

<b>Parish:</b>	<b>Brancaster</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>RETROSPECTIVE - VARIATION of condition 2 and REMOVAL of condition 7 attached to planning permission 24/01167/F: Extensions, alterations &amp; remodelling of dwelling and proposed outbuilding.</b>	
<b>Location:</b>	<b>3 Saw Mill Road Brancaster King's Lynn Norfolk PE31 8AJ</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>N Barley</b>	
<b>Case No:</b>	<b>25/00865/F (Full Application)</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Mrs Jade Calton</b>	<b>Date for Determination:</b> <b>17 July 2025</b> <b>Extension of Time Expiry Date:</b> <b>10 October 2025</b>

**Reason for Referral to Planning Committee** – Deferred from 6<sup>th</sup> October Planning Committee

**Neighbourhood Plan:** Yes

### **Members Update**

Members will recall that this application was deferred from the 6th October Planning Committee in order to reassess the officer report and allow for accurate consideration of the application under the s73A procedure.

The Council's Planning Lawyer noted that there was confusion in the previous Committee report between s73 and s73A of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 (TCP Act) following another recent application involving the same issue where Counsel advised that retrospective applications to amend conditions should be considered under Section 73A and, accordingly, this requires consideration of the wider planning considerations compared to those raised by a variation of condition application.

Whilst wider planning considerations will therefore need to be covered in the report in relation to this application, the existing planning permission is also a material planning consideration, and the recommendation will therefore remain the same.

For ease of reference, amendments to the October report are presented in emboldened text.

### **Case Summary**

The application site relates to a detached bungalow; No.3 Saw Mill, Brancaster.

The application seeks consent for variation of condition 2 (approved plans) and removal of condition 7 (foundation design and construction methodology) through s73A of the TCP Act 1990 in relation to planning permission 24/01167/F for 'extensions, alterations & remodelling of dwelling and proposed outbuilding'.

Brancaster is classified as a Key Rural Service Centre within the Settlement Hierarchy of the Core Strategy and Tier 4 (Key Rural Service Centre) under the new Local Plan.

### **Key Issues**

Principle of Development

History

Form and Character, Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area and National Landscape

Neighbour Amenity

Highway Safety

Arboricultural Impact

Other Material Considerations

### **Recommendation**

**APPROVE**

## **THE APPLICATION**

The application site relates to a detached bungalow; No.3 Saw Mill, Brancaster. Planning permission is sought for the construction of extensions and alterations to create a two storey dwelling and detached summer house. The resulting dwelling would comprise four bedrooms and the summerhouse would comprise a games room, store and an outdoor kitchen / dining area.

The original bungalow which occupied the site was of a simple pitched roof construction, built from orange / brown brick, uPVC and brown pantiles. The proposed extensions would introduce two x two storey gable projections to the front elevation with a central pitched crown roof and a single storey flat roof garage extension to its western elevation.

The application proposes to use buff brick, with flint infill, natural timber cladding, off white render and slate roof tiles.

The overall height of the resulting dwelling would be approx. 7.55m to the highest ridge and approx. 4.4m to eaves level. It would retain the existing spacing to the eastern and western boundaries. Although two gables are proposed, the front elevation would only marginally (extend approx. 1.1m) forward of the existing dwelling.

The proposed summer house would be located to the end of the rear garden and would measure approx. 2.3m to its eaves and 4.1m to ridge level. It would be sited between 2.9m and 3.1m from the western boundary and approx. 5m from the eastern boundary.

Members may recall that a previous application (24/01167/F) was determined by the Planning Committee on the 7th April of this year where it was resolved to approve the extensions and alterations to the dwelling.

Planning Committee  
3<sup>rd</sup> November 2025

The current application seeks to regularise the development through S73A of the TCP Act 1990, which has occurred on site in breach of condition 2 (approved plans) of the abovementioned planning permission, which includes the omission of the attached garage and changes to the design of the summer house. If approved, this would generate a new consent.

The reason for breaching condition 2 related to the demolition plan, where four small sections of wall (two within the front elevation and two within the rear elevation) were demolished on site that were originally shown to be retained. The two full side walls have been retained as originally shown.

## **SUPPORTING CASE**

There is no supporting case accompanying the application.

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

24/01167/F: PERMITTED (Committee) 07/04/25 - Extensions, alterations & remodelling of dwelling and proposed outbuilding at 3 Saw Mill Road, Brancaster.

## **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

**Parish Council:** Removal of condition 2 increases the overdevelopment of the plot.

**Conservation Team:** NO OBJECTION

**Arboricultural Officer:** NO OBJECTION to the removal of condition 7.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

**ONE** letter of **OBJECTION** received from a Third Party raising the following concerns: -

- Section 73a provides a mechanism for regulating unauthorised works.
- The Surveyor advised that the existing foundations were only 4" deep.
- Despite this, the owner still proceeded to attempt to build a two storey house with the existing foundations.
- The builder then demolished the northern and southern walls, in breach of condition 2.
- Requests that committee members / planning officers carefully look at the demolition plan dated 2025 where it clearly shows the areas of the northern and southern walls to be retained.
- A full application was requested by Planning Enforcement.
- Does not agree that the breach of condition can be regularised through a section 73A.
- The original dwelling was timber framed which is not capable of supporting two storeys.
- The eastern and western elevations are being propped up timber stanchion.

## **KING'S LYNN AND WEST NORFOLK LOCAL PLAN 2021-2040**

**LP13** - Transportation (Strategic Policy)

Planning Committee  
3<sup>rd</sup> November 2025

**LP14** - Parking Provision in New Development

**LP18** - Design & Sustainable Development (Strategic Policy)

**LP19** - Environmental Assets - Green Infrastructure, Landscape Character, Biodiversity and Geodiversity (Strategic Policy)

**LP20** - Environmental Assets- Historic Environment (Strategic Policy)

**LP21** - Environment, Design and Amenity (Strategic Policy)

## **NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES**

**Policy 1** - Appropriate Housing

**Policy 2** - Design, Style and Materials

**Policy 3** - Footprint for New and Redeveloped Dwellings

**Policy 4** - Parking Provision

**Policy 5** - Replacement and Extended Dwellings

**Policy 8** - Protection of Heritage Assets and Views

**Policy 10:** Protection and Enhancement of the Natural Environment and Landscape

## **NATIONAL GUIDANCE**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

National Design Guide 2021

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

The main considerations in the determination of this application are:

- Principle of Development
- History
- Form and Character, Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area and National Landscape
- Neighbour Amenity
- Highway Safety
- Arboricultural Impact
- Other Material Considerations

### **Principle of Development:**

**The principle of residential development within the curtilage of an existing dwellinghouse, within the development boundary, would be acceptable in accordance with the Development Plan.**

Planning Committee  
3<sup>rd</sup> November 2025

Residential extensions are supported in principle under the Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan subject to Policy 1 – Appropriate Housing, which encourages smaller properties in line with local housing needs. The Policy states that *'larger dwellings of five bedrooms or more will only be supported in exceptional circumstances where the approach meets the needs of a local family'*.

The proposal involves extensions and alterations to an existing property, proposing four bedrooms, therefore accords with NP Policy 1.

**Members are reminded that the development for extensions, alterations and remodelling of the existing dwelling and construction of a summer house was recently considered to be acceptable at the April Planning Committee where it was resolved to approve application 24/01167/F.**

**Whilst this application relates to S73A of the TCP Act 1990, which allows for retrospective planning applications to be made for development carried out in breach of its conditions, and as such is considered in its entirety, significant weight would be afforded to the recent approval.**

#### **History:**

The 2024 application was supported by a demolition plan which demonstrated that the majority of the existing external walls of the dwelling would be retained which allowed the application to be validated as householder development - extensions and alterations.

During the commencement of works on site, it became apparent that two small sections of wall to the front elevation and two small sections to the rear which were punctured with fenestration could not be retained and were therefore also demolished. Two full external walls to the east and west elevations have been retained.

As the demolition plan formed part of the approved plans condition, the Applicant was therefore in breach of that condition. A legal opinion was sought to establish whether or not the breach would result in the need to submit a fresh new full application for a replacement dwelling as opposed to extension and alterations.

It was advised that the LPA proceeds with this matter by way of a Section 73A Application to **authorise the development which has been carried out on site without complying with the approved plans condition of the original permission.** This judgement had been made on a fact and degree basis taking into account the specific circumstances of this case i.e. the level of demolition involved (with two full walls and foundations retained), the fact that a demolition plan was conditioned within the original consent, relevant Case Law and appeal decisions.

For clarity, whilst demolition of walls which were marked as being retained can result in a planning permission not being implemented and instead an unlawful development, this is a matter of fact and degree on a case-by-case basis, taking into account any conditions and the description of the development, which in this case does include 'remodelling'.

**Although the development should be considered in its entirety, as opposed to taking into account the variations only, special consideration is given to the conditions imposed on the original planning permission and amended accordingly, for example the time limit condition would be removed given that works have commenced.**

## **Form and Character, Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area and National Landscape:**

The application site does not lie within Brancaster's Conservation Area, it lies adjacent to it, with its boundary running to the north across the rear of the plots along Main Road.

Saw Mill Road is a single lane unmade track serving approx. six dwellings on its northern side. Those properties comprise bungalows and 1.5 storey dwellings of varying design and use of materials.

**The original dwelling which previously occupied the site** was of a simple single storey construction, built from orange / brown brick, uPVC and brown pantiles. The properties surrounding the site range from single storey (with buff brick and brown pantile) to a 1.5 / small 2 storey dwellings, newer in construction with a range of materials including red brick, flint pebbles, aluminium frames and timber cladding and render. The dwellings to the south of Saw Mill Road form a modern two storey development of 12 dwellings at Sawyers Yard, served from a separate access off Mill Road. Those dwellings consist of large two storey detached and semi-detached properties.

As such, the immediate area is not defined by distinct building characteristics that would warrant the development to be out of keeping.

**The Agent worked with officers during consideration of the previously approved application in order to maintain better spacing between buildings, amend materials and reduce the impact on the neighbouring residents.**

**Although the development would increase the height of the dwelling, it is not proposed to increase the width of the established built form on the site, thus maintaining the gaps between that and the neighbouring dwellings.**

Whilst trying to accommodate first floor living accommodation, the Applicant has tried to keep the overall increase in height to a minimum, as far as practicable. The height is proposed to increase from approx. 4.48m (previous bungalow) to 7.55m (proposed gable projections). The middle section of the resulting dwelling would measure approx. 6.54m in height. This helps to reduce the overall mass of the dwelling.

The neighbouring property to the west is a single storey dwelling, however, the replacement dwelling to the east is two storeys, measuring approx. 7.4m in height, which is similar to the extensions proposed. Further, there is a mixture of gables, varying in width and height, and pitched roofs along Saw Mill Road. As such, it is not considered that the proposed extensions would result in a form of development that would be radically out of keeping with the character and context of the area.

In terms of appearance, the fenestration would be well balanced and the proposed materials; buff brickwork, flint, natural timber cladding, off white render and slate roof tiles, would be in keeping with the mixed, modern and traditional appearance of the area. The resulting dwelling would conform with the existing building line to the front and it has minimal increase in the depth of its footprint. This would indicate that the development would not amount to overdevelopment of the plot.

**In respect of the proposed variations to the scheme which was recently approved, the removal of the garage to the western side would cause no visual harm to the street scene, wider Conservation Area and National Landscape. Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states that "Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads, and National Landscapes." Arguably, this would reduce the overall mass of development, with a footprint of 200 square metres (as approved) to 162 square metres (as proposed), a reduction of approximately 38 square metre, which could be seen as a positive alteration to the scheme and would not be overdevelopment of the site, contrary to the Parish Council's comment.**

The proposed summer house would be relatively wide in order to accommodate the games room/ store and outdoor kitchen. However, its footprint would be shallow, and the height would be kept low (4m) in order to minimise any visual or neighbour impacts.

**The proposed changes to the design of the Summer House when compared with the previous approval, includes the introduction of a small gable projection to the front (south) elevation, creating an 'L-shape' configuration as opposed to a rectangular shaped pitched roof building.**

The previous use of the summer house included an outdoor kitchen / dining area and store / gym. The changes now include a smaller outdoor kitchen / dining area, a games room (instead of a gym) and a larger store. Double doors are now shown to the southern gable elevation to serve the store.

**The footprint of the previously approved summer house measured approx. 62 sqm, and the proposed footprint of the summer house would measure approx. 64 sqm, which is a very modest increase in size. Its overall height to both eaves (2.3m) and ridge level (4.1m) remains the same, as does its position within the plot and distances from boundaries.**

**Whilst the design and form of the proposed summer house would alter from that previously considered acceptable, it would not be overly visible from the public domain due to its position to rear of the private garden and as such, it is not considered to cause harm to the character and appearance of the area or wider National Landscape.**

Neighbourhood Plan Policy 3 restricts footprints for new and redeveloped dwellings, stating that 'residential buildings (including extended) should occupy no more than 50% of the plot'. The submitted plans demonstrate that the proposed extensions and summer house would not amount to a building to plot ratio of more than 50%. The resulting dwelling would be commensurate to the application site and the form and pattern of development of the area.

In regard to the impact on the setting of the Conservation Area, this would be very limited, if at all. There are intermittent views through gaps between buildings along Main Road to the north (Conservation Area boundary) where the roof top of the proposed may be visible, as is No. 4 Saw Mill Road (neighbouring replacement dwelling). However, it is not considered that the small occasional glimpse for a short

section of the conservation area would cause harm to its significance. This is also considered to be the case regarding the impact upon the setting of the Church and the listed building to the north of the site; there is adequate separation and space between the application site and those heritage assets so not to affect their setting. The Conservation Officer raises no objection to the proposal.

The application site is located within the National Landscape, however, given that the dwelling is nestled within an existing built-up residential area with no long views, it is not considered that the proposed development would cause any impact upon the inherent landscape quality of the designation, in accordance with Development Plan Policy LP19 and paragraph 189 of the NPPF.

**The amendment to the demolition plan is more of a technicality rather than causing a direct impact on the form and character / adjacent Conservation Area. As although additional sections of wall have been demolished and will therefore have to be re-built, they would become internal walls and ultimately the end result, i.e. the extended and altered dwelling, would appear exactly the same as previously approved.**

As such, this element of the application would cause no more impact upon the character and appearance of the area over and above that of the previously approved development.

In conclusion, it is considered that notwithstanding the fact that the proposed extensions and alterations would result in a dwelling which differs in scale and appearance to the existing dwelling on the site, the overall design, mass and use of materials would not harm the mixed character of the area, the Conservation Area and the National Landscape and would therefore be in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan