



SOUTH NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNCIL

Stage 2 Pre-application Report

Pre-application Reference No: P/2018/0249/PRM
Proposal: New community facility.
Site address: Cricket Field Culworth OX17 2AT
Date of Meeting (if applicable): 6th November 2018
Location of Meeting: Culworth Village Hall
Attendees: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nicola Butcher (SNC)• James Gosling (Architect)• Stuart Rolt (Chair of Culworth PC, Chair of Culworth Hill Field Trust) John Duggan (Coordinator of CHFT)• Norman Green (Finance Leader CHFT)• James Powell (Coach, Treasurer Culworth Cricket Club and member CHFT)• Jose Rowling (Clerk to PC, Secretary of Culworth Cricket Club, Secretary to CHFT)
Pre-application history: <p>P/2016/0292/PRM-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The initial proposal was to demolish the existing cricket pavilion and construct a larger building to serve as a combined cricket pavilion and village hall immediately to the south of the existing pavilion.• It was advised that whilst the principle of the proposed development was acceptable, there were significant issues with highways access and the risk of noise and disturbance to adjoining residents and as such we were unable to support the proposal. An alternative site was suggested, in the north east corner or eastern side of the cricket field.• Attention was drawn to the impact on the appearance of the Conservation area, the amenities of neighbouring residents, parking and highway safety along with broad guidance on designs. Further pre-application advice was recommended once initial designs were developed.

P/2017/0224/PRM-Advised as follows:

- Raised concerns regarding the proximity to the cricket field, and the need to ensure that the dimensions of a standard cricket pitch is checked against Sports England guidance to ensure that the building does not interfere with the pitch.
- Please liaise with Sport England to determine whether they are likely to object to the location of the proposal, it would be prudent to gauge their position prior to submission.
- The current siting would cause a pinch point at the south east corner of the building with 6 Butts Close - consideration should be given to rotating the building clockwise and towards the north east. However this may compromise the outlook of the field so it may be preferable to situate the building further north away from the neighbouring curtilage.
- Concerns raised by Conservation and Officer regarding design, a simpler more functional building with simpler materials would be preferable. Please refer to the Design Guide.
- Landscaping - remove the patio area and be mindful of the TPO'd oak tree and any hard surfacing surrounding this. Some removal of a small section of boundary wall to accommodate vehicular access could be acceptable. Recommend that landscaping is shown throughout the process. Native species should be used.
- Raised some reservations regarding the impact on the neighbouring property 6 Butts Close in relation to proximity, openings, noise, smells etc.
- Confirmed a new building on the existing site wouldn't be supported.

Technical Assessment

Please see the first pre-application response on P/2016/0292/PRM

Internal Consultation Responses

HERITAGE

Culworth Cricket Ground is an attractive open site located within the heart of Culworth Conservation Area and for a large part also within the setting of the Grade II* listed St Mary's Church and the listed Old Rectory and St Peters House. Any proposals should seek to preserve or enhance the character and significance of the surrounding heritage assets.

In principle there are no heritage objections to the building of a community facility however there are reservations regarding the proposals and these are as follows:

- Orientation - it is recommended that the building is re-orientated to run along the treeline of the southern boundary. The cricket ground is currently very open providing good views across the countryside and creating an attractive rural setting to the church to the north. Any loss of this open character and rural appearance has the potential to cause harm to the significance on the surrounding heritage assets. By

orientating the building along the treeline and rear boundary of the property to the south this will limit, to a degree, the encroachment of development on the open character.

- Size - it is felt that the current proposed is overly large for the site and has the potential to overshadow and adversely impact the open character of the area. It is advised that the building is reduced in size particularly length.
- Materials - the proposed materials for the building are in keeping with the character of the surrounding area; however it is advised that the design in which they are used is reconsidered as the banding may appear slightly contrived.
- Landscaping - there are no objections to the retention of the main trees along the boundary wall however due to any building on that site having an impact on the character of the conservation area and setting of the listed buildings it is advised that more trees are planted along the boundary wall near the building to provide a level of screening.

Any development within the conservation area should preserve and enhance the special character of the heritage assets and their setting. Whilst it is appreciated that a community facility is required any development on the site has the potential to cause harm to the established and valued character.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH - *Summarised, full comments attached.*

Typical pollution impacts associated with community facilities may include the break out of noise from amplified music entertainment inside the venue, noise from any external plant and machinery. Noise from inside the venue is likely to be generated by use of any amplified equipment for music/dance/signing/speech etc whilst any external sources of noise such as plant or machinery may include vents or extraction outlets for building services, chiller units and pumps etc. There may also be potential for the attendant problems of noise from visitors to the site if car park facilities or visitor congregation areas outside are likely to be overlooked by non ancillary residential amenities and used at noise sensitive periods late at night for example.

The significance of any potential pollution incident in the above respects is generally subject to the proximity of sensitive receptors, such as any non ancillary residential amenities, and several other factors including the nature and frequency of any functions involving music entertainment that are likely to take place and controls put in place to minimise the break out of noise whether engineered or managed. There are no national guidelines on the issue of separation distance but there are a number of practical solutions that should be included in the design and layout of the facility so as to prevent the break out of any music noise and minimise disturbances from other sources. This includes,

sympathetically orientating and positioning the building to avoid it being directly overlooked by noise sensitive dwellings, minimising openings direct into performance area(s) where these open out in the direction of noise sensitive premises close by, utilising suitable materials for the building fabric to minimise transmission of noise/vibration through these, providing acoustic attenuation for any windows/doors that open direct into performance areas, sympathetic positioning and sound insulation for any noise generating building service equipment, or management controls over issues of volume and opening periods etc. These are generally outlined in the Institute of Acoustics Good Practice Guide on the Control of Noise from Pubs and Clubs.

Overall, we would make no adverse comment in respect of the principle of the proposed development but would recommend the applicant to consider whether there is a likelihood of any noise from operation of the proposed development which would affect any existing non ancillary residential amenities close by. If the enquirer considers any noise impact is unlikely then any reasons for this conclusion should be fully explained and stated in the application including any noise mitigation measures that may be required whether engineered or managed (i.e. state what measures will be employed to control noise/vibration), or if a noise impact is expected then a quantified noise impact assessment should be provided and with any subsequent planning application as undertaken by an appropriate qualified acoustic consultant (details of these may be obtained from the Institute of Acoustics at www.iao.org.uk or Association of Noise Consultants at www.anc.org.uk . It would be prudent for the applicant or his acoustic consultants to consult with Environmental Protection regarding any noise impact assessment if this is needed.

ECOLOGY

I have reviewed the information regarding the proposal to demolish the old pavilion, and build a new community facility with associated parking. Please note I have not had an opportunity to visit the site and so have therefore reviewed the proposal on what information I have remotely, for example site photographs, aerial photos, GIS information, the submitted Pre-Application information and previous pre application responses.

I would recommend that the applicants employ a suitably qualified ecologist to carry out a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) of the land and any buildings/trees within the site boundary at an early stage (pre application) to identify any ecology issues that may present and give advice. PEAs have a range of purposes; one key use is in the site development process to gather data on existing conditions, allowing a preliminary assessment of likely impacts of development schemes. As a precursor to a proposed project, evaluation is made of the ecological features present, as well as scoping for notable species or habitats, recommending further surveys required for example protected species surveys, identification of potential constraints to proposed development schemes and recommendations for mitigation.

A suitably professionally qualified ecologist to carry out the PEA and surveys

can be found by searching the following website, all ecologists listed here have declared that they are fully insured for the work they carry out, and undertake at least 30 hours of CPD/training per year, this means that, as well as complying with the CIEEM Code of Professional Conduct, they are experienced and knowledgeable to the latest industry standards.

<http://events.cieem.net/ProfessionalDirectory/Professional-Directory.aspx>

Protected Species are a material consideration with any planning application therefore Natural England's standing advice to review applications that might affect protected species <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/protected-species-how-to-review-planning-applications> should be used as guidance.

Demolition of old pavilion

The old pavilion could provide roost opportunities for species of bats. All species of bats in the UK and their roost sites are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and The Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2010 (as amended). It is therefore recommended that prior to application a preliminary roost assessment is carried out to ascertain if the pavilion has any potential bat roost features and/or evidence of bat utilising the structure, this should be carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist (see above). The ecologist will from the preliminary roosts assessment make a recommendation within their report if further surveys are required to ascertain presence/absence of bats and if bats are present carry out roost characterisation surveys, consisting of between 1-3 visits carrying out dusk/dawn surveys for bats Page 2 of 2 emerging/re-entering the structure, these further surveys if required should be carried out prior to application. If bats/evidence of bats utilising the structure are found the ecologist will in their report suggest appropriate mitigation and if a European Protected Species (EPS) Mitigation Licence application to Natural England is required to enable works to go ahead.

Surveys should also be made for birds nesting within structure prior to an application. Nesting birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), suitable mitigation should be put in place to avoid disturbing breeding/nesting birds if present.

Build new community facility with associated parking

The PEA referred to above should give a full review of any ecology issues within this area and recommend any further surveys required.

The area identified for development has no statutory or non-statutory designated sites within or close to its boundary. The grassland habitat here is likely to be of little ecological value given its amenity use and management, but this should be reviewed as part of any PEA which is carried out.

The tree and shrub cover in this area appears to be mainly of young trees and shrubs planted as part of landscaping, apart from some large mature trees for example the Oak tree on the roadside which has a Tree Preservation Order. The trees in this area particularly the mature trees are likely to have potential bat roost features which maybe being utilised by bats. The trees should be

subject to preliminary roost assessment by a suitably qualified ecologist for the reasons stated above. Any further surveys should be carried out if recommended by the Ecologist and suitable mitigation followed dependant on the survey results. The Oak tree subject to the TPO (01/1976) should be retained within proposals due to the biodiversity value of the mature tree and potential for further value as it continues into its veteran stages. Parking is identified within the locality of the Oak tree, an appropriate root protection zone should be established during and post construction to minimise impacts on the tree by the proposed development which is likely to recommend no parking at least under the canopy of the tree.

The consulting ecologist may recommend further surveys than outlined above based on the findings of the PEA.

Following the PEA and any further surveys required, a suitable report (EclA) summarising the findings, assessing the impacts of the development on habitats and/or species, any appropriate mitigation required, if any EPS licence applications will be required and enhancements, should be submitted with the planning application to be considered as part of the decision making process.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seeks to incorporate enhancements for biodiversity within developments to assist in the government commits to halt net loss of biodiversity and work towards net gain. Dependant on the findings of the survey and report identified above the development could incorporate a number of biodiversity enhancements including;

1. Retaining and managing appropriately open areas of grassland for the benefit of wildflowers, and insects e.g. butterflies
2. Landscape planting and retained trees/shrubs to be managed appropriate for wildlife and additional planting of native local provenance species in a similar planting mix as that found in the locality.
3. Bird and bat boxes could be incorporated within the building design or landscaping to benefit target biodiversity action plan species such as Swifts.

SNC TREE OFFICER- no response to date.

BUILDING CONTROL- no response to date.

RECREATION AND LEISURE- no response to date.

LICENSING- no response to date.

Professional Assessment by Case Officer

Application site

See earlier report (P/2016/0292/PRM)

Proposal

Following on from two previous pre application submissions, the current enquiry seeks guidance to demolish the existing pavilion structure and replace with a new larger building in the north east corner of the field to be a combined cricket pavilion and village hall. The future of the existing village hall is to be assessed as a separate entity.

The proposed access is an in and out access on Queens Road, creating one new opening and widening an existing opening within the existing stone boundary wall. The plans demonstrate both formal and informal parking spaces, bin storage, bike storage and covered areas including a terraced area.

Planning Policy Context:

- NPPF Sections: Core Planning Principles; Section 6 para 83 and 84 (Supporting a Prosperous Rural Economy); Section 12 (Achieving well designed places); Section 8 (Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities); Section 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment); Section 16 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment):
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>
- West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policies SA, S1, RC1, RC2, BN2, BN5, BN9;
<http://www.westnorthamptonshirejpu.org/connect.ti/website/view?objectId=5130832#5130832>
- South Northamptonshire Local Plan Policies: G3, EV1, EV2, EV7, EV9, EV10, EV12, EV19, EV21, EV24, EV29, RC2:
<http://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/1128.htm>
- Supplementary Planning Guidance: Nature Conservation; Planning out Crime; Residential Design in the Countryside; Parking; Residential Extensions: <http://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/1136.htm>
- South Northants Design Guide: <http://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/8387.htm>
- Northamptonshire County Council Local Highways Authority Standing Advice
- Northamptonshire Parking Standards:
<http://www3.northamptonshire.gov.uk/councilservices/northamptonshire-highways/transport-plans-and-policies/Documents/NorthamptonshireParkingStandards.pdf>

I confirm that I will be able to support the proposal, but only on the strict provision that the following amendments are made:

- Reduction in ridge height
- Simpler palette/use of materials
- Look into options for relocating the bin store
- Redesign the maintenance building
- Avoid parking under the canopy of the TPO tree
- Subject to Sport England advice

Principle of Development

The principle of the proposed development remains acceptable as advised in previous pre application reports (originally P/2016/0292/PRM)

Siting of Building

Main Building

Firstly, as per the previous pre application advice (P/2017/0224/PRM) and our meeting on site, I must emphasise the importance of engaging and discussing the proposal with Sport England to establish whether or not they are likely to object to the position of the proposed building. As aforementioned Sport England would be a statutory consultee on any application; we cannot approve an application with an objection from Sport England without referral to the Secretary of State and therefore liaising with them prior to submission of an application would be beneficial in this case.

Since the previous proposal the dimensions of the cricket field have been determined with the two lines on the plan showing the size for junior and senior cricket. This represents another limitation within the site, the site is very constrained with the protected trees, neighbouring property and location of the senior cricket pitch boundary which falls in line with the terrace of the proposed building.

The proposed building has been moved North within the site since the previous application in line with advice. The pinch point adjacent to the neighbour still remains however due to the restrictions of the site and the fact that this area is a covered area only; given the limited options for re-siting the building this is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

It is noted that the Heritage team has raised concerns regarding the siting and scale of the existing building and the impact this would have on the Conservation area and the setting of the nearby Church. Heritage has proposed moving the building in line with the neighbouring boundary and tree line. However I have concerns that this would increase the likelihood of the proposal adversely impacting neighbouring amenities due to the close proximity to 6 Butts Close.

It is accepted that the proposal is a large linear structure; however subject to my advice below regarding design, when viewed from the Church the proposal is not, in my view, considered to have any significant impact and would cause limited harm on the openness of the area or the setting of the listed Church or neighbouring listed properties. The proposal is a single storey structure set with the tree line behind and does not inhibit the views across the open countryside behind.



The location of the building is considered to be the best option for the site whilst taking into account the various constraints such as highways, neighbours, the conservation area, listed buildings and the requirements of the use of the field and is considered acceptable.

Ancillary building

We have been provided with limited information on the ancillary machinery maintenance building proposed. The structure is to replace a pre-fabricated concrete garage located adjacent to the existing cricket pavilion, pictured below:



The principle of a replacement maintenance building is acceptable and appears from the site plan as a modest structure. The proposal would benefit from being located closer to the main building so the main building screens it from the wider area.

Design of Building

Main building

The design of the main building has moved on considerably since the previous proposal. The building now appears as two linear structures in the form of a barn with contemporary glazing towards the pitch with a veranda and covered porches and walkway areas. The scale of the proposal has been raised as a concern by Heritage. During the site meeting the size was discussed and it is noted that the measurements for facilities such as the changing areas has been taken from dimensions specified by Sport England. It should be noted that Sport England will weigh up the size of the structure in relation to the impact that this will have on the useability of the sports pitches/playing field provided. I note the concerns of Heritage however due to the facilities required with the combined nature of replacing the existing pavilion and village hall, the size of the field itself and the location of the proposal the building as a single storey linear structure does not appear as overdevelopment of the site. The proposal will be visible from Queen's Street and the surrounding area however constructed of traditional materials in a traditional linear barn style form, single storey, the proposal is unlikely to create a dominate feature within the street scene.

Some alterations to the design are required; at present the proposal does appear top heavy with the large expanse of roof and overhang. The scheme would benefit in a reduction at ridge height, the plan below shows the yellow highlighted section to be removed.



The reduction in ridge height is likely to create a reduction in roof pitch, this would mean that the view from the North elevation should demonstrate two similar pitched roofs at different heights which is considered to be an improvement.

The materials themselves are considered to be an improvement on the previous scheme and accepted by the Heritage team. I concur with Heritage's view that although the use of stone and tile is in keeping with the surrounding area the banded stone and tiling is not necessary in a proposal such as this and could appear overly decorative and contrived. The proposal is a new structure within the Conservation area and is a community building rather than a new dwelling or extension to a dwelling; it would therefore be preferable to remove the banding from the scheme and to keep the appearance simple and understated.

Proposed roof materials were discussed on site, there were legitimate concerns raised regarding damage to traditional roofing materials by cricket balls and the

like due to the proximity of the building to the pitch. Modern alternatives were discussed but it is felt that due to the structures proposed location and the surrounding area traditional roof materials are required.

Ancillary building

The materials proposed at present is brick, it would be preferable to have a timber outbuilding however as the building is to house machinery brick is considered acceptable in this instance to ensure the structure is secure. Although no elevations have been provided, the report provided by Gosling Architects limited shows the below photograph as an example of the brickwork proposed:



The brickwork shown is not considered suitable for an ancillary structure, the formal nature of the brickwork, Flemish bond with dark red stretchers and blue brick headers, is more suited to residential properties and should be reconsidered. Flemish bond or Flemish garden bond, using a single brick with less contrasting variation in colour, is shown throughout South Northamptonshire; a red stock brick is preferable in this instance.

It is likely that a brick sample panel will be required as part of any approval on site. No other details regarding design or roof materials were included as part of the pre application and will be required to determine the acceptability of the structure.

Residential Amenity

Residential amenity has been discussed through the previous pre application submission. With the submission of the current scaled plans and location the proposal in terms of location is unlikely to effect the neighbour, the applicants should ensure that there are no openings closest to 6 Butts Close. Further to comments from Environmental Protection the applicants should be mindful of noise pollution and consider looking into a noise mitigation scheme to protect the inhabitants of 6 Butts Close and those along Queens Street. It is noted that the current Village Hall is on Queens Street however the proposal is considered

likely to cause an intensification of activity given the combined use and larger facilities provided by the proposal.

I do have concerns regarding the location of the bins in the covered area to the rear, due to the prevailing wind and close proximity to 6 Butts Close there are concerns regarding smells and nuisance. An alternative location should be considered if at all practicable.

It should be noted that any comments submitted by surrounding residents during a planning application must be given due consideration.

Landscaping

The pitch itself is proposed to be reoriented following confirmation of the dimensions required. Due to this some engineering works are required to regrade part of the land, full details will be required of this as part of a full planning application. The land levels at the far end of the building were also discussed on site; further investigative work is required as to whether the land can be regraded at this point or a ramp installed without encroaching on the pitches. All details of hard and soft landscaping including trees to be retained and those to be removed will need to be provided. The TPO'd tree and memorial tree have been previously discussed and are to remain and should be kept free of parking under their canopies (which could cause damage to the roots). Please note the Heritage officers' suggestion of potentially more trees being planted, this would be welcomed but is not considered to be a planning requirement.

In relation to the landscaping proposed at present, the use of a hoggin road is not considered suitable in this location and is likely to be resisted by highways for safety reasons. This should be reconsidered.

Highways

As aforementioned the use of a hoggin road is unlikely to be accepted by highways as a suitable surface and should be reconsidered. Previous pre application advice states that you were in discussions with NCC Highways, this should continue in relation to suitable surfacing materials as well as the requirements of the proposed entrance and exit points from Queens Street. The informal parking spaces beneath the protected tree should be removed from the plans; this is an informal arrangement and is likely to raise queries regarding the suitability of this location for parking both from NCC Highways and the Tree Officer.

As previously stated the inter-vehicle visibility splays are 2m x 43m for a 20mph and 30mph road which will need to be shown on a plan alongside 2m x 2m pedestrian visibility splays. Further advice can be found on the Local Highway Authority Standing Advice Document.

Ecology

Ecology advice is shown in the comments in full above; it is recommended that a survey is carried out on site.

Trees

I am yet to receive updated comments from the Tree Officer.

CIL

Please be aware that South Northants Council have implemented a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge. However, based on the details provided, it is considered your proposal would not fall within one of the categories of development subject to the CIL Charging Schedule.

Issues still outstanding:

- Reduction in ridge height
- Simpler palette/use of materials
- Look into options for relocating the bin store
- Redesign the maintenance building
- Subject to Sport England advice
- Further detailed information required as outlined above- can be provided at application stage

Notwithstanding the officer comments above, is a Section 106 Legal Agreement likely to be required for this type of proposal?

Please see the first pre-application response on P/2016/0292/PRM

Additional plans/info required for formal planning application submission:

- CIL forms
- Site and block plans at appropriate scales
- Proposed elevations and floor plans at appropriate scales, including for the maintenance building
- Proposed materials- make, type, colour etc with samples if necessary
- Proposed architectural detailing including:
 - 1:5 scale drawings (including sections) of windows and doors (to include details of reveal, colour and materials)
 - Eaves and verge detailing
 - Lintels and cills
 - Rain water goods
 - Meter boxes (siting and colour)
- Heritage statement and Design and Access Statement, including details of community consultation undertaken and how the proposal addresses any issues raised
- Proposed operational hours and uses of the building
- Ecology report
- Tree report and survey of what is to be retained and what removed
- Hard and soft landscaping proposals (soft landscaping to include details of proposed tree, hedge and shrub planting, sizes and positions and grass seeded/turfed areas. Also to show trees and hedges to be retained including existing and proposed soil levels at base of each tree/hedgerow and minimum distance between base of tree and nearest edge of excavation)

- Proposed parking and access arrangements including surfacing materials
- Proposed site access arrangements including compliance with NCC Highways requirements
- Proposed boundary treatments
- Proposed bin storage areas and collection points
- Details of foul and surface water drainage treatment including Foul Drainage Assessment form 1 if a non-mains drainage foul drainage solution is being proposed.

I consider that it is advisable for you to proceed to a further stage of pre-application discussions before submitting an application: NO

- Subject to consultation with Sport England and the above amendments being undertaken alongside the additional information provided the Officer is satisfied with the principle of the scheme and the proposed siting and design could be supported.

Building Regulation Consent required?:

Please see the first pre-application response P/2016/0292/PRM

Date of report: 14/11/2018

Case Officer: Nicola Butcher

IMPORTANT NOTICES FOR CUSTOMERS:

You should note that the above advice represents the professional views of Council Officers and although given in good faith, cannot prejudice any decision which the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, may make at either Development Control Committee or delegated officer level. You should also note that any advice given is based upon the matters raised at any meeting(s) and upon any plans/details/information submitted by you with this enquiry form or supplied before any meeting(s) and that any alteration or addition to these could affect the outcome of a subsequent planning application. If you have not supplied a location plan with the site outlined in red, you should note that the case officer may not have been able to inspect the site if it cannot be identified and/or the case officer may not have been able to give reliable advice if the boundaries of the site are unclear. Where only a partial inspection of the site has been possible you should note that some issues, which could have a bearing on the outcome of a planning application, may only become apparent following a full site inspection once a formal application is made. You should note that the comments of external consultees or any change in local/regional/central government policy/strategies could also impact upon the outcome of any planning application. You should note that the older the pre-application advice is, the less reliable it will be when submitting a formal application and that advice given more than 2 years ago may no longer be applicable. Finally, you should

note that the Council has no legal liability in contract or in tort for the accuracy and/or quality of the advice given.

*It is recommended that you make contact with these external consultees to discuss your proposals – see below for their contact details. The comments of these external consultees could have a bearing on whether or not planning permission is granted irrespective of the pre-application advice provided by this Council.

**It cannot be guaranteed that the application will be dealt with under delegated powers. Some applications which would normally be dealt with under delegated powers will need to be decided by the Development Control Committee. Circumstances where this would occur include:

The application being 'called-in' by a Councillor within 25 days of the application being registered and with the agreement of the Chairman of the Committee and the Development Services Manager;

The application being referred to Committee by the Head of Public Protection and Development Management in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee because of its controversy or significance;

Recommendations to approve a significant departure from the development plan or other SNC approved policies and/or strategies;

The application is being made by a member or senior officer of this Council.