

## AGENDA ITEM NO: 8/3(k)

<b>Parish:</b>	Terrington St Clement	
<b>Proposal:</b>	Re-development of site for 4No. dwellings following the demolition of 7 and 8 Church Bank	
<b>Location:</b>	7 & 8 Church Bank Terrington St Clement King's Lynn Norfolk	
<b>Applicant:</b>	Freebridge Community Housing	
<b>Case No:</b>	16/01844/F (Full Application)	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Clare Harpham	<b>Date for Determination:</b> 19 December 2016 <b>Extension of Time Expiry Date:</b> 13 February 2017

**Reason for Referral to Planning Committee** – The views of Terrington St Clement Parish Council is contrary to the Officer recommendation.

### Case Summary

The application relates to the redevelopment of two plots within Church Bank following the demolition of the two pre-fabricated bungalows which are currently on site. The proposal seeks to replace these two bungalows with a pair of semi-detached dwellings and two detached dwellings which would result in four residential units in total. The application site is located within the development boundary of Terrington St Clement which is a Key Rural Service Centre as defined by Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy and thus the proposal is acceptable in principle.

### Key Issues

Form and Character  
Design and Scale  
Amenity Issues  
Highways Issues  
Flood Risk Issues  
Ecology  
Other material considerations  
Crime and Disorder

### Recommendation

**APPROVE**

## THE APPLICATION

Church Bank is currently a small development of former local authority dwellings which are located to the northern side of Church Bank and immediately adjacent to farmland which is to the west. The existing dwellings are predominantly pre-fabricated bungalows with some replacement bungalows which have some first floor accommodation within the roof space. Much of the access road is private unadopted road which is narrow (single width).

The application seeks planning permission to demolish two of the pre-fabricated bungalows and replace them with one pair of semi-detached properties and two detached dwellings which would result in four dwellings, thus doubling the number of units.

There is a second application (16/01843/F) also to be considered at planning committee which seeks to replace an additional three pre-fabricated bungalows at Church Bank with three semi-detached dwellings thus doubling the units from three to six. Overall in conjunction with this application the two applications should they be approved would result in a net increase of five dwellings.

## **SUPPORTING CASE**

- Freebridge Community Housing seeks approval for the demolition of 2 No. substandard single storey dwellings and replacement with 4 No. 1½ storey dwellings.
- The proposals consider the siting of the development within a flood risk area which precludes the replacement of the dwellings “like for like” and instead provides for sleeping accommodation to be at first floor level.
- In order to minimise impact on the adjacent properties the proposals suggest a low ridge line, with roof lights to reduce the massing and to minimise overlooking. The eaves internally are reduced to 1.2m, considering this as a practical minimum before losing usable floor space.
- Initial enquiries with NCC Highways Department have been carried out which suggests that there is no objection in principle to the redevelopment subject to the scale of the scheme. The two applications combined do not exceed the capacity limit suggested by NCC Highways.

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

16/01843/F: Pending Consideration at Planning Committee: - Re-development of site for 6No. dwellings following the demolition of 1, 4 and 5 Church Bank – 1, 4 and 5 Church Bank

14/00039/PD: GPD HH extn - Not Required: 18/11/14 - Single storey rear extension which extends beyond the rear wall by 4.4 metres with a maximum height of 3.86 metres and a height of 2.7 metres to the eaves - 6 Church Bank

11/00650/F: Application Permitted: 01/07/11 - Removal of present conservatory and construction of single storey extension to form new lounge area - 9 Church Bank

2/96/1469/F: Application Permitted: 16/12/96 - Conservatory extension to dwelling - 10 Church Bank

2/01/0817/F: Application Permitted: 25/07/01 - Construction of domestic garage/workshop - 6 Church Bank

2/00/0922/F: Application Permitted: 26/07/00 - Demolition of existing arcon bungalow and construction of replacement bungalow - No 6 Church Bank

## **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

**Parish Council: OBJECT**

- The land is running silt and not suitable for building. Permission was refused for a two storey building when the High School was built and has caused problems with sewers.
- Consideration should be given to Drainage Board requirements should the development go ahead.
- There are over eight dwellings and therefore in line with the highways recommendations the highway should be improved to the standard of Highways recommendations.
- The site is adjacent to an agricultural access to nearby farmland and a hard standing area used by agricultural vehicles when collecting produce. There will be noise issues associated with large vehicles and combine harvesters and issues with mud.
- A precedent has been set with previous refusals to build two storey dwellings on the site.
- Two storey dwellings will have an impact upon amenity of the existing privately owned bungalows which remain on site.
- The access road leads to a public footpath and bridleway and further traffic increases will impact upon the amenity of the footpath and the enjoyment of it.
- The BCKLWN resolved not to build on or lose gardens and this goes against that resolution.
- If there is any development it should be single storey only and approved only after the social care needs of residents are rigorously assessed to prevent any reduction in quality of life.
- If approved dwellings should be like for like so as not to overshadow existing private dwellings and accommodate needs of the elderly.
- Existing elderly residents should be given priority to the housing on site.
- Site is on the boundary of the village conservation area and near the church, the proposal would have a visual impact upon both.
- There is a moral issue as there will be a profound impact upon existing elderly residents who have lived on site undisturbed for many years.
- To request fragile residents to move is at best thoughtless but could prove to be extremely detrimental to their well-being. Such a move for people in their 90s would prove traumatic. Also many private owners have health issues. The social and moral needs of the residents could be resolved by building one dwelling and housing an existing resident and then doing the same for the second resident etc.
- Like for like rather than re-house elderly residents in houses with a stair lift they may not have the capability of using or in housing away from their local neighbourhood.

**Highways Authority: NO OBJECTION**

The site is accessed via a private drive. Having visited the site I find traffic levels and speed is low and traffic is local. As a result I believe it would be difficult to substantiate an objection on highway safety grounds.

**Housing Enabling Officer: NO OBJECTION** No contribution required on either site due to the netting off of demolished units.

**Environment Agency: NO OBJECTION** The proposal is within Flood Zone 3, the recommendations of the FRA should be followed.

**Environmental Health & Housing - Environmental Quality: NO OBJECTION** The review of the Site Investigation Report produced by Delta Simons indicated that no elevated level of contamination was encountered. As such even though the site investigation was limited it considered that no additional site investigation was warranted. The proposed development will include the demolition of the existing buildings. Given the age of the building it is

considered highly likely there will be asbestos containing materials within the building. Therefore conditions are recommended relating to asbestos.

**Emergency Planning: NO OBJECTION** The application site is located in an area at risk of flooding and there recommend they sign up to the EA Flood Warning Direct Service and prepare an evacuation plan.

## REPRESENTATIONS

**SEVEN OBJECTIONS** covering the following:-

- The proposed dwellings are out of character and visually intrusive.
- The proposal will look like a car park to the front of the dwellings.
- The proposal is overdevelopment of the plot.
- The existing character is smaller cottage style dwellings and bungalows.
- The existing pre-fabs need replacing but should be replaced with bungalows benefitting the older population as there are few bungalows in the village.
- There were size / height restrictions placed on the re-building of no.6 (details submitted).
- The current residents will not be able to live in the proposed dwellings as they are not single storey (moral issues relating to re-locating current elderly residents).
- Will cause amenity issues relating to loss of light, being overbearing and causing overlooking due to their proximity and height.
- Additional parking due to additional vehicles will cause amenity issues to other residents (noise and pollution).
- The highway / road is inadequate to cope with the increased number of vehicles and potential on-road parking generated. Church Bank is a private, poorly maintained single width road.
- The access from Churchgate Way onto Church Bank is very narrow with no footpath provision along Church Bank.
- There are existing problems down Church Bank which is due to the existing engineering works which often have large vehicles visiting the site and obstruct properties. It experiences heavy farm traffic at certain times (seasonal) due to the farmland immediately adjacent to it. There are two schools in very close proximity so at certain times of the day (pick up / drop off) the road gets extremely congested.
- Church Bank has a public right of way which crosses the fields to Orange Row and it is well used by pedestrians and horses. There are no footpaths and therefore how safe will pedestrians be during construction and also due to increased vehicles associated with extra dwellings.
- The parking is now situated at the rear of plots 1 and 4 and therefore there will be a number of blind spots within Church Bank which could be a safety issue.
- Flood risk in the area is low.
- There are water drainage issues on some adjacent plots.
- There are problems with the existing sewer and also problems with the water pressure. More houses will cause more problems.
- Running silt can cause problems with construction.
- Some of the existing site / location plans do not accurately reflect the garages / extensions on site.
- There have been newts in neighbouring gardens due to the nearby drain, what will happen to them?
- Amended plans were received relating to the parking, why were neighbours not informed? (They were informed; a letter was issued on 5th December 2016).

## **NATIONAL GUIDANCE**

National Planning Policy Framework – sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

National Planning Practice Guidance - Provides National Planning Practice Guidance, in support of and in addition to the NPPF

## **LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES**

**CS02** - The Settlement Hierarchy

**CS06** - Development in Rural Areas

**CS08** - Sustainable Development

**CS09** - Housing Distribution

**CS11** - Transport

**CS12** - Environmental Assets

## **SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES PLAN 2016**

**DM2** – Development Boundaries

**DM15** – Environment, Design and Amenity

**DM17** - Parking Provision in New Development

**DM21** - Sites in Areas of Flood Risk

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

The application site is located within the development boundary of Terrington St Clement which is identified as a Key Rural Service Centre (Policy CS02) and therefore an application to materially increase the number of residential dwellings is acceptable in principle. The main issues to consider when determining the application is as follows:

- Form and Character
- Design and Scale
- Amenity Issues
- Highways Issues
- Flood Risk Issues
- Ecology
- Other material considerations
- Crime and Disorder

### **Form and Character**

Church Bank is a relatively narrow road which meets Churchgate Way to the north-west of the Church. Slightly north of the junction is Terrington High School as well as the primary school on either side of Churchgate Way. Along Church Bank there are a variety of

dwelling. Along the southern side are more modern detached two storey dwellings and to the northern side is a mix of business premises, modest two storey terraced cottages and the development at the western end of Church Bank which has two parallel rows of predominantly single storey dwellings, most of which are pre-fabricated ex-local authority housing.

The pre-fabricated bungalows have low-profiled roofs and are set in generous plots. There is evidence of two brick built replacement dwellings one of which has first floor accommodation in the roof-space. This proposal will reduce the spatial separation of the units as the proposed semi-detached properties and detached dwellings are wider than the two existing bungalows. There are examples along Church Bank of terraced cottages and a mix of style age dwellings and therefore this is not considered a reason to refuse the application.

The character of the plots in the immediate locality on this northern side of Church Bank are single storey and the proposal is to replace these detached units with a semi-detached 1 ½ storey dwelling which would be pushed further back into the plot in order to allow for two detached dwellings to be sited further forward in line with the neighbouring bungalows. The proposed dwellings would have a significantly steeper roof pitch to the pre-fabricated bungalows which they are to replace. The pre-fabricated bungalows will have to be replaced at some point and whilst replacing them with single storey units would be much more in character with the existing single storey development, this is not possible given the sites location in an area of flood risk. In order to comply with the current flood risk requirements the floor levels need to be raised above the surrounding ground area by 0.5m and in addition to this there must be first floor sleeping accommodation. These in combination have resulted in a form of development which is considerably higher than the existing form of development (and which is illustrated in the drawings showing the proposed street scene).

There are objections to the proposal on the grounds that the proposal is not like-for-like and should be single storey. As stated above in order to comply with current flood risk policy it is not possible to construct single storey accommodation. The existing replacement dwellings were approved prior to current flood risk guidance and policy.

There are objections to the proposal in that it is overdevelopment of the site and the proposed car parking would look like a car park to the front of the dwellings.

It is true that the proposed form of development does not follow the existing low density layout of Church Bank; however there would be adequate garden space and sufficient parking. There would also be a significant amount of parking to the front of the proposed dwellings, some of which will be screened to either side by the two detached dwellings (plots A and D). Given the front to back relationship between the two rows of dwellings in Church Bank, the rear parking to plots 1 and 4 (shown in application 16/01843/F) would be visible to properties which are to the north of these plots and this parking relationship would not be dissimilar albeit to the front of the proposed dwellings.

## **Design and Scale**

The proposed replacement dwellings are different in design and scale to the existing form of development for the reasons outlined above.

Whilst there have been objections to the proposal on the basis that the proposal will impact upon the conservation area informal discussions with the Conservation Officer have raised no issues. The proposed materials are red / brown brick walls and clay roof-tiles (pantiles and plain clay tile to porch) and this is a characteristic of Terrington conservation area which lies to the eastern end of Church Bank. Additionally Church Bank itself is narrow reducing views from the conservation area to the application site and there is also a business

premises and row of two storey terraced dwellings screening the development to some degree from the east. As the site is approached from the west along the public right of way the dwellings will be clearly seen, however they will be seen against the backdrop of existing development to the east and the proposed materials are in character with the locality.

### **Amenity Issues**

The impact upon the neighbours abutting the application site has been assessed. There have been objections from the neighbours on amenity grounds.

The proposed development will be much nearer to no.6 than the existing relationship. Plot D will be immediately west of no. 6 which has two windows on its western elevation facing the application site. The occupier of no.6 has confirmed that these two windows serve a utility room and a bathroom which for planning purposes are not considered habitable rooms. Consequently whilst the proximity of the proposal will impact upon the light to these two rooms it would not be material to the degree which would warrant a refusal. For similar reasons the proposal is not considered to be overbearing to the degree that would warrant a refusal. There are windows to the rear of the proposed dwellings which would look down the garden. The first floor window closest to the boundary would serve the stairwell and it is not considered that the proposal would cause overlooking to the degree that would warrant a refusal.

The impact of plot A on no.9 has been considered. Plot A is directly east of no.9 however its material impact is lessened by the fact that there is an existing garage to no.9 between the proposal and the dwelling. There is an extension to the rear of no.9 which wraps around the garage (not shown on the submitted plans) and is close proximity to the shared boundary. There would be some impact upon this extension in the morning due to the extensions proximity to the boundary, however later in the day there will be minimal impact due to the orientation. The proposal whilst higher than the existing bungalows on site would not have an overbearing impact upon this neighbour. The proposal is screened to some degree by no.9s garage and the height of the eaves at 4.0m is not considered to be intrusive. There will be first floor windows in the rear of the proposal which will look down the garden. The window which is nearest to the boundary would serve a stairwell which is not a habitable room and therefore overlooking is not considered to be material to the degree that would warrant a refusal.

The plots in the middle of the proposed development (B and C) are set back and due to their orientation to the north-west and north-east of no.6 and no.9 respectively are not considered to cause any issues with regard to loss of light, being overbearing or overlooking.

There have been objections to the proposal with regard to the noise and disturbance created by the increase in vehicular traffic to the sites and corresponding additional parking. The vehicles would utilise an existing private road and the parking has been moved away from the boundary edges so that it will reduce any potential disturbance to the existing dwellings.

### **Highways Issues**

Church Bank is a relatively narrow road which leads to the public right of way joining Orange Row to Churchgate Way.

There have been a number of objections to the proposal on highways grounds, i.e. the junction at Churchgate Way is too narrow, the road is very busy with people dropping off and picking up children due to proximity of schools, the road is often blocked due to heavy vehicles both with regard to the existing business located further east along Church Bank and also due to farm vehicles accessing the fields to the west. The visibility from the

proposed access points is not good and there could be a conflict with other vehicles / pedestrians.

The proposed parking in the application accords with parking standards and in fact includes additional visitor parking. Therefore whilst the proposal will generate more vehicular movements to the site it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on the basis that other vehicle user's park or utilise Church Bank in an inconsiderate way. Church Bank is a narrow private road where traffic speeds are low and there are relatively low levels of traffic. There are no objections from the Highways Officer.

There have been objections, including from the Parish Council, based upon the fact that it is not proposed to widen the road at the junction of Churchgate Way as per some pre-application advice from NCC Highways Department. This advice stated that should future development be in excess of 8 dwellings then improvements would be needed along the site frontage and at the junction. However, whilst the approval of the two applications would result in ten new dwellings, the proposal would also result in the loss of 5 existing units and therefore the proposed development (in conjunction with application reference 16/01843/F) would result in a net increase of 5 dwellings which is below the threshold over which NCC would require improvements. This has been confirmed verbally with the Highways Officer.

### **Flood Risk Issues**

The application site lies within Flood Zone 3 of the SFRA but not in a Hazard Zone. Additionally the site lies in an area covered by the Tidal Hazard Maps where depths of 0.5m could be reached in the event of a breach of the tidal defences. The submitted FRA proposes to raise finished floor levels to 0.5m above surrounding ground levels and to incorporate flood resistance and resilience techniques into the construction. There are no objections from the Environment Agency to the proposal provided the recommendations within the FRA are implemented. The LPA do not need to apply the sequential test as it involves the redevelopment of a site with existing residential use and therefore could not be relocated elsewhere.

There are objections regarding the existing mains drainage on the site; however it is the responsibility of Anglia Water to ensure that the drainage is effective.

### **Ecology**

The European Habitats Directive (the Directive) prohibits activities such as the deliberate capturing, killing or disturbance of protected species, subject to derogation in specific and limited circumstances. These requirements are enforced in England and Wales by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (the Regulations) and any derogation is regulated and overseen by a system of licensing administered by Natural England (NE).

In exercising its functions, including determining planning applications, a Local Planning Authority (LPA) is required to have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive in so far as they may be affected by the exercise of those functions. It is not the role or responsibility of the LPA to monitor or enforce NE's obligations under the Regulations. However, if a development proposal could potentially result in a breach of the Directive, the LPA is required to form a view on the likelihood of a licence being granted under the Regulations by NE in order to fulfil its own obligation to have regard to the Directive requirements.

NE will only grant a licence if satisfied that the three statutory tests prescribed under the Directive and the Regulations have all been met.



The tests are:

1. There are imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI);
2. There are no satisfactory alternatives; and
3. It would not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species at favourable conservation status.

It is understood that the level of detail required for a licence application to NE under the Regulations may not yet be available at the planning application stage. Also, the level of detail required for NE to satisfy the tests of derogation will usually be higher than that required in the planning consent process. However, the obligation on the LPA is to consider the likelihood of a licence being granted by NE, not to determine definitively whether or not the licence will, in fact, be granted. It therefore has to review the three tests, in the context of a planning application, to then form a view on the likelihood of NE granting a derogation licence under the Regulations.

The Ecological Impact Assessment by Torc Ecology has identified a small population of Great Crested Newts on the application site. Mitigation measures are proposed both during the construction phase which would involve removing the newts under licence prior to clearing works and erecting amphibian fencing around the perimeter of the working area. It is proposed to provide an area to the north of the northern boundary of the site by including planting hedgerow and native shrubs which should enhance the habitat for the newts and create a high quality environment which is to mitigate for the loss of the low and medium quality habitat which currently exists at the site.

The LPA can therefore conclude that there are Greater Crested Newts present and that if development were to proceed there is the possibility of a breach of the Directive. Therefore the LPA is required to consider the tests:

1. IROPI - NE's guidance advises that IROPI can potentially include developments that are required to meet or provide a contribution to meeting a specific need such as complying with planning policies and guidance at a national, regional and local level. The Local Plan shows a need for additional housing in the Borough over its fifteen year life (2011 – 2026). Therefore the need for housing sites adds to the indication that there is an IROPI.
2. No satisfactory alternatives – The proposal is located where there is existing residential development which could impact upon the GCN. The redevelopment could not be moved elsewhere and it is therefore considered to be reasonable to conclude that there are no satisfactory alternatives.
3. Population maintenance - it appears to be unlikely that this development with the appropriate identified mitigation, will detrimentally impact the conservation status of GCNs and long-term should enhance their habitat.

The LPA can therefore reasonably form the view, from the information submitted to it for this planning application that NE would not be unlikely to grant a derogation licence under the Regulations in relation to this development and that planning permission should not be refused for this reason.

A condition will be imposed in line with the submitted report from Torc Ecology relating to the demolition of the existing dwellings and the provision of mitigation measures.

## **Other material considerations**

The Parish have made comment regarding the Drainage Board requirements; all the proposed development is in excess of 9m from any ditch and therefore would comply with Byelaw 10 of the IDB.

There are objections regarding the type of soil that the plots are on and that it is unsuitable for building. It is a matter for the applicant to find an engineering solution and to comply with building regulations and not a reason to refuse the planning application.

Potential mud and noise from the agricultural traffic and the business located down Church Bank is intermittent and seasonal and not a reason to refuse the application.

There are objections regarding the disruption to existing elderly and fragile residents, both of the dwellings to be demolished and in the surrounding homes. Whilst sympathy can be had for the possible re-homing of existing residents the moral issues arising from the granting of planning permission are not material to the application but are a matter for the applicant to resolve with the tenants.

## **Crime and Disorder**

There are no issues arising from the application with regard to crime and disorder.

## **CONCLUSION**

The proposed development, whilst not emulating the existing character of this part of Church Bank would not have a detrimental impact upon the built characteristics of the locality or the nearby conservation area. The proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon amenity or ecology, highway safety nor flood risk in the area.

The proposal complies with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS02, CS06, CS08, CS09 and CS11 of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Adopted Core Strategy 2011 and Policies DM2, DM15, DM17 and DM21 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan. Members are asked to consider the application for approval.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

**APPROVE** subject to the imposition of the following condition(s):

- 1 Condition The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 1 Reason To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.
- 2 Condition The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans 3264.07RevA received by the Local Planning Authority on 18th October 2016.
- 2 Reason For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- 3 Condition Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed access / on-site car parking / turning areas shall be laid out, demarcated,

levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.

- 3 Reason To ensure the permanent availability of the parking / manoeuvring area, in the interests of highway safety.
- 4 Condition Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a survey specifying the location and nature of asbestos containing materials and an action plan detailing treatment or safe removal and disposal of asbestos containing materials shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The details in the approved action plan shall be fully implemented and evidence shall be kept and made available for inspection at the local planning authority's request.
- 4 Reason To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, and to ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of land after remediation.

This also needs to be a pre-commencement condition given the fundamental details linked to asbestos containing materials which need to be planned for at the earliest stage in the development.

- 5 Condition Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved evidence of the treatment or safe removal and disposal of the asbestos containing materials at a suitably licensed waste disposal site shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.
- 5 Reason To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, and to ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of land after remediation.
- 6 Condition The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment by Geoff Beel Consultancy dated April 2016 with regard to the following mitigation measures:-
  - Finished ground floor levels shall be 500mm above existing surrounding ground levels.
  - Flood resilient construction methods shall be incorporated into the development up to 300mm above finished ground floor level.
- 6 Reason In order to prevent an increased risk of flooding in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.
- 7 Condition The development hereby approved shall be carried out in complete accordance with Section 6. (assessment of effects and mitigation measures) of the Ecological Impact Assessment by Torc Ecology (Project Ref: TE/SB/2016\_368) and dated October 2016.
- 7 Reason To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the principles and parameters contained with the Ecological Assessment and in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.
- 8 Condition No development shall take place on any external surface of the development hereby permitted until full details and samples of the materials to be used in the

construction of the external surfaces of the buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 8 Reason To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and grouping of materials in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.
- 9 Condition Prior to commencement of development a detailed construction management plan must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority; this must include proposed timescales and hours of construction phase. The scheme shall also provide the location of any fixed machinery, and proposed mitigation methods to protect residents from noise and dust. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.
- 9 Reason To ensure that the amenities of neighbouring occupants are safeguarded during demolition / construction.

This needs to be a pre-commencement condition as noise/dust/vibration is a fundamental issue that needs to be planned for and agreed at the start of the development.