

a) **DOV/23/00119 – Erection of seven dwellings including the demolition and rebuilding of existing dwelling - 8 The Street, Ash**

Reason for report – Number of contrary views (18) and call-in by Cllr Conolly raising concerns regarding overdevelopment and overlooking.

b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning permission be granted

c) **Planning Policy and Guidance**

Core Strategy Policies (2010): CP1, DM1, DM13

Draft Dover District Local Plan (March 2023) - The Submission Draft Dover District Local Plan is a material planning consideration in the determination of applications. At submission stage the policies of the draft plan can be afforded some weight, depending on the nature of objections and consistency with the NPPF. The relevant policies are: SP1, SP4, CC5, CC6, PM1, PM2, T13, NE3, HE1, HE2 and HE3.

Ash Neighbourhood Plan (NP) - September 2021

ANP1, ANP3, ANP6

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021): Paragraphs 8,11, 38, 92, 110, 111, 119, 122, 124, 126, 130, 131, 132, 134, 152, 180, & 182 and Chapter 16 (historic environment).

National Design Guide & National Model Design Code (2021)

Kent Design Guide

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended)

Section 72(1) of Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990

Section 66(1) of Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990

Under the above there is a statutory duty to both preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a Conservation Area and have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest.

d) **Relevant Planning History**

TC/19/00075 - Fell four trees (T1 - yew. T2 - not known, T3 - not known, T4 - Sycamore). Approved.

DOV/20/00155 - Erection of 6 no. dwellings and works to the existing building to form 7th dwelling with associated parking and landscaping. Planning permission granted 23 September 2022.

e) **Consultee and Third-Party Representations**

Representations can be found in the online planning file, a summary is provided below:

KCC Highways – has sought clarification on the following:

- The need for double yellow lines for a length of 11m to be provided opposite the access, measured from the corner of No.11 The Street, to provide a passing place and remove the need for vehicles to override the footway mitigating this concern by way of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) subject to a separate consultation exercise and the provision of accessible parking spaces to be provided within the site access to offset the loss of spaces on The Street.
- An amendment to the plans to show that a fire tender can enter and exit the site without conflict.
- It is noted that the drag distance of refuse for residents is beyond the standard and as such it is advised that the Waste & Recycling Team at DDC are consulted. If they wish to enter the site then a swept path analysis demonstrating that an 11.4m long vehicle can enter, manoeuvre and exit the site in a forward gear should be submitted.
- It is noted that the intention is to retain the existing pedestrian gate leading onto the PROW, however, a path within the site connecting to this gate is not indicated on the plans. Such a path should be step free to ensure DDA compliance.

(Officer comment: Some of the above has been addressed on the submitted plans and is expanded upon in the highways section).

KCC PROW - PROW EE117 runs adjacent to the proposed development and raises no objections subject to reminding the applicant that there must be no disturbance of the path at any time.

(Officer comment: This can be imposed as an informative in the event that planning permission is granted)

Southern Water - Requires a formal connection to be made to the public sewer to be made by the developer or applicant. Raise no objections subject to an informative relating to the potential for a public sewer to be crossing the site.

Ash Parish Council –

- The PC is committed to providing new homes for residents and the housing need for the village has been addressed in the NP.
- The application for the removal and replanting of trees covered by TPOs (ref: 19/01474) has not been addressed.
- There is no affordable housing provision or specialist housing/bungalows to meet the needs of older residents.
- The design does not appear to respect the settings of listed buildings and buildings of note considered to be heritage assets that are adjacent to the site nor the integrity, character and appearance of the adjacent CA
- Parking – KCC minimum standards requires 16 spaces excluding garages. There is no provision for visitor parking.
- Overdevelopment - The density of the site does not reflect the constraints of the topography of the site
- Overlooking – The layout will lead to a loss of privacy for the properties in Glebelands. In particular Unit 8 is very close to the boundary.
- Access – The objection from KCC Highways states that it is not possible to provide the required splays and turning access from the Street. It is also noted that there are no details of how a pedestrian-access connection can be made. The suggested alternative access from Molland Lane would conflict with the delivery of the NP allocation. Road side refuse collection will increase congestion.

Third party Representations: 19 objections have been received and are summarised below:

- Overdevelopment of the site
- Contrary to the Ash Neighbourhood Plan for e.g. retaining a rural feel to the village.
- Not in keeping with the existing street scene
- Bungalows would be better and would meet the demand in the village.
- Given the levels difference there is clear potential for overlooking to the properties opposite
- Serious overlooking to properties to the north from Units 2 and 3.
- There are no details of street lighting in the development. Needs to be subject of a condition to avoid impact on neighbouring gardens
- Maintenance of the trees
- Removing trees
- Concern about new tree planting along the northern boundary and potential future overhanging and subsequent loss of light
- Parking problems in the village.
- The access is dangerous – relocate to Molland Lane
- The speed limit should be reduced
- Potential for additional congestion during construction phase.
- Impact on bats and other protected species
- The scheme ignores concerns of the local residents, consultees and other interested parties
- Concern regarding future development on the site
- Inadequate drainage
- Need for a condition for the developer to advise neighbours at the start of their activities and contact details of site manager
- Refuse collection arrangements

f) **1. The Site and the Proposal**

The Site

- 1.1 The application relates to a site along The Street in the settlement confines of the village of Ash. To the west is the centre of the village. The site is bound to the north by Glebelands, a 1960s development of chalet style bungalows, Molland Lane to the west and a public right of way EE120 (PROW) runs to the east in the direction of Glebelands. The western half of the site, (previously undeveloped), lies within the designated Ash Conservation Area (CA). 7 Yeomans Cottage, A Grade II listed building can be found across the road to the south of the site.



Figure 1 – Site location plan

- 1.2 The site originally comprised a 2-storey dwelling and ancillary buildings in large, landscaped grounds that over the past years has become overgrown and towards the end of last year the existing dwelling has been the subject of extensive fire damage and little of the original building can be salvaged.
- 1.3 There are trees within the site subject of a TPO, notably an individual horse chestnut to the NW corner (T11), a copper beech and a sycamore to the W boundary (T12 & T13) and a sycamore tree to the southern boundary (T14).
- 1.4 The site sits approximately 3.5m above street level and the land steeply rises from south to north.
- 1.5 Given the age, setting and architectural design of the former building, it had been considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.

The Proposal

- 1.6 Planning permission is sought to erect 7 dwellings including the rebuilding of the fire damaged property. There is an extant planning permission granted 23 September 2022 to erect 6 dwellings and carry out works to the existing dwelling on the site to form a 7th dwelling. However, due to the fire and the subsequent damage to the building, this permission cannot be implemented, hence the need for a fresh planning application. However, for all intents and purposes what is proposed under this application is no different to the scheme approved by the Planning Committee last year. The proposal includes 2 4-bedroom dwellings (Units 1 & 7) and 5 3-bedroom dwellings (Units 2-6).



Figure 2 – Proposed plan

- 1.7 Units 1, 4 & 7 are detached and Units 2, 3, 5 & 6 are semi-detached units. The dwellings exhibit a contemporary style with a material palette comprising yellow brickwork, slate roof tiles and timber fenestration. The proposal seeks to utilise the existing access to the southeast of the site from The Street. Vegetation is to be removed to facilitate safe visibility splays. The access leads to a courtyard type parking area. The development would require the clearance of vegetation from the site but none have been identified as being protected or are of any merit. None of the TPO trees would be removed. Provision is made for a total of 21 open parking spaces resulting in an average of 3 parking spaces per unit.

2. Main Issues

2.1 The main issues for consideration are:

- Principle of the development
- Impact on visual amenity and the character and appearance of the Ash Conservation Area (CA) and setting of heritage assets
- Impact on residential amenity
- Impact on highway safety
- Impact on ecology
- Other matters

Assessment

Principle of Development

- 2.2 The starting point for decision making is Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which states that if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 2.3 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that development which accords with an up to date development plan should be approved without delay whilst, where there are no relevant development plan policies or where the most important policies are out of date, permission should be granted unless policies in the NPPF for protected areas or assets provide a clear reasoning for refusing the development or where the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in NPPF as a whole. A footnote confirms that whether policies are out of date also include instances where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply or where the delivery of housing falls below 75% of the housing requirement in the previous three years. DDC can demonstrate 6.03 years of housing supply and have achieved 88% of the housing requirement.
- 2.4 It is considered that policy DM1 is the 'most important' policy for determining this application.
- 2.5 Policy DM1 places a blanket restriction on development which is located outside of settlement confines, which is significantly more restrictive than the NPPF. As a matter of judgement, it is considered that policy DM1 is out-of-date and, as a result, should carry reduced weight. As this is the 'most significant policy' it is concluded that the 'tilted balance' approach included at paragraph 11 would be engaged (save for the reasoning at paragraph 2.6 below). Policy DM1 states that development will not be permitted outside of the settlement boundaries, unless it is justified by another development plan policy, functionally requires a rural location or is ancillary to existing development or uses. The site is located within the settlement confines and therefore accords with Policy DM1.
- 2.6 The Ash Neighbourhood Plan is a material planning consideration and carries significant weight in the decision-making process. There are no specific policies in the plan that relate to housing development within the village. However, policy ANP1 relates to development in the countryside saying that it will only be supported beyond the Ash village settlement boundary where it provides for a business or community need. However, policy ANP3 is concerned with green and open spaces in new developments and says that developments of 5 dwellings or more should provide

appropriate green and open spaces in accordance with the District Council Standards, for residents' health and well-being and recreational use. This can be achieved by way of access to these via green routes and access by foot or cycle to and around the village and public amenities. Policy ANP6 seeks a demonstration of a high standard of design which respects and reinforces the local distinctiveness of its location and respects and responds to the village setting. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that the paragraph 11 'tilted balance' is disengaged where there is an adopted Neighbourhood Plan which is less than 2 years old, as is the case in Ash. As such, this application must be assessed against the traditional or flat planning balance.

- 2.7 Policy SP4 of the Submission Draft Dover District Local Plan is relevant to this application as it relates to windfall development. It says that residential infilling of a scale that is commensurate with that of the existing settlement will be permitted within the settlement boundaries of named villages, of which Ash is one, subject to a number of criteria being met, those relevant including the development being compatible with the layout, density, fabric and appearance of the existing settlement, it would not result in the loss of a green space that would compromise landscape character, it would preserve or enhance any heritage assets within its setting, it would not harm residential amenity and traffic movements can be safely accommodated by the local road network. Given the stage of the Plan and its consistency with the NPPF then this policy can be apportioned moderate weight. These criteria will be discussed below.

Character, Appearance and Heritage

- 2.8 Regard has been had for the provisions of Section 66(1) and Section 72(1) of Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990, which states that "special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses" and "special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area". In these respects, it is noted that the site is opposite 7 Yeomans Cottage, The Street, which is Grade II Listed and is partially within The Street, Ash Conservation Area. The context of the site is that of development fronting onto The Street although there is no consistency in terms of overall scale and design. The development to the north at Glebelands is completely hidden from view from The Street and only becomes apparent upon approach from Molland Lane or on foot via the PROW. The immediate feature of the application site is of a very strong 'treescape' with mature trees extending up the bank and effectively screening what was the original dwelling and its ancillary structures from view. The layout of the proposed development is inward facing and given the retention of a large part of the perimeter screening then there will be glimpses only of the built development from the road and the Conservation Area to the west. However, even when the development will be more visible in the winter months given the spacious layout then it would not be out of character with the street scene.
- 2.9 Whilst the original dwelling is not salvageable and requires rebuilding, the intention is to replicate the original building together with an extension that was the subject of the previous planning permission. The visual impact of the development in total will therefore not change as a result of the development proposed.
- 2.10 Turning to the scale, design and form and materials of the proposed development. The proposal seeks to incorporate contemporary architectural features. The application explains how this design approach responds to the character of the area making reference to a collection of gable features that echo that found in the village, providing modest rural houses set amongst a large tree canopy. The pitched roofs

create a traditional roofscape offsetting the neighbouring dwellings to the north. The use of yellow brick and slate roofs is a simple material palette that reflects the dwelling that once stood at the front of the site. The window frames will match the slate in colour to give the building a complete composition which is coherent and clear. The use of high-quality brickwork with careful and precise detailing will give depth and texture to the exterior to create a modern building of its time and setting. It is described as having an “architectural language that reflects order and proportion with large windows forming a dignified composition within the site. This language is traditional in principle, but contemporary in detail”. In turn, the site would not be highly prominent in views from the street such that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved. In reaching this view, regard has been had for the provisions of Section 72(1) of Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990, which states that “special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area”.

- 2.11 It is regrettable that the original C19 dwelling is fire damaged and a structural report confirms that it is not salvageable. The intention is to rebuild the dwelling to replicate the previous permission which was to renovate the dwelling and extend to the rear in the area where there was previously a catslide addition with a 2-storey extension with a roof form sensitive to the original dwelling. All materials would be the same as before referencing the original dwelling using buff brick to the elevations, a slate roof and hardwood painted timber fully functioning sash windows.
- 2.12 In conclusion, it is therefore considered that the development would sit comfortably within the context of the site with no harm to visual amenity or the character and appearance of the Conservation Area nor the setting of the listed building to the south. It would therefore accord with paras. 189, 197 and 203 of the NPPF as well as policy ANP6 of the Ash Neighbourhood Plan and criteria b) and e) of Policy SP4 in the emerging Local Plan.

Residential Amenity

- 2.13 The neighbouring properties that have the potential to be affected by the proposed development are those in the housing estate of Glebelands located immediately to the north of the application site, and whose rear gardens back onto the site. They are nos. 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50. And 52
- 2.14 Nos. 40 and 52 are considered to be a comfortable separation distance from the proposed dwellings to the north of the application site, to not be adversely affected by the development.
- 2.15 Turning to the remaining nos. 44, 46, 48 and 50. Nos 48 and 50 back onto the site where Unit 7 would be located sideways on to the boundary. The plans annotate a separation distance of 5m to the boundary. There is then the length of the gardens. In terms of the built development, given this separation distance there would be no harmful overbearing development. There are no windows at first floor level in the side elevation facing the rear gardens of Glebelands so there would be no overlooking.
- 2.16 In respect of Nos. 42, 44 and 46. Their back gardens would face onto the front elevations of Units 2 and 3. At first floor level there are bedroom windows facing in the direction of the boundary of the site with Glebelands but these new dwellings are positioned some distance into the application site and in turn given the depth of the gardens in Glebelands there is a comfortable separation distance such there would be no harm to the residential amenity of the occupiers of the dwellings in Glebelands.

The proposals would therefore accord with paragraph 130 of the NPPF and criteria h) of Policy SP4 of the emerging Local Plan.

- 2.17 Representations have raised concerns about the nature of any new planting on the northern boundary with the properties in Glebelands. There is already mature screening on this boundary such that the new planting will not make a significant difference to any potential overshadowing of the rear gardens of Glebelands.

