

<b>Parish:</b>	<b>Grimston</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Conversion and change of use of an agricultural barn to a dwelling</b>	
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Tithe Farm Broad Drove Grimston King's Lynn</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Geoffrey Mason Ltd</b>	
<b>Case No:</b>	<b>17/02002/F (Full Application)</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Mr C Fry</b>	<b>Date for Determination: 19 December 2017</b>

**Reason for Referral to Planning Committee** – Contrary to Grimston Parish Council comments and called in by Councillor Alistair Beales

**Neighbourhood Plan:** No

**Case Summary**

The application site lies within an area of countryside according to local plan proposals maps for Grimston.

The site contains a fletton brick and flint barn and concrete apron to the front that is accessed from Broad Drove.

The application seeks consent for a change of use of the barn to a residential property, following a refusal of a prior notification for a change of barn to dwelling 16/00524/PACU3.

**Key Issues**

- Principle of Development and Planning History
- Impact upon Visual Amenity
- Residential Amenity
- Protected Species
- Highway Safety
- Other Material Considerations

**Recommendation**

**APPROVE**

## THE APPLICATION

The application site lies within an area of countryside approximately 1.66km south east of Grimston and 2.67km north east of Gayton.

The site is accessed via Broad Drove and contains an brick and flint agricultural building to the southern side of Tithe Farm egg production unit.

The barn has a concrete apron to the southern side and is open to the egg production unit to the north.

Broad Drove contains dwellinghouses that belong to Tithe Farm and are occupied by farm operatives.

A recently constructed 2 storey farmhouse is the nearest neighbour. The farmhouse is adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site.

The application seeks consent to convert the barn to residential use, through the demolition of the northern extension of the barn and other internal alterations. This application follows a refusal of a prior notification to convert the barn to residential use under Class, Q, Schedule 2 Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 as amended (16/00524/PACU3). The prior notification was refused as it was considered based on the information provided that the future occupiers would not have a good standard of amenity given the adjacent use being an egg producing unit.

## SUPPORTING CASE

The applicant's supporting statement will be forwarded on in due course.

## PLANNING HISTORY

16/00524/PACU3: Prior Approval - Refused: 04/05/16 - Prior Notification: Agricultural building to dwellinghouse

## RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

**Parish Council: OBJECTION** Permitted development rights notwithstanding, the Parish Council does not as a rule support residential development outside the development boundary. The Parish Council also has concerns about the location of the dwelling close to the working farm in particular the chicken sheds and whilst someone would purchase the property clear in the knowledge of the location, it is still considered to be an inappropriate site for residential development.

**Highways Authority: NO OBJECTION** mindful of the permitted class development rights of the building and the matter that the site is accessed from a private section of road, I do not have an objection to the proposal on highway grounds

**Environmental Health & Housing – Community Safety Neighbourhood and Nuisance: NO OBJECTION** Since my involvement with the previous application, 16/00524/PACU3, I have been working with the agent/s and applicant to address my previous concerns over noise and odour. On 25 November 2016 I carried out a site visit, meeting with the applicant and an agent. I spent just under two hours there viewing the entire site and learning about

the operations of the turkey farm. I entered all the buildings and saw at first hand the birds and how they are kept and fed. I even went further up the track to the east of the site, to the brow of the hill, and across the fields to the south, with the applicant, to assess the large pile of waste matter removed from the site and stored pending distribution on the fields. Additionally I viewed the internal area/s of the existing buildings to assess them in relation to the adjacent business. I even considered, viewed and discussed the potato store to the front of the business site, which includes mechanical fans, as well as looking at existing external lighting.

I discussed the existing dwellings in the area and how they drain foul water, and was shown where the water supply comes from. We discussed how foul drainage could be achieved, as I raised the issue of this draining off site to other land outside of the curtilage. It was agreed this would not be an issue if the dwelling were let, but if sold, there would be a legal agreement drawn up to allow access/prevent damage to the system etc.

As mentioned in the Planning, Design and Access Statement, I recommended measures were incorporated into any future designs that would provide mitigation from noise and odour. All those measures I recommended have been included in this application. I am therefore confident that everything has been considered in relation to noise and odour. I also raised concerns about the sloping nature of the concrete to the front of the site (downhill towards the barn) and possible surface water drainage issues, which had not been considered at that time, and advised this could be addressed by a suitable drainage scheme.

I also met again with the agents on 28 June 2017 in the Council Offices, for around an hour and a half, to further discuss my recommendations and mitigation methods.

The only thing I cannot see provided at this time is anything directly showing the surface water and foul water drainage for the site, and I recommend this is conditioned, unless the information can be submitted in advance of a decision being issued.

**Environmental Health & Housing – Environmental Quality: NO OBJECTION** subject to conditions

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

None received

## **LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES**

**CS01** - Spatial Strategy

**CS02** - The Settlement Hierarchy

**CS06** - Development in Rural Areas

**CS08** - Sustainable Development

**CS09** - Housing Distribution

**CS10** - The Economy

**CS11** - Transport

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

**DM1** – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

**DM2** – Development Boundaries

**DM15** – Environment, Design and Amenity

**DM17** - Parking Provision in New Development

### **NATIONAL GUIDANCE**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

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

### **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

The main planning considerations in regards to the application are:-

- Principle of Development and Planning History
- Loss of employment use
- Impact upon Visual Amenity
- Residential Amenity
- Protected Species
- Highway Safety
- Other Material Considerations

#### **Principle of Development and Planning History**

It is noted that the Parish Council objects to the application as the site lies within an area of countryside according to local plan proposals maps for Grimston.

Development in the countryside for residential development is very restrictive in line with paragraph 55 of the NPPF; however Policy DM2 of the Site Allocation Development Management Policies Plan and Policy CS06 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy allows for the consideration of the conversion of former farm buildings into residential use provided:-

- The existing building makes a positive contribution to landscape;
- A non-residential use is proven to be unviable;
- The accommodation to be provided is commensurate to the site’s relationship to the settlement pattern and
- The building is easily accessible to existing housing, employment and services

The building’s contribution to the landscape is discussed later in the report, however it is considered that the provision of a 4 bedroom property approximately 1.66km south east of Grimston and 2.67km north east of Gayton –with both villages linked with Pott Row that act as a Key Rural Service Centre, would be acceptable. The property would be accessible to

existing housing, employment and services, albeit likely to be by motor car (with some limited cycle and bus services), but the natural location of barn conversions would mean that there will always be some reliance on the motor car.

Furthermore, Policy CS10 states that the Council will seek to retain land or premises currently or last used for employment purposes (including agricultural uses) unless it can be demonstrated that:-

- Continued use of the site for employment purposes is no longer viable, taking into account the sites characteristics, quality of buildings, and existing or potential market demand; or
- The use of the site for employment purposes gives rise to unacceptable environmental or accessibility problems particularly for suitable modes of transport
- Or an alternative mix use offers greater potential benefits to the community in meeting local business and employment needs, or in delivering the Council's regeneration agenda

The merits of the scheme in relation to both CS06 and 10 and other material considerations are discussed further in the report.

The site has had a previous application for a change of use of the barn (ref 16/00524/PACU3) refused under the prior notification process. The prior notification was refused on the grounds that the proposed conversion of the agricultural building would have resulted in a dwellinghouse that was in an undesirable location, as the associated movements involved in egg production were considered to result in a poor standard of amenity for the dwelling.

The proposal will therefore need to adequately address this issue.

### **Loss of employment use**

As referenced in the preceding section of this report, farm buildings can be considered to be suitable for conversion to residential use provided that policy CS10 can be satisfied.

In regard to the policy requirements, the application has not been supported by a financial viability assessment that comprehensively concludes that the building cannot be used for economic employment purposes and the building and to the councils knowledge the building has not been marketed for disposal, however, the building and the characteristics of the site would not be conducive to an employment/commercial use.

Whilst the building appears to be structurally sound according to the structural report that accompanies the application, there is no electric, no services and no floors to the building. It has not been used in association with the keeping of chickens or intensive agricultural operations for sometime. With no windows and doors in some elevations, the building is currently open to the elements. There is a limited yard area to the front (south) which services the building and access to the site is from a single width Drove. Furthermore, the operations of the adjacent chicken farm business requires wheel washing to take place before the site's entrance in order for the farm to operate to the required EU standards. An unrestricted employment use could either result in noise and disturbance or the emissions of odours and waste that could affect the operations of the chicken shed. Furthermore, the enjoyment of the residential properties on the Drove could be detrimentally disturbed by the operations of an employment use through associated vehicular movements and the operations of the building. All these issues with the barn being used commercially have been raised in the applicant's supporting statement.

It is therefore considered that on balance, without the financial viability assessment and marketing of the site, the principle of losing the building for economic purposes can be accommodated in this instance.

### **Impact upon Visual Amenity**

In line with Policy CS06 – the building itself needs to make a positive contribution to the landscape for it to be considered suitable for residential conversion.

Given the topography of the land surrounding site, the building is not seen in the wider landscape.

The building has been the subject of extensions and alterations, the front elevation (south) has been the subject of a fletton brick extension that has resulted in the original roof being extended and a rear extension that has been constructed from fletton red brick with an asbestos sheeted roof.

According to the applicant's statement, the building has existed on the site for at least 200 years and could not therefore be considered as an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside. Upon a site visit, it was evidenced that once removing the rear extension, the flint material with attractive brick quoin detailing used in the construction of the building, would be exposed along with the original barn door opening.

The courtyard has a flintwork wall enclosing the western boundary of the site that is quite attractive to the setting of the barn.

The proposed conversion would result in the removal of the rear extension and by virtue of exposing the original barn door opening as a feature to provide windows to serve the dining room and landing areas the overall proposal can be said to be of good design. Other elements of the scheme include replacing asbestos sheeting with pantiles on a single storey western wing and the use of timber stained joinery.

The area to the rear (north) would provide some amenity space, albeit not detailed for that specific use on the accompanying plans and the yard area to the front would be split to provide a car parking area and garden areas. Parking will be provided in carports that would be supported by the wall along the western boundary of the site.

In respect to providing acoustic attenuation, discussed more in the subsequent section of the report, a raised earth bank with 1.2m fencing encloses the rear amenity space.

The barn does form part of the collection of farm buildings and although not widely seen in the local landscape, makes a positive contribution to it.

In order to retain some control over future developments involving alterations and extensions to the building to retain the architectural merit of the barn it is considered necessary to restrict permitted development rights for classes A, B, C, and D of Part 1 Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended).

### **Residential Amenity**

The Parish Council also has concerns about the proposal providing satisfactory amenity for the future occupiers of the dwelling, as the prior approval to convert the barn into a residential dwelling was refused for the following reason:-

“The proposed conversion of the agricultural building would result in a dwelling that would be in an undesirable location. The associated movements that are associated with the nearby farmyard access and the processes involved in egg production would result in a poor standard of amenity for the future occupiers of the dwelling. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of Class Q2(1)(b) and Q2.1(e) of Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015.”

Since that application has been determined, the agent has worked with the environmental health team to address this reason for refusing the prior notification, as primarily the reason relates to the operations of the adjacent egg production unit causing a dis-amenity to the future occupiers of the dwelling.

The agent has stated that with the barn subject of this proposal being located to the southern side of the hen sheds and with prevailing wind blowing from the south west, the neighbour would not be detrimentally affected by any dust dispersal. The concrete roadways that exist on the egg production plant also limit the impact of noise and disturbance on the residents of the dwelling.

The agent states that the main source of noise would be generally limited. Noise associated with the operations of the egg productions would primarily be from the feed vehicles attending the site rather than the turkeys themselves. The turkeys are said to be generally quiet. Eggs are collected 3 times a week from a welfare building and feed is delivered once a week by a single lorry. Cleaning of the turkey sheds is once every 6 months.

In regards to waste disposal, the agent states “deceased turkeys are immediately incinerated in a DEFRA approved incinerator situated to the rear north of the main turkey sheds. In this location further from the proposal site, upwind of the barn and incorporating filters, no odour would affect the amenity of the barn’s occupiers. Waste bedding is stored in a significant distance from the occupied buildings (150m – 200m away) and is subsequently distributed across the arable land as fertiliser”

In order to provide an appropriate standard of amenity for the future occupiers of the building, the proposal has been amended from that which accompanied the prior approval application to include;-

- Fenestration to the northern elevation of the barn facing the hen turkey sheds will be triple-glazed and non-opening (any openings to be sited to the south elevation to for means of escape in the event of an emergency evacuation)
- An earth bund measuring 3m in height will be created to the northern side of the barn, with a 1.2m high solid fence above to minimise noise and disturbance from the egg-production unit. This earth bund is a continuation of the earth bund used to provide attenuation for the new replacement farmhouse that has been constructed to the east of the application site.
- Private amenity space will be provided within the walled yard to the southern side of the barn
- The internal layout of the proposed conversion has resulted in the majority of the habitable rooms and bedrooms being located on the southern side of the building

The Environmental Health Officer has commented that they inspected the turkey farm and the egg production unit on the 25th November 2016. Their visit included viewing the entire site and learning about the operation of the turkey farm. Having entered into all the buildings and saw how the birds were kept, and viewed where waste water was distributed in relation to the prevailing wind, they conclude that with the measures incorporated in the proposal as referenced above, they have no objection to the proposed change of use.

It's your officer's opinion that with the associated measures outlined above in place that the proposal would provide an acceptable standard of amenity as outlined in the NPPF, Core Strategy and Policy DM15 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Plan Policy, and overcomes the previous concerns raised.

There are no residential neighbours to the north, south or immediately to the west. The closest residential neighbour is the farmhouse to the east of the site. This is an existing farmhouse.

In respect to the siting and scale of the barn in relation to this farmhouse and the internal layouts proposed, it is considered that the proposal will not cause any detrimental neighbour amenity issues.

### **Protected Species**

The barn has features that could contain bats and barn owls in accordance with Natural England's standing advice.

Original surveys were conducted in respect to the barn in 2015 and updated surveys submitted as part of this application.

The 2015 surveys found no evidence of bats roosting in the barn (3 daytime inspections and 2 nocturnal surveys) and in terms of barn owls, a small number of pellets in distinct locations beneath roosting sites within the barn were found. No evidence of barn owl nesting or potential nest sites were identified within the barn and a known nesting site within an artificial box was present in a modern barn approximately 150m to the north of the site.

An updated survey has been submitted that incorporates both bat and barn information. In regards to bats it has found that a total of 12 bat droppings and associated moth remains were recorded in the main barn section, beneath the ridge, and it is suggested that this is the roosting location of a single brown long-eared bat. There is potential for crevice roosting bats, such as pipistrelles to roost between the roof tiles and the roof timbers, and the walls of the main barn contained several holes and large cracks.

Two nocturnal bat activity surveys were then carried out which concluded that a single brown eared bat and a common pipistrelle bat were using the barn. Two common pipistrelles were recorded flying to the south of the barn during those surveys.

In respect to barn owls, there was no evidence from the latest surveys that suggests that the barn has been used for barn owls.

Conclusions from the report suggest that an EPS License is likely to be required in respect to bat works. The LPA is required to have regard to the tests of derogation as to whether Natural England would grant an EPS License for the development.

The tests are as follows

Test 1 – Overriding Public Interest – this is considered to have been met by preserving a barn building that is of some architectural importance that has the use of flint work.

Test 2 – No satisfactory alternative

There is no satisfactory alternative as the development proposal is a change of use of an existing building

Test 3 – Maintaining favourable conservation status



The brown long-eared bat and common pipistrelle is a common species, the number of bats to be hibernating is low and so long as there is mitigation with respect to the undertaking of the works and compensation for the lost roosts, the conservation status of bats can be maintained. The report has referenced that suitable mitigation can include works in areas of confirmed or potential roosts to be completed by hand under the supervision of the licenced ecologist and compensatory bat boxes built in/erected upon the re-developed building or buildings nearby.

In regard to protecting other species, a restrictive condition can be imposed in respect to works being carried out during the bird nesting season and if such works are required during the season, then it will be necessary for a bird ecologist to inspect the buildings.

Enhancement can be achieved through the incorporation of bat/bird boxes being built into the structure.

### **Highway Safety**

The site is on Broad Drove and some 450m to the east of the junction of Broad Drove with Eastgate Drove. Broad Drove is single track and there are grassed verges either side of the road.

Vehicular movements on the track includes the private cars associated with the occupants of the dwellings on Broad Drove and the vans that collect the eggs 3 times a week and the weekly feed delivery by a single lorry.

The highways officer has no objection to the proposal and does not wish to impose any highways conditions.

### **Other Material Considerations**

The site is within flood zone 1 of the EA maps and accordingly there is no flood risk associated with the site.

Soakaways would be provided within the courtyard; however there is a high risk of groundwater contamination. It is therefore considered that a condition be imposed, notwithstanding the proposed use of soakaways in regards to surface water drainage.

Foul water drainage is said to be piped to surrounding agricultural land. Again given the risk of potential ground water contamination being high, a condition in respect to foul water drainage is imposed.

### **Conclusion**

Members will need to consider whether the barn satisfies policy CS06 and 10 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and whether the amenity of the future occupants of the dwelling would be satisfactory as the issue of amenity was the reason for refusing the prior approval application.

It's your officer's opinion that the barn building will require substantial investment for it to be attractive for commercial users, and given the sensitivities of the adjacent egg production operations a commercial occupier may not be suitable. The barn building has some architectural merit through the use of flintwork and brick quoin detailing. Furthermore the building has been evident on site for over 200 years. It is therefore considered that the

proposal would be compliant with the aims of Policy CS06 and CS10 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

The applicant has worked with the Borough's Environmental Health Officer in respect to ensuring that a good standard of amenity is achieved for the future occupiers of the building. The measures incorporated into the design of the building and the layout of the site has ensured result in a no objection from your environment health officer.

Otherwise issues, including ecology can be dealt with a planning condition.

It is therefore considered that the proposal be approved subject to the following conditions.

## **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:-
  - Site Plan as proposed - 1548-214A received 23rd October 2017
  - Site Sections as proposed - 1548-215A received 23rd October 2017
  - Elevations as proposed in relation to the raised/extended earth-bank - 1548-216A received 23rd October 2017
  - Floor plans and building sections as proposed - 1548-21 received 23rd October 2017
  - Elevations as proposed, Block Plan as proposed - 1548-222 received 23rd October 2017
- 2 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- 3 Condition: No development shall commence until full details of the foul and surface water drainage arrangements for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage details shall be constructed as approved before any part of the development hereby permitted is brought into use.
- 3 Reason: To ensure that there is a satisfactory means of drainage in accordance with the NPPF.

This needs to be a pre-commencement condition as drainage is a fundamental issue that needs to be planned for and agreed at the start of the development.
- 4 Condition: No development over or above foundations shall take place on site until full details of the window style, reveal, cill and header treatment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4 Reason: To ensure that the design and appearance of the development is appropriate in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.

5 Condition: No development shall take place on any external surface of the development hereby permitted until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building(s) 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.

5 Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and grouping of materials in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.

6 Condition: Prior to the commencement of groundworks, an investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

(i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;

(ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:

- \* human health,
- \* property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
- \* adjoining land,
- \* groundwaters and surface waters,
- \* ecological systems,
- \* archaeological sites and ancient monuments;

(iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

6 Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors. This needs to be a pre-commencement condition given the need to ensure that contamination is fully dealt with at the outset of development.

7 Condition: Prior to the commencement of groundworks, a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must 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 the land after remediation.

7 Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters,

property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors. This needs to be a pre-commencement condition given the need to ensure that contamination is fully dealt with at the outset of development.

- 8 Condition: The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of groundworks, other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

- 8 Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.
- 9 Condition: In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of condition 6, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 7 which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition 8.

- 9 Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.
- 10 Condition: Notwithstanding the provisions of Class A,B,C, and D of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no enlargement, improvement or other alteration to the dwellinghouse, the enlargement of the dwellinghouse consisting of an addition or alteration to its roof; other alterations to the roof; the erection or construction of a porch outside any external door of a dwellinghouse shall be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.
- 10 Reason: In order ensure that future alterations and extensions are of a design and appearance that is appropriate in accordance with the principles of the NPPF
- 11 Condition: Prior to the commencement of development, a bat mitigation plan shall be submitted that includes details of compensatory roosts and their locations and a timetable for their installation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority. The mitigation measures shall be implemented in accordance with the details agreed and shall be retained and maintained thereafter.

- 11 Reason: In the interests of protected species and in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF and the Habitats Regulations 2010.
- 12 Condition: Any hedgerow, tree or vegetation clearance will shall take place outside of the bird nesting/breeding season between the 1st March and 31st August in any given year. Should hedgerow, tree removal or vegetation clearance be required during this period, prior to its removal a bird nesting/breeding survey shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The result of the survey shall also include any mitigation/enhancement measures appropriate to the extent of any breeding/nesting bird recorded in order to minimise the impact of such landscape feature removal upon the bird species. The mitigation/enhancement works shall be completed and maintained in accordance with the agree details and timetable other than with the proir written approval of the Local Planning Authority.
- 12 Reason: In order to safeguard protect species in accordance with the Wildlife Countryside Act 1981 and the National Planning Policy Framework
- 13 Condition: Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling herby approved the bunding and fencing details as shown on the approved plans shall be provided and retained thereafter as such.
- 13 Reason: In order to safegaurd the amenity of the future occupants of the building in accordance with the principles of the NPPF and Policy DM15 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan 2016
- 14 Condition: The windows on the north elevation of the dwelling hereby approved shall be retained as being triple glazed and non-opening unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 14 Reason: In order to safegaurd the amenity of the future occupants of the dwelling in accordance with the principles of the NPPF and policy DM15 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan