

ITEM:		RECOMMENDATION:	APPROVAL
REF NO:	3PL/2018/0740/F	CASE OFFICER	Lisa ODonovan
LOCATION:	ROCKLANDS Model Farm Chapel Street, Rockland St Peter	APPNTYPE:	Full
APPLICANT:	Mr & Mrs P Dunning Manor Barn Caston Road	POLICY:	Part In Set Bndry
AGENT:	Peter Codling Architects 7 The Old Church St Matthews Road	ALLOCATION:	N
PROPOSAL:	Improvements and upgrade to existing access, demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of one new self build dwelling and garage	CONS AREA:	N
		LB GRADE:	N
		TPO:	N

REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The application is brought to committee as the recommendation is contrary to Policy.

KEY ISSUES

Principle of development
Impact upon character and appearance of area
Amenity impact
Impact upon highway safety
Impact upon Protected Species
Trees

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

This application seeks full planning permission for the alterations and improvements to an existing access; demolition of existing outbuildings; and the erection of one dwelling and linked 2-bay garage on land to the north of Model Farm. The proposed dwelling would be constructed of red facing brick and black and red pantiles for the roof, although precise details have not been provided. The proposed dwelling is a two storey, four bed detached dwelling.

SITE AND LOCATION

The application site lies outside but adjacent to the Settlement Boundary for Rocklands and is currently used for the keeping of horses. The access to the site and the existing dwelling Model Farm to the south falls within the Settlement Boundary. The site is bounded to the south and south west by residential dwellings, to the north by agricultural land, and to the east by open land. The boundaries to the site consist of trees and hedges.

EIA REQUIRED

No

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

3PL/2018/0088/F - Alterations and improvements to existing access. Demolition of existing outbuildings, erection of two new dwellings and garages - Refused

3PL/2016/1361/F - Alterations and improvements to existing access. Demolition of existing outbuilding. Erection of three new dwellings and garages - Refused and dismissed at appeal

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following policies of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the adopted Site Specific Policies and Proposals Document, including the Proposals Maps, have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application. The provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance have also been taken into account, where appropriate

CP.04	Infrastructure
CP.10	Natural Environment
CP.11	Protection and Enhancement of the Landscape
CP.14	Sustainable Rural Communities
DC.01	Protection of Amenity
DC.02	Principles of New Housing
DC.16	Design
DC.17	Historic Environment
DC.19	Parking Provision
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance
SS1	Spatial Strategy

OBLIGATIONS/CIL

Not Applicable

CONSULTATIONS

ROCKLANDS P C

Rocklands Parish Council wish to object to the above application on the following grounds: This is the third application that has been put forward for this land in the past few years. The 1st was for 3 dwellings, the 2nd for 2 - both of which were refused, primarily on the basis that the proposed access was on a tight bend, onto a narrow street without pavement and situated too close to the existing farmhouse and adjacent property

Brandywell, so that traffic accessing the site would have impacted on the privacy of neighbours and any future residents of Model Farm. This remains the case with this application for 1 dwelling. Also, it represents backland development, outside the settlement boundary - both principles of development that would set an unwelcome precedent for the future in Rocklands. The applicant refers to Breckland's lack of a five year housing land supply, which, considering that this is for one house, really has no relevance to this application at all. This application would breach other, more serious planning considerations, such as the loss of privacy to the neighbouring houses and infill of previously open land. There could also be complications for future residents of Model Farm with the shared driveway and access to another property sited behind this dwelling. The new proposal has provision for 3 vehicles and together with service vehicles, deliveries and so on, could mean considerable traffic disturbing the residents of Brandywell and Model Farm in particular, as well as other properties that back onto this plot of land. All this traffic would exit onto the narrow Chapel Street. Likewise, claiming that this development would support a strong, vibrant community - again we would dispute that one house could make any appreciable difference, either economically or socially. There is no bus servicing Rocklands, so the property would be reliant on the car to access the wider range of services offered in Attleborough. Also, in the Planning Statement, the applicant tries to draw parallels with a development in Great Ellingham. This is totally irrelevant as Great Ellingham is a nominated service centre village with substantial applications and building taking place. It cannot be compared to Rocklands, which is a rural settlement, already adding to and exceeding the recommended percentage of new housing to its stock on an annual basis. The applicant also quotes an application, which Rocklands Parish Council approved, (3PL/2016/1119/O) which was initially refused by Breckland, but granted on appeal, for a single dwelling on Low Lane at the far end of the village. We had acknowledged that this would be just outside the settlement boundary but as there was going to be no impact on other neighbours, outside any flood areas in the village that this was an acceptable development. We strongly object to this application for all the reasons shown above. We would urge Breckland to not allow this application at Model Farm.

TREE AND COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTANT

The central area of the site is clear with the only trees being on the boundaries. I cannot see any trees which are likely to be implicated by the construction of the dwelling or the access.

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS

The Highway Authority has commented on a number of applications for this site most recently 3PL/2018/0088. The current application reduces the density of the development to a single dwelling. From a highway point of view the advice remains as previously given.

The site lies to the north east of a proposed residential development which was the subject of Planning Appeal Decision APP/F2605/W/16/3154802.

The Appeal inspector had concerns regarding the potential for pedestrian/vehicular conflict as a result of the severely restricted visibility from the site access onto Chapel Street. However the Inspector noted-

"Rockland St Peter provides a good range of facilities and the Council have accepted that the village is a sustainable location for housing development"

"I saw that the local services were available within walking distance of the appeal site along Chapel Street and The Street. However, both streets are unlit with no dedicated footway or cycleway. While therefore there may at times be some dependence on the car to access facilities, particularly during the winter months I cannot rule out the possibility that pedestrians and cyclists would be actively using Chapel Street to access local services. I note the representations received by occupiers of surrounding properties confirm this occurs. Therefore I consider that future occupiers of the properties would have a choice of alternative sustainable transport options to reach the local services. I would concur therefore that the site is within an accessible location".

On the basis that the appeal Inspector considered Chapel Street to be within a sustainable location, but

equally accepted that there may be some dependence on the use of the car to access facilities. They consider they would have difficulty in substantiating an objection to the principle of 1 dwelling in this location and the resultant traffic generation. The submitted proposal can with the removal of the existing hedge provide an acceptable level of visibility onto Chapel Street. It also includes proposals to upgrade the existing access. If minded to approve appropriate planning conditions required.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER

I have looked at the Geo-Environmental Desk Study report reference 0405/1 by Goldfinch Environmental Ltd dated November 2016 and at the responses provided by Martin Howe, Architectural Technician at Peter Codling Architects. On the basis of the information provided, I understand that the pump is linked to a former water well and that the disused foundry is located on the proposed access road only. As such, I have no further comments to make.

PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY OFFICER

No objection in principle to the application but would highlight that a Public Right of Way, known as Rocklands Footpath 4 is aligned along the northern boundary of the site. The full legal extent of this footpath must remain open and accessible for the duration of the development and subsequent occupation.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SERVICE

No objection subject to condition.

ECOLOGICAL AND BIODIVERSITY CONSULTANT

No objection subject to conditions.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICERS

There are no objections or comments on the grounds of Environmental Protection, providing the development proceeds in line with the application. Please note that the development is located in an area in which the ground conditions have historically led to problems with poor drainage. As the applicant is planning to use package treatment plants they should ensure that the system has sufficient capacity to cope with the expected foul water from the development, complies with current Building Regulations and has the necessary Environment Agency Consent. Please note owners of private foul drainage systems may be held responsible for pollutions incidents involving foul water and it is important to regularly maintain such systems and keep them in good repair.

HOUSING ENABLING OFFICER

No Comments Received

REPRESENTATIONS

Site notice erected: 11-07-2018

Consultations issued: 04-07-2018

38 representations received 4 in support and 34 objecting.

Main points of objections relate to:

- Outside settlement boundary
- Previous refusals and appeal dismissed
- Unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties
- Unsustainable development
- Highway safety and dangerous access, no footpaths
- Boundary disputes
- Ecology/wildlife issues

- Drainage ,sewerage and sewerage issues
- Backland Development

The comments raised in respect of the boundary issues were relayed to the Agent who advised that the red line is correct. Notwithstanding this, it should be noted that boundary disputes are a civil issue that would need to be addressed outside of the planning remit.

ASSESSMENT NOTES

1.0 Principle

1.1 The site is located outside the Rocklands Settlement Boundary and therefore the application is contrary to Policies SS1, DC2 and CP14 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2009. The principle of the proposal is therefore not accepted.

1.2 Paragraph 10 of the NPPF states that at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 11 further states that proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved without delay, and where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining applications are out-of-date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

1.3 The Council cannot demonstrate a current 5 year housing land supply and therefore the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Document are not considered up-to-date and therefore the material considerations are assessed in line with the sustainable development roles within paragraph 8 of the NPPF:

- economic, to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
- social, to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and
- environmental, to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

1.4 Economic - The proposal would provide one new dwelling closely related to the existing settlement boundary and would therefore make a positive, albeit small, contribution to the housing supply. The proposal would provide limited short-term economic benefits through labour and supply chain demand required during construction.

1.5 Social - The village of Rocklands is classified in Policy SS1 as a rural settlement. It is split into two sections, one to the north is known as Rockland St Peter and one to the south is known as Rockland All Saints, the services (a public house, a shop with post office, a primary school and village hall) are available within the southern section. The application site is approximately 0.5 mile away from these services and facilities, which equates to an approximate 10 minute walk. Whilst rural settlements are usually completely reliant on higher order settlements for services and facilities, it is acknowledged that there are some available

in Rocklands itself and Great Ellingham, a Service Centre Village is approximately 2 miles to the east. As a result of these factors, the proposal is considered to comply with the social role of sustainable development.

2.0 Impact on the character and appearance of the area

2.1 The environmental role of sustainable development seeks to, in part, contribute to protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment. Consideration of a development's impact on the character and appearance of the area within which it is situated is, therefore, integral to the environmental dimension of sustainable design, as is its design.

2.2 Policy DC16 requires all new development to achieve the highest standard of design. As part of this, all design proposals must preserve or enhance the existing character of an area. Consideration will also be given to the density of buildings in a particular area and the landscape/townscape effect of any increased density.

2.3 The application site is located outside but adjacent to the Rocklands Settlement Boundary with the site consisting of an existing outbuilding to be demolished with the remainder being grassed and used as paddocks with hedgerows/trees along the boundaries. The development would form an outward extension of the village to the north of Chapel Street and would give the immediate locality a more built up appearance.

2.4 The principal visual effects would be experienced from the neighbouring properties; however the scheme would not be prominent in the wider public views, being set to the rear of existing properties. Whilst the development would be visible from the public right of way which runs adjacent to the site along the northern boundary, the development would be screened to a degree by existing hedging and trees, which could be supplemented. For these reasons it is considered that although some harm would be caused this effect would be localised and limited.

2.5 Due to its backland nature the proposed development would mark a departure from the predominant pattern of linear frontage development along Chapel Street. However, the layout of development, including building set backs and orientation, does vary along Chapel Street, and St Peter's Close, which is located a short distance to the west along Chapel Street, comprises a small close of dwellings set to the rear of existing frontage properties. In this context, it is not considered that the development in depth would appear so out of place as to cause significant harm to the form and character of the village.

2.6 In terms of materials, the proposed dwelling would be constructed of red facing brick and black and red pantiles for the roof, which are deemed acceptable and in keeping with the surrounding development. If approved a condition would be imposed for precise details to be agreed to ensure the proposal was in keeping with surrounding development.

3.0 Amenity impact

3.1 Policy DC1 seeks to protect residential amenity and that all new development must have regard to amenity considerations and states that development will not be permitted where there are unacceptable effects on the amenity of neighbouring residents and future occupants.

3.2 The previous refusal for three dwellings was upheld at appeal on amenity impact grounds. The appeal Inspector stated that...

3.3 "The occupiers of Model Farm would similarly suffer from noise from passing traffic, potentially to a greater degree as the access passes even closer to the side of this dwelling. The appellant has suggested

that the concept of 'buyer beware' would mitigate for the harmful impact on future occupants. However, Paragraph 17 of the Framework states that planning should always seek to secure good standards of amenity for future occupants of land and buildings. Whilst some form of boundary treatment could be provided to lessen the impact, on both properties, I could not be certain that such treatment would satisfactorily mitigate the disturbance.

3.4 Moreover, any form of barrier would obstruct the remaining parking area available for Model Farm. Similarly I cannot assess the effect different surfacing materials could have on the noise generated by traffic or whether this would satisfactorily mitigate the harm.

3.5 As such, I consider the occupiers of neighbouring properties would suffer from noise and disturbance from the proposal such that their living conditions would be unacceptably harmed. Consequently the development would conflict with Policy DC 1 of the BCS which aims to ensure development does not unacceptably affect the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants. I give this policy full weight as I consider it contributes little to the Council's inability to provide a five year supply of housing."

3.6 The application has been reduced to one dwelling. On the basis that the Inspector's previous decision considered three dwellings and the likely traffic generation as a result of this number, approximately 18 movements (6 per dwelling), the reduced scale of development and therefore vehicle movements, now 6 is considered a significant decrease and the impact as a result of this number is significantly lessened and that a refusal on this basis could not be upheld. Whilst the gable end of Model Farm is directly adjacent to the access, it is considered the impact on the occupiers is unlikely to be significant given the low number of vehicular movements resulting from a single dwelling.

3.7 In addition, the dwelling has been positioned centrally within the plot which retains a generous separation distance between it and all of the neighbouring dwellings, this alongside the proposed/existing boundary screening will ensure that impact on neighbour amenity is kept to a minimum in terms of loss of light and overlooking. The dwelling will also not appear over-dominant given its siting and generous separation distances. The proposal also provides the future occupiers with a generous amount of private amenity space.

3.8 In terms of the comments raised in respect of drainage and sewerage, the site is not located within a medium/high risk flood zone therefore there is no requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment. Environmental Health have raised no objection however advise that the package treatment system will need to have sufficient capacity to cope with the expected foul water from the development, complies with current Building Regulations and has the necessary Environment Agency Consent. This will be added as an informative note.

3.9 In light of the above, the proposal is considered to have due regard to Policy DC1.

4.0 Highway safety

4.1 Policy CP4 of the Core strategy seeks to ensure that all access and safety concerns are resolved in new developments. Policy DC19 requires sufficient Parking for all new development.

4.2 The scheme seeks to upgrade the existing access and provides sufficient parking and turning within the site. The Highway Authority was consulted and advised that the site lies to the north east of a proposed residential development which was the subject of Planning Appeal Decision APP/F2605/W/16/3154802.

4.3 The Appeal inspector had concerns regarding the potential for pedestrian/vehicular

conflict as a result of the severely restricted visibility from the site access onto Chapel Street. However the Inspector noted-

"Rockland St Peter provides a good range of facilities and the Council have accepted that the village is a sustainable location for housing development"

"I saw that the local services were available within walking distance of the appeal site along Chapel Street and The Street. However, both streets are unlit with no dedicated footway or cycleway. While therefore there may at times be some dependence on the car to access facilities, particularly during the winter months I cannot rule out the possibility that pedestrians and cyclists would be actively using Chapel Street to access local services. I note the representations received by occupiers of surrounding properties confirm this occurs. Therefore I consider that future occupiers of the properties would have a choice of alternative sustainable transport options to reach the local services. I would concur therefore that the site is within an accessible location".

4.4 On the basis that the appeal inspector considered Chapel Street to be within a sustainable location, but equally accepted that there may be some dependence on the use of the car to access facilities, the highway Authority advise they would have difficulty in substantiating an objection to the principle of 1 dwelling in this location and the resultant traffic generation.

4.5 The submitted proposal can, with the removal of the existing hedge, provide an acceptable level of visibility onto Chapel Street. It also includes proposals to upgrade the existing access.

5.0 Impact on the former foundry

5.1 The proposed development is on a site marked as a former foundry on the 2nd edition Ordnance Survey map. Demolition will affect structures associated with the foundry and destroy the last evidence of an important local rural industry which is worthy of recording prior to its destruction.

5.2 The Historic Environment Service have requested that if planning permission is granted, that this be subject to condition for a programme of archaeological work in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 197.

6.0 Ecological implications

6.1 Policy CP10 seeks the enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity in the district. Proposals need to ensure that the ecological network and protected species are not harmed or detrimentally impacted and mitigation measures are put in place where appropriate.

6.2 The application is supported by a Protected Species Surveys report (Finnemore Associates; September 2016). The buildings were assessed as having low potential for roosting bats. Bat emergence surveys were carried out and no bats were seen emerging/ re-entering the buildings. Precautionary methods of working need to be adhered to including soft stripping off the roof to wall plate level and removing the soffit and bargeboard. Measures outlined in section 5.2, 5.4 and 5.5 of the report also need to be adhered to.

6.3 A single pond was assessed as having average suitability to support great crested newts. Three other ponds in close proximity to the site were not assessed for their suitability to support great crested newts. All of the ponds were surrounded by grazed or mown grassland or situated in arable land. The short horse grazed sward as found at Model Farm was considered to have neither shelter nor foraging potential for great crested newts.

6.4 The impact of the proposed development on reptiles does not appear to have been considered in the

Protected Species Survey report (Finnemore Associates; September 2016). From photographs the site appears unsuitable for reptiles. Precautionary measures must be taken to avoid killing or injuring reptiles and great crested newts if present on the site during construction works. Measures outlined within the Biodiversity method statement must be followed.

6.5 There is suitable habitat available on the site for nesting birds in the form of trees, hedgerows and buildings. The site plans and Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Preliminary Method Statement (Oakfield Arboricultural Services; June 2018) highlights the proposal does not require trees to be removed to accommodate the layout and access will be gained via the existing access to Model Farm and will not require the removal of any vegetation.

6.6 There are several county wildlife sites within 2km of the proposed development site, however due to the distances involved and the scale of the proposed works it is unlikely there will be impacts on these sites.

6.7 In light of the above, the proposal is considered to have due regard to Policy CP10 subject to conditions.

7.0 Trees

7.1 Policy DC12 seeks to preserve the District's trees, hedgerows and other natural features and secure appropriate landscaping schemes to mitigate the impact of, and complement, new development. None of the trees within the applicant's ownership are covered by a TPO

7.2 The application has been supported by an Arboricultural Implications Assessment, Method Statement and plan. Given the dwelling's central location, away from root protection areas and significant hedgerows there is a minimal impact in this regard. The Tree and Countryside Officer raised no objection.

8.0 Planning Balance

8.1 The site's location has been considered sustainable by an Appeal Inspector. The proposal seeks permission for a single dwelling on land to the rear of existing development. The dwelling has been positioned so that it matches the line of neighbouring development and the reduced scale, i.e. one dwelling is considered to address the concerns raised by the Inspector in terms of the amenity impact.

8.2 In light of the above, and applying the tilted planning balance, weighed against our lack of a 5 year housing land supply, the application for one dwelling is considered acceptable and is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Permission

CONDITIONS

- 1 Full Permission Time Limit (2 years)**
The development must be begun not later than the expiration of TWO YEARS beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason for condition:-
As required by section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and to ensure the deliverability of the scheme to contribute to the five year housing land supply.
- 2 In accordance with submitted plans NEW 2017**

The development must be carried out in strict accordance with the application form, and approved documents and drawings as set out in the table at the end of this notice.

Reason for condition:-

To ensure the satisfactory development of the site.

3 External wall and roof materials to be agreed

No development beyond slab level shall take place until precise details, (including samples where required), of the materials used in the construction of the external walls and roof(s) of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall apply notwithstanding any indication as to these matters that have been given in the current application. The materials to be used in the development shall be in accordance with the approved details.

Reason for condition:-

To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the colour, tone, texture and appearance of the materials used to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, as required by Policy DC 1 and DC 16 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

This condition will require to be discharged

4 Existing access - widened or improved

Prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted the vehicular access shall be upgraded / widened to a minimum width of 4.5 metres in accordance with the Norfolk County Council residential access construction specification Trad 5 for the first 5m metres as measured back from the near channel edge of the adjacent carriageway. Arrangements shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.

Reason for condition:-

In the interest of highway safety and traffic movement.

5 Provision of visibility splays - conditioned

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted a visibility splay measuring 2.4 x 4.3 metres shall be provided to each side of the access where it meets the highway and such splays shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction exceeding 0.6 metres above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.

Reason for condition:-

In the interest of highway safety.

This condition will require to be discharged

6 Provision of parking and servicing - when shown on plan

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed access, parking and turning area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.

Reason for condition:-

To ensure the permanent availability of the parking / manoeuvring area, in the interests of highway safety.

7 Archaeological recording

No development shall take place within the site until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of historic building recording which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority.

In this instance the programme of historic building recording will comprise a photographic survey of the structures to be demolished.

Reason for condition:-

The details are required to be submitted prior to the commencement of the development to ensure the potential archaeological interest of the site is investigated and protected from the outset of the development, in accordance with Policy DC 17 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

8 Nesting birds condition

No building demolition works or removal, in full or in part, of hedgerows, trees and shrubs shall take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests immediately before the vegetation is cleared and provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. Any such written confirmation should be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for condition:-

To ensure the development is not detrimental to Protected Species and in order to protect the wildlife value of the site in accordance with Policy CP10 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2009 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9 Ecology practices

Given the nature and size of this development and the information included in the , the following working practices will be adhered to:

- No piles of loose sand or other granular materials into which amphibians or reptiles could bury themselves should be left around the site. All such materials should be delivered in bags and kept on pallets or hardstanding until required for use;
- Should any waste be generated from the development, this should be placed straight into skips or rubble sacks, or immediately removed and not left lying around the site;
- No bonfires should be made or lit on site. Amphibians and/or reptiles often use piles of timber as a place of refuge;
- All trenches should be left covered at night. They must be checked in the morning before they are filled in.
- The development footprint and any working areas needs to be maintained in its current condition by regular mowing to ground level at weekly intervals until construction commences.
- Works should preferably be restricted to daylight hours only to prevent disturbance or accidental harm to nocturnal animals such as hedgehogs. Ideally night lighting of the site should be minimised to reduce disturbance to other nocturnal animals such as bats.

Reason for condition:-

To ensure the development is not detrimental to Protected Species and in order to protect the wildlife value of the site in accordance with Policy CP10 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2009 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10 Precautionary methods of working (bats) - ecology

Precautionary methods of working shall be carried out throughout development in order to avoid impacts on bats. These shall include: soft stripping off the roof to wall plate level and

removing the soffit and bargeboard of the buildings proposed for demolition and all measures outlined in section 5.2, 5.4 and 5.5 of the Protected Species Surveys report (Finnemore Associates; September 2016).

Reason for condition:-

To ensure the development is not detrimental to Protected Species and in order to protect the wildlife value of the site in accordance with Policy CP10 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2009 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

11 Implementation of submitted boundary treatment

The boundary treatment shown on the plans and particulars hereby approved shall be constructed in the manner shown and completed before the building is first occupied.

Reason for condition:-

In the interests of the satisfactory appearance of the development in accordance with Policy DC16 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

This condition will require to be discharged

15 Variation of approved plans

Any variation from the approved plans following commencement of the development, irrespective of the degree of variation, will constitute unauthorised development and may be liable to enforcement action.

You or your agent or any person responsible for implementing this permission should inform the Development Control Section immediately of any proposed variation from the approved plans and ask to be advised to the best method to resolve the matter. Most proposals for variation to the approved plans will require the submission of a new application.