



Application No: 160103

Location: Former Bus Depot, Magdalen Street, Colchester, CO1 2LD

Scale (approx): 1:1250

The Ordnance Survey map data included within this publication is provided by Colchester Borough Council of Rowan House, 33 Sheepen Road, Colchester CO3 3WG under licence from the Ordnance Survey in order to fulfil its public function to act as a planning authority. Persons viewing this mapping should contact Ordnance Survey copyright for advice where they wish to licence Ordnance Survey map data for their own use.

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey Material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller Of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Crown Copyright 100023706 2015

7.2 Case Officer: Sue Jackson

MAJOR

Site: Former Bus Depot, Magdalen Street, Colchester, CO1 2LD

Application No: 160103

Date Received: 20 January 2016

Agent: Miss Laura Dimond, Maddox and Associates Ltd

Applicant: Mr Robert Oates, Victorial Hall Management Ltd

Development: Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to deliver student accommodation (Use Class Sui Generis) across five blocks of one, two, three and four storeys to provide 230 bedspaces (59 cluster flats and 17 studio flats), communal facilities (to include bin stores, cycle stores, site management office, gym and communal amenity areas) as well as undercroft car park (20 car parking spaces), landscaping and a new public pathway through the site.

Ward: New Town & Christ Church

Summary of Recommendation: Conditional Approval subject to signing of Section 106 Agreement

1.0 Reason for Referral to the Planning Committee

- 1.1 This application was considered by the Planning Committee at the meeting on 17th March 2016. The following extract from the minutes of the meeting sets out the issues and concerns raised by members, the response by the Major Development and Projects Manager and the Committee resolution.

“Some members of the Committee voiced their concern regarding the close proximity of elderly residents to the site, the difficulty of managing the different lifestyles of the proposed neighbouring communities, the impact on nearby listed buildings and the impact of a transient group of residents in this location. Reference was also made to the proposals not being in keeping with the contents of the development brief, whether the location was appropriate for this type of development and the cramped nature of the proposals at the rear of the site. Suggestions were made regarding the potential to reduce the density of the development and to introduce an outdoor open space area. Other members of the Committee did not consider the location to be unsustainable as student accommodation and were of the view that it was beneficial to promote mixed communities along with the need to provide for safeguards to address disputes relating to lifestyle differences. It was considered possible for the opportunity to be taken to propose additional conditions to ensure a robust Management Plan was in place to address neighbour impact issues. Examples were cited, to address such issues including visits by student representatives, eviction action after three reported problems, the imposition of timescales to restrict outdoor noise during the night time and waste management and litter collection measures.

- 1.2 The Major Development and Projects Manager reminded the Committee that the application was considered to address the aims for the site in a considerable way and that a letter of support had been received from Historic England. He acknowledged concerns from the Committee members regarding the impact on residential amenity but he considered that a refusal of the application would be difficult to sustain.
- 1.3 A proposal which had been seconded, to refuse the application suggested that the Committee may be minded to determine the application contrary to the officer's recommendation in the report on grounds of lack of conformity with the development brief, adverse effect on both the setting of adjacent listed buildings and adjacent communities and over development. In accordance with the Committee's Deferral and Recommendation Overturn Procedure (DROP) the Chairman invited the Major Development and Projects Manager to indicate the likely implications should the Committee overturn the Officer's recommendation in this instance. The Major Development and Projects Manager advised against refusal on the grounds of adverse impact on amenity and in relation to its adherence to the development brief. He referred to the application having satisfied a number of aspirations for the area and the need for sound evidence to justify and substantiate a refusal. He explained that the proposal was for a quasi-residential use which could be made acceptable by the imposition of conditions. He also referred to an absence of sound reasons for refusal having the potential for costs to be awarded against the Council. In the light of this advice the Chairman determined that the DROP be invoked.
- 1.4 RESOLVED that the Deferral and Recommendation Overturn Procedure be invoked and a further report be submitted to the Committee giving details of the risks to the Council, the financial implications, possible reasons for refusal as well as advice on whether representations constituted evidence to support reasons for refusal and proposed provisions to be included in an accommodation Management Plan to address instances of noise, disturbance and littering".
- 1.5 The report below discusses possible reasons for refusal, sets out the legal advice received regarding "representations" and comments on the Management Plan.
- The report concludes that reasons for refusal discussed by the committee could not be defended at appeal and would be likely to result in a costs award against the council.
- 1.6 The previous report to members is produced in Appendix 1. The amendments are those on the amendment sheet for the 17th March meeting plus the response from Essex County Council SUDS team withdrawing their objection.
- 2.0 Government advice in respect of the award of costs is set out in National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)**
- 2.1 The following quote is from the NPPG "What type of behaviour may give rise to a substantive award against a local planning authority?"

2.2 Local planning authorities are at risk of an award of costs if they behave unreasonably with respect to the substance of the matter under appeal, for example, by unreasonably refusing or failing to determine planning applications, or by unreasonably defending appeals. Examples of this include:

- failure to produce evidence to substantiate each reason for refusal on appeal
- vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about a proposal's impact, which are unsupported by any objective analysis".

3.0 **Possible reasons for refusal**

1. The close proximity of elderly residents to the site, the difficulty of managing the different lifestyles of the proposed neighbouring communities

3.1 Environmental Protection has been asked to comment on these concerns and the response is set out below:

"Potential Environmental Protection issues

Disturbance from the demolition/construction phase, Light, Car park – noise and fumes, Plant noise, Noise from functions, Noise from individual rooms, Noise from outdoor areas.

Issues considered in detail and potential mitigation measures/conditions

Demolition/construction phase -Noise and general disturbance from this phase of the development is inevitable with residential properties located nearby. Environmental Protection has previously recommended conditions limiting the working hours and the provision of method statement to ensure dust and other impacts of the demolition and construction phase are minimised to practical levels.

Light- General pollution and illumination nuisance should be adequately controlled in accordance with the recommendations of the Institute of Lighting Professionals by the condition previously recommended by EP. *Officer comment: see draft condition 18*

Car park- This is located to the western side of the site as far as possible from residential properties. It is accessed via the busy Magdalen Street and has few spaces close to the residential boundary. A close-boarded 2m high fence has been recommended and this will both screen from fumes and attenuate noise. Being formerly a bus depot the proposed activity will be negligible compared with the previous use. *Officer comment: condition added*

Plant noise- There will be some building plant such as air-conditioning and this will be designed to comply with our conditioned requirements in accordance with the current British Standard to ensure that it does not cause a nuisance to residential units on- or off-site.

Noise from functions- There is only one communal area noted on the plans. This is located on the ground floor close to the main Magdalen Street entrance and is located well away from the residential properties to the rear. It is unlikely that noise from this area would adversely impact the properties in Winnock Road, with proposed buildings D and E acting to an extent as an acoustic barrier. However, no use of amplified

sound audible at the site boundary; closure of all external doors and windows when events involving amplified sound take place, or similar, could be conditioned if deemed necessary. *Officer comment this condition would be difficult to enforce and is not recommended*

Noise from individual rooms (music) - This is potentially the largest issue with regard to impact on residential amenity. However, the following factors should ensure that the potential is minimised:

- The rooms are generally too small for parties of any size.
- The current trend is to listen to music through personal devices; either via headphones or small speakers. Sound from these systems does not travel in the same way as the older stereos with large bass speakers etc.
- The buildings nearest the boundary with the properties in Winnock Road have been designed with the access landings on the Winnock Road side and therefore do not have any windows facing sensitive receptors. Therefore internal noise from individual rooms should be contained within the building envelope.
- Buildings further away from the residential boundary do have some windows facing Winnock Road, but many of these will be acoustically screened by buildings D and E. Any noise will also attenuate over the increased distance to the Winnock Road properties.
- Building C does have some windows to the side elevations to the south and some unscreened windows facing Winnock Road, although further from the residential boundary. If deemed necessary these windows could be conditioned to be non-opening with trickle ventilation. *Officer comment: this condition is not considered necessary*
- In order to mitigate against external noise the proposed windows will be designed with high levels of sound insulation and alternative means of ventilation. This will reduce noise egress, even with windows partially open.
- We work in partnership with the University of Essex and have developed protocols for dealing with particularly noisy students (attached in Appendix 2 which have proved effective.
- We understand that a site manager will be present 24-hours in order to ensure students behave reasonably. The presence of a 24-hour site manager can be conditioned, as can a site management noise plan. *Officer comment: this matter is included in the proposed legal agreement*
- In the unlikely event of the above measures failing, in the case of individual students we have extensive powers with regard to controlling noise nuisance.

Noise from outdoor areas- There is only one small courtyard area. This is contained within the centre of the site and is well screened by the boundary buildings. It could be conditioned that no amplified sound shall be permitted outside. *Officer comment: condition added in response*

There is potential for noise from rowdy students returning home on foot late at night. The main site entrance is located on the busy Magdalen Street and is shielded from the Winnock Road properties by buildings D and E. It is not envisaged that many residents will use the Winnock Road entrance at night as they are likely to be coming from the town centre.

The recommended 2 metre-high close-boarded fence along the residential boundary will help mitigate noise produced at ground level. Signage requesting residents to respect neighbours could also be conditioned, as could an overall site noise management plan previously mentioned”.

- 3.2 The applicant has submitted details of two applications for student accommodation refused planning permission and allowed at appeal. Obviously all applications are determined on their individual merits and all sites are different, but one decision is of relevance as one of the main issues was the change from retirement apartments to student accommodation. The application was refusal on grounds of the impact of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers with specific reference to overlooking/loss of privacy, noise and disturbance; in particular during unsocial hours and the development would lead to anti-social behaviour and littering. The Inspector considered these concerns could all be satisfactorily addressed by the implementation of the Student Accommodation Management Plan, which included 24 hour staffing.
- 3.3 The applicant has submitted a Management Plan (MP) described in below, the plan includes 24 hour security and proposes the setting up of a Community Steering group.
- 3.4 The proposal involves purpose built student accommodation with a 24 hour security presence and is different to individual dwellings occupied as Houses in Multiple Occupation. Environmental Protection has a protocol for student accommodation which applies whether the accommodation managed by the university directly or privately. Environmental Protection has indicated they would not be able to defend a reason for refusal based on the adverse impact of the student accommodation on neighbours. Any refusal based on this concern is therefore unsubstantiated by evidence and vulnerable to appeal and potentially an award of costs.

2. The impact on nearby listed buildings and the impact of a transient group of residents in this location.

- 3.5 Historic England provides expert advice to central Government and Local Authorities on development proposals and their impact on the historic environment including heritage assets. Their response to the development and its impact on the adjacent listed buildings and conservation area is set out in full in the report; the Recommendation is set out below”

“Historic England consider the proposed redevelopment of this major site would not cause harm to the significance of the setting of the abutting grade II listed Kendall Almshouses or the adjacent Colchester New Town Conservation Area. The scale, massing and detailed design of the residential scheme would be an enhancement on the current streetscene in this prominent location on Magdalen Street. We would have no objections should your authority be minded to approve the application for planning permission”

- 3.6 Members will note that Historic England considers the development would be “an enhancement to the current street scene” and in view of this unequivocal support from the specialist consultee a reason for refusal based on adverse impact on the adjacent listed buildings could not be substantiated and is likely to lead to an award of costs against the council at appeal.

3. Proposals are not in keeping with the contents of the development brief, whether the location was appropriate for this type of development

- 3.7 The development brief is one important material consideration in determining the application but it also has to be determined in accordance with national and local policies together with other relevant material planning considerations. The site is ‘brownfield’ within a regeneration area and close to the town centre, the bus station and a railway station. Magdalen Street has a mixed character; containing a variety of uses which include residential, retail and commercial. The brief is not prescriptive and cannot predict all uses that may come forward. Whilst student accommodation is not referred to in the brief it is in keeping with other uses in the area and the edge of town location. The development proposal satisfies many of the criteria in the brief including minimising impact on air quality, limited traffic generation, providing buildings set back from the carriageway forecourts to road frontage with tree planting, a pedestrian link between Magdalen Street and Military Road is also provided and the scheme retains heritage assets. In fact student accommodation would generate significantly less traffic than other uses referred to in the brief and would have less of an adverse local environmental impact on the surrounding area than some other types of development/uses where car trip generation is much higher.
- 3.8 The NPPF has a presumption in favour of sustainable development and promotes the development of brownfield sites. The development satisfies the Councils regeneration aspirations. A reason for refusal based simply on the fact that student accommodation is not mentioned in the brief could not be defended at appeal.

4. Overdevelopment

- 3.9 A proposal would constitute overdevelopment if it appeared cramped and out of keeping with adjacent development resulting in an adverse impact on the street scene and/or adjoining properties and usually the development would not satisfy the Councils standards such as parking and amenity space standards.
- 3.10 The proposed development ranges in height between one and four storeys but is no higher than adjacent buildings and having regard to the larger building forms that are already a characteristic of the immediate surroundings and consequently would not look out of place in the street scene. There is a significant change in levels between the site and the almshouses to the rear and as a result the new buildings would not appear overbearing. The buildings have also been carefully modelled and fenestrated so there are no overlooking or privacy/amenity issues.

- 3.11 The “Adopted Parking Standards” do not include a standard for student accommodation. On other student development a standard of 1 space per 5 bedspaces has been accepted elsewhere. Whilst the application proposes only twenty parking spaces; those students not eligible for a parking space would be required to sign a lease that includes a clause that prevents them from bringing a vehicle to Colchester during term time. The development also includes a travel plan and an “Operational Management Plan.” There is also no amenity space standard for student accommodation similar to hotel uses. The application provides external courtyard areas between the buildings as well as a pedestrian link between Magdalen Street and Military Road and a landscaped area to the street frontage.

Conclusion

- 3.12 It would be difficult to substantiate a refusal reason on the grounds of overdevelopment at appeal as the development would not result in material or demonstrable harm to the surrounding area or neighbouring properties and parking and the amenity spaces around the buildings are considered acceptable.

4.0 Whether representations constituted evidence

- 4.1 The Councils planning solicitor has provided the following advice;

“My view is that where a consultee has provided substantiated, independent and verifiable evidence, then it would be feasible to treat such representation as evidence. For example, if a consultee has produced written findings from an expert which demonstrates the impact on the adjacent communities, then I think it would be safe to use such representations as evidence justifying a refusal. However, where there is no material evidence to support or substantiate their arguments, then representations should be treated purely as representations but not as evidence. My concern of course is that if the application is challenged and the Council seeks to defend its position by arguing that the application was refused on the basis of supporting evidence, we would then be required to produce such evidence and the mere reliance upon a statement made by a consultee would not I believe constitute evidence”.

5.0 Operational Management Plan

- 5.1 A site specific management plan has been submitted the document is produced at Appendix 3. The main points are summarised below;
- Our objective is to commit to the local areas in which we operate and to form lasting relationships with the local community
 - Our principle objective is to integrate any new development into its community and we pride ourselves on establishing successful relationships with our neighbours through transparency and trust.
 - Victoria Hall recognises that each new community is individual and that each new environment gives rise to unique challenges and opportunities...
 - Magdalen Street itself is largely commercial in nature, but the surrounding hinterland is residential and we are acutely aware of the close proximity of existing residential properties to the site and the need to protect the amenities and general wellbeing that existing residents currently enjoy. We would therefore propose to establish a Community Steering Group that will create a regular forum for open discussion of concerns, but also a forum for generating ideas to help strengthen

ties with the community. The forum would include members of the local community, senior Victoria Hall Operations Management, the accommodation Hall Manager and most importantly student representatives. Accountability lies at the heart of transparency and actively engaging the students themselves within the forum will help to engender a sense of accountability and an understanding of the environment and the mixed community within which they live and study.

- **Security Arrangements-** Victoria Hall employ 24-hour Caretaking/Security staff specifically in order to provide assistance and support to students, staff, visitors and members of the local community. Their function is to ensure, as far as is possible, the personal safety of students, staff and visitors; the wellbeing of the local community, particularly neighbouring properties; the security of residential buildings and the protection of personal property. Security Patrols Caretaking / Security staff are responsible, throughout the 24-hour period, for patrolling the exterior and interior of the complex and for responding to incidents. Whilst on patrol, these staff will deal proactively with any noise issues to ensure that disturbance to other residents as well as surrounding neighbours is minimised. These patrols are increased in the event of incidents occurring which warrant ongoing attention
- **Staffing** The staff team within a Victoria Hall site comprises of a Hall Manager, an Assistant Manager and 2 no. Caretakers who are based on-site and supplemented by additional Security guards. A Business Relations Manager, Operations Manager, FM Manager, Health and Safety Assistant and Child Protection Officer are also employed by Victoria Hall to provide support and guidance. These positions are based off site. Victoria Hall also employs casual staff to assist as and when required.
- **Unsociable Behaviour of Some Students** To try and prevent and/or reduce the level of unsociable behaviour of our residents, Victoria Hall undertake: To visit all local complainants in the community who are concerned at the anti social behaviour committed by students of Victoria Hall. To investigate matters, of a purely internal nature, resulting from student misbehaviour. To give advice, guidance and support to all members of Victoria Hall staff in dealing with students who have misbehaved or contravened their Tenancy Regulations. To introduce a central database of offenders which would be accessible to those members of the Police and University who have a vested interest in such matters.
- **Disciplinary Issues** Most of our residents act in a responsible manner having a respect for themselves, neighbours and property. There are some, however, who act inappropriately which often results in the requirement for disciplinary action to be taken. Noise in general, antisocial behaviour, loud music both inside and outside the hall, deliberately setting off fire alarms and engaging in criminal activity, are all areas of concern and it is essential that all such incidents are dealt with quickly and effectively. To assist in managing potential situations / incidents Victoria Hall has drawn together a useful guide for Hall Managers which sets out how to try and ensure the effective management of low level incidents of anti-social behaviour, and how the support of the University concerned can assist in dealing with serious incidents of anti-social behaviour. There is evidence to support that dealing with these types of incidents quickly prevents escalation into more serious or more frequent incidents
- **Cleaning /Waste Management** Victoria Hall staff will ensure all elements of the accommodation (both internally and externally) maintain a good, clean, stain and graffiti-free appearance, ensure repairs to damage of the building fabric and services is delivered through a responsive maintenance service, with emergency

assistance available 24 hours per day, 365 days per year. Grounds Maintenance will use reasonable endeavours to ensure all hard landscaped areas are safe and accessible, and kept free from graffiti, litter, weeds, waste and other debris, ensure all soft landscaped areas are kept free from litter and other debris and are tended to produce a well-kept and cared-for appearance, ..., use reasonable endeavours to provide an environment that is clean, tidy, free of odour. The Magdalen Street scheme includes a dedicated refuse store, to be managed through regular weekly collections. The site caretaker will supervise on collection days, ensuring that the bins are returned to the store once refuse vehicles have left the site. The refuse store will be subject to regular cleaning. With respect to our general waste management procedures, Victoria Hall will always use reasonable endeavours to: ensure the frequent collection and removal of all waste in a hygienic manner from the designated bin store; ensure that sufficient capacity is available to cope with the quantity of rubbish within the accommodation and increase storage provision if necessary, ensure that collection is at such times and in such a manner as to cause the minimum level of disturbance to residents, neighbours and visitors; ensure that collection is at such times and in such a manner so as to comply with all relevant statutory requirements and cause the minimum of risk to the health and safety of residents, neighbours and visitors, ensure that collection is undertaken at such times and in such a manner so as to comply with all relevant statutory requirements and cause the minimum of risk of rodent, insect or other infestation; ensure adequate recycling facilities are available”.

6.0 Conclusion

- 6.1 Officers have given careful and detailed consideration to the concerns raised by Members but in this instance are not been able to identify and recommend any reasons for refusal which they consider could be successfully defended at appeal. In the absence of any evidence and lack of support from “expert” consultees the likelihood of costs being awarded against the council at appeal would be high. The previous recommendation of a conditional planning permission subject to the prior signing of a legal agreement is recommended. A planning permission granted by the council and subject to conditions and a legal agreement gives greater certainty than a potential appeal scenario founded on unsubstantiated reasons with a high degree of vulnerability.

The previous report to members is produced in Appendix 1

7.0 Amendments to the previous report are set out below

- 7.1 The description was revised during the consideration of the application and should refer to 17 studios and 59 cluster flats, paragraph 4.2 should also be amended (the number of bed spaces is not affected)
- 7.2 Condition 2 drawings numbers amended The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the submitted Drawing AFM1512 PL-10-SITE, AFM1512 PL-10-00 rev C, AFM1512 PL-10-01, AFM1512 PL-10-02, AFM1512 PL-10-03, AFM1512 PL-10-BASE, AFM1512 PL-10- ROOF, AFM1512 PL-20-A-100, AFM1512 PL-20-B-101, AFM1512 PL-20-C-102, AFM1512 PL-20-C-103, AFM1512 PL-20 -D-104 AFM1512 PL-20-E-105, AFM1512 PL-30-01, AFM1512 PL-40-SS-01, AFM1512 PL-40-SS-02 AFM1512 PL-40-SS-03, AFM1512 PL-50-A-01, AFM1512 PL-50-B-02, AFM1512 PL-50-C-03 AFM1512 PL-50-D-04, AFM1512 PL-50-

E-05, AFM1512 PL-50-ST-100, AFM1512 PL-50-ST-01 AFM1512 EX-10-01, AFM1512 EX-50-02, AFM1512 EX-50-03, AFM1512 EX-40-04, AFM1512PL-30-01 and LANDP001 rev)3.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to the scope of this permission and in the interests of proper planning.

- 7.3 A minor rewording of conditions 3, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29 and 32 is proposed to allow demolition to take place prior to the condition being discharged
- 7.4 A minor rewording of condition 19 is suggested so that details of the insulation to the gym is required prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the development
- 7.5 Since the publication of the previous report a response has been received from Essex County Council Flood & Water Management Planning & Environment withdrawing their objection. They comment as follows “As the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) this Council provides advice on SuDS schemes for major developments. We have been statutory consultee on surface water since the 15th April 2015. In providing advice this Council looks to ensure sustainable drainage proposals comply with the required standards as set out in the following documents:
- Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems
 - Essex County Council's (ECC's) adopted Sustainable Drainage Systems Design Guide
 - The CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753)
 - BS8582 Code of practice for surface water management for development sites.

Lead Local Flood Authority position

Having reviewed the Flood Risk Assessment and the associated documents which accompanied the planning application, we do not object to the granting of planning permission. The proposed development will only meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework if the following measures as detailed in the FRA and the above mentioned documents submitted with this application are implemented and secured by way of planning condition on any planning permission.

No works shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include but not be limited to:

- Investigation into the feasibility of infiltration on site. Should this prove acceptable this should form the basis of the surface water drainage strategy. If this is found not to be possible discharge from the site must not be more than 50% of the existing 1 in 1 year brownfield rate for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 event plus a 30% allowance for climate change. This should be based on a detailed assessment of the existing on site drainage system.
- Written evidence that permission has been granted from Anglian Water to discharge into the existing drainage network. Further information should be sought about the viability of connecting to the existing surface water sewer.

- Provide sufficient surface water treatment for all elements of the development, in line with the CIRIA SuDS manual (C753)

The scheme shall subsequently be implemented prior to occupation.

Reason

- To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site.
- To ensure the effective operation of SuDS features over the lifetime of the development.
- To provide mitigation of any environmental harm which may be caused to the local water environment

No works shall take place until a Maintenance Plan detailing the maintenance arrangements including who is responsible for different elements of the surface water drainage system and the maintenance activities/frequencies, has been submitted to and agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Reason to ensure appropriate maintenance arrangements are put in place to enable the surface water drainage system to function as intended to ensure mitigation against flood risk.

The applicant or any successor in title must maintain yearly logs of maintenance which should be carried out in accordance with any approved Maintenance Plan. These must be available for inspection upon a request by the Local Planning Authority. Reason To ensure the SuDS are maintained for the lifetime of the development as outlined in any approved Maintenance Plan so that they continue to function as intended to ensure mitigation against flood risk.

- 7.5 Prior to the occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted a 2metre high fence shall be erected along the boundaries of the site in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved details shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjacent neighbours.

- 7.6 No amplified sound is permitted outside the buildings.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjacent neighbours.

8.0 INFORMATIVES:

- 8.1 Essex County Council has a duty to maintain a register and record of assets which have a significant impact on the risk of flooding. In order to capture proposed SuDS which may form part of the future register, a copy of the SuDS assets in a GIS layer should be sent to suds@essex.gov.uk.
- 8.2 Any drainage features proposed for adoption by Essex County Council should be consulted on with the relevant Highways Development Management Office.
- 8.3 Changes to existing water courses may require separate consent under the Land Drainage Act before works take place. More information about consenting can be found in the attached standing advice note.