floor levels for the buildings hereby approved shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details submitted shall include section drawings showing the buildings in the wider site context. Once approved the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance upon completion of the development.

Prior to the commencement of each phase of development as set out in the approved phasing programme, construction works on that phase shall not commence until a scheme for the enhancement of ecology and biodiversity has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall take account of any protected species that have been identified on the site, and in addition shall have regard to the enhancement of ecology and biodiversity generally. It shall include the enhancement measures for Bats and Birds set out in the submitted Ecology Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy by Greenlink Ecology Ltd dated 29 April 2016 and as shown on drawing numbers 16/05/36D and 16/05/37B. The submitted details shall also include a scheme of wildlife education for occupants of the residential dwellings hereby approved and a timetable for the provision of the scheme of ecology and biodiversity enhancement. The phase shall then be constructed in accordance with the approved proposals and shall be carried out in perpetuity unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect and enhance existing species and habitat on the site in the future.

Prior to the commencement of each phase of development as set out in the approved phasing programme, written details of the renewable energy provision to be used in that phase shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include design, layout, positioning, type and angles as relevant. The details shall generally be in accordance with the details submitted in the application documents (e.g. Cranbrook Renewables Statement Final Report Version 2, May 2016). Where solar PV is to be installed, the details should contain a roof plan. Once approved the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details for that phase unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of development which meets the needs of current and future generations.

Prior to the commencement of the development other than the demolition phase, hereby approved, the developer shall advise the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Southern Water) in
writing of the measures which shall be undertaken to divert the public
sewers. Once approved the development shall be carried out in
accordance with the approved details unless agreed otherwise in
writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning.

(18) Prior to the commencement of the development other than the
demolition phase, hereby approved, details of the proposed means of
foul and surface water sewerage disposal shall be submitted to, and
be approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority in consultation
with Southern Water. The development shall then be carried out in
accordance with the approved details unless agreed otherwise in
writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To avoid pollution of the site and surrounding area.

(19) Prior to the commencement of the construction phase of the
development hereby approved, a scheme to demonstrate that the
internal noise levels within the residential units will conform to the
standard identified by BS 8233 2014, Sound Insulation and Noise
Reduction for Buildings - Code of Practice, shall be submitted to and
be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The work
specified in the approved scheme shall then be carried out in
accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the
premises and be retained thereafter unless agreed otherwise in
writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect the occupiers of the dwellings from undue
disturbance by noise.

(20) The existing trees and shrubs shown on the approved plan, other than
any shown to be removed, shall not be lopped, topped, felled,
uprooted or wilfully destroyed without the prior written consent of the
Local Planning Authority, and any planting removed without such
consent shall be replaced within 12 months with suitable stock,
adequately staked and tied and shall thereafter be retained to the
satisfaction of the Authority for a period of 5 years.

Reason: Pursuant to Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning
Act 1990 and to protect and enhance the appearance and character of
the site and locality.

(21) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning
(General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order
amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order), no windows or similar
openings shall be constructed in the elevations or roofs of the
buildings, other than as hereby approved, without the prior written
consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of occupants of the adjoining
property.

(22) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning
(General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order
amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order), no development shall be carried out within Classes A, B, C, E and G of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of that Order (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order), without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of protecting the character and amenities of the locality.

(23) Prior to the first use or occupation of any of the buildings hereby approved within any of the phases of development set out in the approved phasing programme, the area shown on the approved site layout drawing as vehicle parking space and turning for that phase shall be provided, surfaced and drained in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the use is commenced or the premises occupied, and shall be retained for the use of the occupiers of, and visitors to, the development, and no permanent development, whether or not permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order), shall be carried out on that area of land so shown or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to this reserved parking space unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Development without provision of adequate accommodation for the parking of vehicles is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users.

(24) Prior to the first use or occupation of any of the buildings hereby approved within any of the phases of development set out in the approved phasing programme, the area shown on the plans hereby approved for the provision of cycle parking and storage shall be constructed and be available for use before the use is commenced or the premises occupied, and shall be retained for the use of the occupiers of, and visitors to, the development, thereafter unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable development and ensuring that alternative modes of travel are available for users of the development and to ensure retention of adequate off-street parking facilities for bicycles in the interests of highway safety.

(25) Piling or other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted, other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater.

Reason: To ensure the protection of controlled waters including underlying groundwater and the Crane Brook stream from any contamination arising from the site.

(26) The construction phase of the development hereby permitted shall not
begin until:

A) A detailed sustainable surface water drainage scheme for the site has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The detailed drainage scheme shall be based upon the proposals within the GTA Civils Ltd. Flood Risk Assessment Ref.5059/2.3F dated April 2016 and demonstrate that the surface water generated by this development (for all rainfall durations and intensities up to and including the climate change adjusted critical 100yr storm) can be accommodated and disposed of without exacerbating flood risk on or off of the site.

B) Details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The details shall include:

i) A timetable for its implementation; and
ii) A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development

which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage system throughout its lifetime.

Once approved the development hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with these approved details prior to the first occupation of any of the residential units hereby approved or the first use of the Community Hub facility whichever is the sooner and shall thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal and to ensure on-going efficiency of the drainage provisions.

Prior to the first use of the premises, details of any plant (including ventilation, refrigeration and air conditioning) or ducting system to be used in pursuance of this permission shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall ensure that the noise generated at the boundary of any noise sensitive property shall not exceed Noise Rating Curve NR35 as defined by BS8233: 2014 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings and the Chartered Institute of Building Engineers (CIBSE) Environmental Design Guide 2006. The equipment shall be maintained in a condition so that it does not exceed NR35 as described above, whenever it’s operating. After installation of the approved plant, no new plant or ducting system shall be used without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To protect the residential amenity of the locality.

(28) Any facilities used for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The bund capacity shall give 110% of the total volume of the tanks, unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Environment Agency).

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems.

(29) No infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters.

Reason: To ensure the protection of controlled waters including underlying groundwater and the Crane Brook stream from any contamination arising from the site.

(30) All footpaths shown on approved plan number 16/05/14 revision A (Proposed Site Plan showing pedestrian routes) shall be constructed in accordance with a specification and surfaced with materials, details of which should be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details submitted shall include a timetable for the provision of the footpaths. The paths shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and timetable prior to the completion of the dwelling(s) hereby approved, and thereafter shall be kept open to the public at all times unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of public safety, convenience and amenity and to ensure the satisfactory completion of the approved layout for the site.

(31) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development as set out in the approved phasing programme, before any building is first occupied or first used, details for the storage and screening of refuse shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be then be carried out in accordance with the approved details before any building is first occupied or first used, and shall thereafter be retained unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To facilitate the collection of refuse, preserve visual amenity and to reduce the occurrence of pests.

(32) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development as set out in the approved phasing programme, prior to any building being first occupied or first used, details of a refuse collection scheme shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Authority. The development shall be then be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme of refuse collection unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To facilitate the collection of refuse, preserve visual amenity and to reduce the occurrence of pests.

(33) The retail unit approved as part of this development shall be used for retail (A1 use) or financial and professional services (A2 use) only and not for any other purpose whether or not in the same use class of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2005 or any subsequent Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, or whether the alternative use is permitted by virtue of Article 3 and Schedule 2 Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order.

Reason: In order to preserve the amenity of the locality.

(34) Prior to the first occupation of any of the residential units hereby approved, access and services/infrastructure shall be provided to the boundary of the Community Hub land. A specification detailing access and services/infrastructure to be provided shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with Cranbrook and Sissinghurst Parish Council prior to the first occupation of any of the residential units hereby approved. Once approved the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning.

(35) The rating level of noise emitted from the proposed plant and equipment to be installed on the site (determined using the guidance of BS 4142 : 2014 Rating for industrial noise affecting mixed residential and Industrial areas) shall be at least 5dB below the existing measured ambient noise level LA90, T during the day time period. For the purpose of the assessment the Authority will accept 07:00- 23:00 hours as covering the day time period.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

(36) The rating level of noise emitted from the proposed plant and equipment to be installed on the site (determined using the guidance of BS 4142 : 2014 Rating for industrial noise affecting mixed residential and Industrial areas) shall be at least 5dB below the existing measured ambient noise level LA90, T during the night time period. For the purpose of the assessment the Authority will accept 23:00 - 07:00 hours as covering the night time period.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

(37) Prior to the first operation of the premises, a scheme and maintenance schedule for the extraction and treatment of fumes and odours generated from cooking or any other activity undertaken on the
premises, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any equipment, plant or process provided or undertaken in pursuance of this condition shall be installed prior to the first operation of the premises and these shall thereafter be operated and retained in compliance with the approved scheme, unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

(38) No external lighting shall be installed until a detailed scheme of lighting has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. This scheme shall take note of and refer to the Institute of Lighting Engineers Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Lighting, GN01, dated 2005 (and any subsequent revisions) and shall include a layout plan with beam orientation and a schedule of light equipment proposed (luminaire type; mounting height; aiming angles and luminaire profiles) and an ISO lux plan showing light spill. The scheme of lighting shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved scheme unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To protect the appearance of the site and locality and wildlife and local residents from light pollution.

(39) Prior to the first use of the Community Hub facility hereby approved a Management Plan for users of the site shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Management Plan shall include (but not be restricted to) the following:

- List of users of the Community Hub facility;
- Hours of operation;
- How bookings are to be managed;
- Code of Conduct for use of the Hub facility;
- Operation of equipment for amplified music;
- Complaints procedure.

The use of the Community Hub shall thereafter operate in accordance with the approved Management Plan unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

(40) Prior to the first occupation of any of the residential units accessed from the Regal Car Park or the first use of the Community Hub, whichever is sooner, the Regal Car Park improvements set out within the application hereby permitted shall be completed unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and vehicular safety and to ensure that the Wilkes Field element of the development has a satisfactory means of access.
Informatives:

1. The scheme of development will require the developer to agree terms (a) for the exchange of land parcels, and (b) with the Council and others for access, parking rights and development rights over the existing car park.

2. The applicant is advised to discuss the matter of future ownership of sewers with Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire, SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk.

3. A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development. Contact should be made with Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire, SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk.

4. Detailed design of the proposed drainage system should take into account the possibility of surcharging within the public sewerage system in order to protect development from potential flooding.

5. Your attention is drawn to the Mid Kent Environmental Code of Development Practice. Broad compliance with this document is expected.

6. Attention is drawn to Approved Document E Building Regulations 2010 (Resistance to the Passage of Sound) as amended in 2004 and 2010. It is recommended that the applicant adheres to the standards set out in this document in order to reduce the transmission of excessive airborne and impact noise between the separate units in this development and other dwellings.

7. Adequate and suitable measures should be carried out for the minimisation of asbestos fibres during demolition, so as to prevent airborne fibres from affecting workers carrying out the work, and nearby properties. Only contractors licensed by the Health and Safety Executive should be employed. Any redundant materials removed from the site should be transported by a registered waste carrier and disposed of at an appropriate legal tipping site.

8. There is a Public Right of Way crossing the site (WC110). This should be kept open and available at all times and no materials or waste arising from the development should be stored on the Public Right of Way.

9. It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure, before the development hereby approved is commenced, that all necessary highway approvals and consents where required are obtained and that the limits of highway boundary are clearly established in order to avoid any enforcement action being taken by the Highway Authority. The applicant must also ensure that the details shown on the approved plans agree in every aspect with those approved under such legislation and common law. It is therefore important for the applicant
to contact KCC Highways and Transportation to progress this aspect of the works prior to commencement on site.

(10) The recovery, treatment and disposal of contaminated soils and groundwater is regulated by waste legislation and requires an Environmental Permit. Treatment of contaminated soil by mobile plant requires a mobile treatment licence. Soil may be re-used on-site as part of a soil recovery operation by registering an exemption with the Environment Agency or by obtaining an Environmental Permit. Developers should ensure that all contaminated materials are adequately characterised both chemically and physically, and that the permitting status of any proposed on-site operations are clear. If in doubt, the Environment Agency should be contacted for advice at an early stage to avoid any delays. It is recommended that developers should refer to the Environment Agency's: Position statement on the Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice and website at www.environment-agency.gov.uk for further guidance.

(11) Where it is proposed to store more than 200 litres (45 gallon drum = 205litres) of any type of oil on site it must be stored in accordance with the Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) (England) Regulations 2001. Drums and barrels can be kept in drip trays if the drip tray is capable of retaining 25% of the total capacity of all oil stored. Informative: Care should be taken during and after construction to ensure that all fuels, oils and any other potentially contaminating materials should be stored (for example in bunded areas secured from public access) so as to prevent accidental/ unauthorised discharge to ground. The area's for storage should not drain to any surface water system.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 16/503954 - FORMER CRANBROOK ENGINEERING SITE AND WILKES FIELD, STONE STREET, CRANBROOK

PLA51/16 Planning Report and Presentation - The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application 16/503954 and this was summarised at the meeting by Mrs Gilbert, Principal Planning Officer, and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

Updates and Additional Representations – No further comments had been received on this application but it was subject to a slightly updated set of conditions, as tabled and circulated at the meeting.

Registered Speakers - There were 3 members of the public, a Parish representative and a Borough Councillor, who had registered to speak in accordance with the Constitution rules (Procedure at Meetings of the Area Planning Committees). Summaries of their views are provided below:

i. Councillor Hartley, a Parish Councillor, spoke in a personal capacity as an objector and his main points included the following:
   • There had been a proposition discussed with the developer to include the Listed Building (building C), along with buildings A and
D, for use as community facilities but the proposition had not been considered in the viability test in respect of the previous application. If these buildings had been handed over to the community in lieu of the land, on which houses could have been built, then viability might not have been an issue.

- As far as the relevance to this application was concerned, building C would have had more cultural significance if it could have been retained together with buildings A and D as they were all part of the former Bull Hotel in Stone Street. He therefore recommended the application was deferred to consider this as a more appropriate solution.

ii. Mr D Rivers, agent to the applicant, supported the application but advised that he had nothing further to add.

iii. Councillor Rook, Vice-Chairman of the Parish Council, spoke in a personal capacity as a Cranbrook businessman of 45 years standing, and a supporter of the proposal. He gave background information relating to the closure of Cranbrook Engineering and how it had adversely affected the town. He therefore considered the current proposals would help to improve the local economic situation. He confirmed that the Vestry Hall would remain in Community use. He explained that Kent Libraries had been unable to commit to the project until planning permission had been received for the new Community Hub. Finally, he advised that the Parish Poll had not been for a loan but to raise the Parish Precept for a loan.

iv. Councillor Veitch, Chairman of Cranbrook and Sissinghurst Parish Council spoke in support of the Listed Building consent. The Grade II Listed Building could become more visible and could be better appreciated if it had a new lease of life as a dwelling.

v. Councillor Dr Hall, a Parish Councillor, spoke as a Borough Councillor for the Ward of Benenden & Cranbrook. She provided historical information regarding the Listed Building and asked for assurance that its particularly fine staircase would be resurrected. Tourism was very important to Cranbrook and she considered it was a shame, that the Listed Building could not be retained along with the associated LHAs. If the application were to be approved, she asked that some artefacts such as ironwork, a fireplace, serving hatch and larder cupboards be removed and donated to the museum. However, she suggested that the application should instead be rejected or deferred, while the Parish were trying to raise funds for the hub. This could allow enough time to draw up alternative plans to retain and restore the Listed Building along with the LHAs for community use. In support of this she quoted paragraph 14 and footnote 9 of the NPPF as she considered that the adverse impact would indeed outweigh the benefits.

Matters of Clarification by Officers, Committee Members’ Questions to Officers and Committee Member Discussion:

i. Mr Baughen responded to matters raised by the speakers and reminded members of the Committee that this application was to consider the impact on the Listed Building only and not the merits of the previous application. Mr Baughen also noted that some of the features referred to by Councillor Dr Hall were not in the Listed...
Building but in the adjoining LHAs. He suggested, however, that as the Agent to the applicant was present at this meeting, no doubt the Councillor’s comments would be noted. Mr Stephenson additionally responded to the suggestion made relating to the staircase. He explained that only a small first floor element remained and otherwise only a shadow line remained on the wall. Consequently, he advised that its reproduction would not accord with current conservation principles. Councillor Hamilton suggested that reassurance could be taken from Agent’s earlier commitment to engaging a full historical record and Mr Stephenson confirmed that this was clearly stipulated by condition no (4).

Decision/voting - A motion was proposed by Councillor Backhouse, seconded by Councillor Mrs Cobbold and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation as discussed.

RESOLVED - That application 16/503954 be approved subject to the plans and conditions as updated at the meeting and as set out below:

(1) The development to which this consent relates shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this decision.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

(2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the following submitted plans/documents:

Documents:

Condition Report for Grade II listed building (on Cranbrook Engineering Site) dated June 2015 received 09/05/16;
Interim Report on the standing buildings dated January 2015 received 09/05/16;
Cranbrook Engineering – Enabling Schedule of works for new listed building dated 13 July 2015 received 09/05/16;
McCarey Simmonds letter to Mr D Rivers dated 10 July 2015 received 09/05/16;

Plans:

16/05/01 revision C (labelled ‘Block Plan’ but is location plan with site edged red) received 09/05/16;
16/05/02 revision H (Proposed Site Plan showing surrounding area) received 09/05/16;
16/05/03 revision J (Proposed Site Plan) received 09/05/16;
16/05/13 revision G (Proposed site plan showing roof plans) received 09/05/16;
16/05/25 revision F (Proposed Plans Plots 1-8) received 08/08/16;
16/05/26 revision D (Proposed Plans Plots 1-8) received 09/05/16;
16/05/27 revision F (Proposed Elevations Plots 1-8) received 09/05/16;
13/36/108 (Demolition Plan) received 11/05/16; 16/05/SK09 (Proposed floor plan of listed building) received 02/08/16.

Reason: To clarify which plans have been approved.

(3) No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include the statement of significance and research objectives, and:

- the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;

- The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication and dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

- All works and excavation shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure items of historic merit are properly recorded.

(4) No development shall take place until a written specification and timetable for a programme of building recording, to be undertaken by a competent person(s) or organisation approved by the Local Planning Authority, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implementation of that programme has been fulfilled in accordance with the approved programme and all findings submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure items of historic merit are properly recorded.

(5) Notwithstanding the submitted drawings and all supporting documentation no development shall commence in respect of those matters referred to below until written schedules of work have been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Work schedules shall be produced for and include as stated, the following:

a) Roofs, (flat and pitched): a full schedule of all proposed works affecting existing timbers, both structural and non-structural associated with the repair, construction or alteration of the roof, both historic and modern, shall be provided complete with a method statement, including plans and detailed drawings at an agreed scale, detailing how works will be carried out.

b) Roof, (flat and pitched): a full schedule of all proposed works to roof coverings, flashings, soakers, dormers, shall be provided complete with method statements, plans and details at an
agreed scale, detailing how works will be carried out. Shall include samples of proposed replacement / additional materials proposed.

c) Masonry: a full schedule for all proposed works to brickwork, stonework, including walls, chimneys, parapets, piers, window/door heads, jambs and cills and any other masonry features along with appropriate drawings to clearly identify all areas to be taken down, cut out or repointed. Submission should include provision for inspection on site of 1m x 1m sample panels showing brick sample, masonry bond, bed and perpend width and pointing finish, along with a method statement for any demolition, replacement of damaged bricks and a specification for repointing.

d) Timber framing / floor construction: a full schedule of all proposed works to existing timbers, both structural and non-structural, historic and modern associated with the repair, construction or alteration of walls or floors shall be provided complete with method statement detailing how works will be carried out including plans/elevations and detail drawings at a scale of 1:20.

e) Miscellaneous joinery repairs: a full room by room repairs schedule for all miscellaneous joinery items including but not restricted to; existing skirtings, dado rails, picture rails, panelling, staircases shall be provided complete with full sections and elevations to scale 1:5 of typical details of all new joinery items, details of mouldings shall be to a scale of 1:1 or 1:2.

f) Plasterwork - ceilings and walls both solid and partition, historic or modern: a full works schedule room by room detailing problems and solutions with method statements for all works to lathe and plaster and/or two coat with skim plaster finishes to all areas where these finishes exist or are deemed to have existed prior to dilapidations as determined by the Local Planning Authority.

g) Timber Decay - Investigation: a full schedule of works required to fully investigate and address the existence of dry rot, insect presence and other decay mechanisms shall be provided complete with method statements covering all identified works.

h) Timber Decay - Resolution: a full schedule of works detailing problems and solutions shall be provided with method statements for remedial action to treat dry rot, insect presence and other decay mechanisms. Detailed elevations and plans identifying all areas where works are to be carried out shall be provided at a scale of not less than 1:50. Where such works involve works of intervention to historic fabric the provision of additional appropriate schedules of works shall be prepared as agreed with the Local Planning Authority and in accordance with the appropriate Local Planning Authority standard 'schedule of works' conditions as if they had been applied to
the current permission.

i) Treatment of damp: A full schedule of works detailing problems and justified solutions shall be provided with method statements for damp proofing measures. Detailed plans identifying all areas where works are to be carried out shall be provided at a scale of not less than 1:50.

The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To preserve the character and historic fabric of the building.

(6) Notwithstanding the submitted drawings and all supporting documentation prior to commencement of those areas of work referred to below, the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

a) Full detail sections at a scale of 1:10 through all roof structure, floors or walls which are proposed to be altered to achieve better insulation, weatherproofing or for other purposes shall be provided complete with method statements or specifications for all proposed works and proposed materials.

b) Full detail sections and elevations to a scale of 1:5 or 1:2 of all new joinery, including but not restricted to all new windows, doors, porches, door surrounds, shutters, staircases, panelling, skirtings, dado rails, picture rails etc. In addition, sections of glazing bars and mouldings shall be to a scale of 1:1 or 1:2. Details of finishes shall also be included.

c) Full detail sections and elevations to a scale of 1:10 of the proposed interface between the existing building and the new build including intersections at roof level, ceiling level, floor level, foundation level and wall junctions where applicable.

d) Full detail sections to a scale of 1:2 of all rainwater goods and other external pipework indicating section sizes, profiles, material and method of fixing, shall be provided complete with method statements or specifications for materials and installation, along with fully detailed elevations at a scale of 1:50 showing the location of all external pipework.

e) Full detailed information of all flues, air conditioning units and mechanical ventilation that may be required, including dimensions, colour and material shall be provided complete with method statement of installation. Fully detailed elevations at a scale of 1:50 showing the location of all flues or mechanical installations shall also be submitted.

f) Full detailed layout plan and method statement for the electrical, domestic plumbing and heating fit-out shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any works are commenced on the implementation of this element of the consent. The works shall
be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To preserve the character and historic fabric of the building.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING
PLA52/16 RESOLVED – That the next Planning Committee meeting take place on Wednesday 28 September 2016, at 5pm.

URGENT BUSINESS
PLA53/16 RESOLVED – That there was no urgent business for consideration.

NOTE: The meeting concluded at 7.30 pm.