Highways

- 2.18 Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy suggests that a minimum of 2 independently accessible car parking spaces be provided per dwelling, together with an additional 0.2 spaces per dwelling for visitors, acknowledging that parking should be a designed process. The application proposes 21 off-street car parking spaces within the site, which includes 2 communal visitor spaces. Adequate provision is therefore made to meet the standards and the development therefore accords with policy DM13 of the Core Strategy. To encourage and to facilitate the use of this sustainable form of transport, cycle storage provision (one space per bedroom) will be secured by planning condition to meet the requirements of Kent Design Guide and the NPPF.
- 2.19 There is no change to the access arrangements from the previous planning permission where Kent Highways raised no objection to the visibility and manoeuvring room at the site access. In turn, it has been advised that the proposals are likely to generate 3-4 two-way vehicle trips during the network peak hours which is unlikely to have a severe impact on the capacity of the highway network. It is, however, acknowledged that there is a lack of passing places in this section of The Street due to the demand for on-street parking. This therefore leads to some east bound drivers overrunning the footway immediately to the east of the site to make way for west bound drivers. It is therefore proposed to provide an 11m length of double yellow lines opposite the access to provide a passing place and avoid the need for vehicles to overrun the footway. This will result in the loss of 2 existing on-street parking places, however, as a compensatory measure, 3 additional parking spaces are to be provided within the site. These works can all be secured by way of a planning condition. The plans also show that there is adequate space for delivery vehicles to enter the site, manoeuvre and exit in a forward gear. Whilst there is a refuse collection point shown on the site the dragging distance falls short of the required measurements but DDC Waste Management is satisfied that collection can take place on the side of the road. There is no footway the site and therefore a step-free connection is proposed to the existing PROW at the rear of the site, providing safe pedestrian access to the wider footway network and bus stops, school and other services/amenities in the village. This would comply with the requirements of policy ANP3 of the Ash Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.20 Given the above the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in highway safety terms and would therefore be in accordance with paragraphs 110 and 111 of the NPPF, Policy DM13 of the Core Strategy and criteria j) of Policy SP4 of the Submission Draft Dover District Local Plan.
- 2.21 Residents have raised concerns about traffic disruption during the construction phase and that there should be a specified access to the site. A condition seeking the submission of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) is proposed. This will include on-site parking for construction workers, temporary access arrangements, measures to prevent dirt on the road. There is no control over the routing of construction vehicles to the site nor the actual access that is used. Conditions run with the land and can only be used where they would be enforceable. As such, it is not possible to

control movements of third party vehicles on the public highway network through the planning process.

Ecology

- 2.22 The EU Habitats Directive 1992, requires that the precautionary principle is applied to all new projects, to ensure that they produce no adverse impacts on European Sites. Regard has been had to Natural England's Standing Advice which suggests that given the characteristics of the site being unmanaged vegetation surrounded by dense mature trees/hedges it could provide suitable habitat for protected species.
- 2.23 The results of a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA), concluded that there were no amphibians, badgers or dormice present on the site. It made recommendations for a list of ecological enhancements that can be the subject of a planning condition. The appraisal also states that a breeding bird survey was not deemed necessary, on the basis that the site contains suitable habitat for breeding birds, but that consideration must be given to the timing of the clearance works, if any are to take place. This can be subject of a planning condition.
- 2.24 Further survey work was recommended in respect of bats and reptiles. The bat survey concluded that one species of bat was using the house as a roost. Although no bats were seen emerging/entering the outbuilding from evidence it could be that the outbuilding is being used as an occasional day or night roost. To ensure that the local bat population stays at a favourable conservation status mitigation has been recommended in the form of the provision of a bat box on a tree and a bat loft incorporated into the roof of one of the dwellings. The reptile survey concluded that none were present.
- 2.25 On the basis of the above and in consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer, it is considered that the development is acceptable and would not conflict with paragraph 180 of the NPPF.

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, Regulation 63: Appropriate Assessment

- 2.26 It necessary to consider any likely significant effects of the proposed development in respect of disturbance of birds due to increased recreational activity on the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA (as a designated European Site).
- 2.27 It is not possible to discount the potential for housing development within Dover district, when considered in-combination with all other housing development, to have a likely significant effect on the protected Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA.
- 2.28 Following consultation with Natural England, the identified pathway for such a likely significant effect is an increase in recreational activity which causes disturbance, predominantly by dog-walking, of the species which led to the designation of the site and the integrity of the site itself.
- 2.29 A Strategic Access Mitigation and Monitoring Strategy (SAMM) has been prepared and adopted by the Council in order to monitor potential impacts on the qualifying bird species for the SPA arising from development in the district and to provide appropriate mitigation through a range of management and engagement methods. This is set out at Policy NE3 of the draft Local Plan, which provides the most up to date scientific knowledge of the issue. The site lies within the 9km Zone of Influence, within which mitigation will be required.

- 2.30 This mitigation comprises several elements, including the monitoring of residential visitor numbers and behaviour to the Sandwich Bay, wardening and other mitigation (for example signage, leaflets and other education).
- 2.31 Having had regard to the proposed mitigation measures (to manage recreational activities from existing and new residents), it is considered that the proposed development would not have a likely significant adverse effect on the integrity of the protected Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA where it would make a contribution towards implementation of the SAMM. Having had regard to draft policy NE3, it is considered that the proposal would have a likely significant adverse effect on the integrity of the protected Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar sites. A contribution payment of £6,654 is therefore required and this needs to be secured by way of Unilateral Undertaking. The mitigation measures will ensure that the harmful effects on the designated site, caused by recreational activities from new residents, will be effectively managed.

Flood Risk

- 2.32 The site lies within Flood Risk Zone 1, where there is the lowest risk of flooding. However, given the size of the site, it is appropriate to consider whether the development would be likely to lead to localised on- or off-site flooding. The NPPF, paragraph 163, states that local planning authorities should ensure that flooding is not increased on-site or elsewhere, and priority should be given to the use of sustainable drainage systems. Further to this, the Planning Practice Guidance states that sustainable drainage systems should be designed to control surface water run-off close to where it falls and replicate natural drainage as closely as possible.
- 2.33 Whilst Southern Water have raised no objection in this instance, it is considered reasonable to attach the pre-commencement conditions requiring the submission of detailed schemes for both foul water and surface water disposal.

Other Matters

- 2.34 A number of third-party representations have been received raising concerns regarding the loss of trees on the site. It is relevant to note whilst the proposed development would require clearance of the existing vegetation on the site.
- 2.35 To accommodate the proposed dwellings, it would not result in the loss of high amenity value trees. The tree survey and tree protection plan has been reviewed by the DDC's Tree Officer concluding that the proposal was deemed acceptable subject to a condition requiring execution of the tree protection plan during the construction period.
- 2.36 Concerns have also been raised about who is going to maintain the new tree planting and the potential for the new tree planting along the boundary to the north of the site with the rear gardens of Glebelands to become overgrown and overbearing over time. The plans show minor tree planting to the northern boundary in the form of approximately 5 specimens. The finer detail will form part of the details of a landscaping scheme. Notwithstanding this, there are already mature trees on this boundary which already create some overshadowing to these rear gardens. The maintenance of new tree planting can be included as part of any landscaping detail.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 The development has previously been considered acceptable under planning permission ref: DOV/20/00155 and a fresh planning application is only required due to the recent fire necessitating the rebuilding of the existing dwelling on the site. There are no changes to the nature of the proposed development.
- 3.2 Being located within the built confines of the village there is no policy objection to the principle of the development. There would be no harm to the visual amenity of the locality, the character and appearance of the adjacent Conservation Area and the setting of the listed building opposite would be preserved. There would be no harm to residential amenity, the development is acceptable in terms of highway safety, drainage, trees and ecology. The recommendation is therefore to grant planning permission.

g) Recommendation

- I PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED, subject to the completion of a legal agreement to secure a payment towards the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar sites mitigation strategy and the following conditions:
- 1) Time limit
 - 2) Approved plans
 - 3) Samples of materials
 - 4) Bicycle and bin storage
 - 5) Demolition and Construction Management Plan
 - 6) Provision of measures to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the highway.
 - 7) Vehicle parking
 - 8) Use of a bound surface for the first 5 metres of the access from the edge of the highway.
 - 9) Cycle parking
 - 10) Completion of the access and associated highway alterations (parking restrictions)
 - 11) Gradient of the access
 - 12) Visibility splays
 - 13) Completion of the step-free paved connection to public footpath EE117 at the rear of the site.
 - 15) Removal of PD rights (classes A, B, C, D and E)
 - 16) Removal of PD rights for insertion of window openings at first floor level
 - 17) Joinery details, eaves details, ridge details at 1:10 for the non-designated heritage asset.
 - 18) Tree protection measures, including hand digging
 - 19) Programme of archaeological works
 - 21) Ecological mitigation and enhancement
 - 22) Landscaping scheme
 - 23) Surface water drainage details
 - 24) Foul water drainage details
 - 25) Boundary treatment and hard surfacing
- II Powers to be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions and the S106 in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

Case Officer

Lucy Holloway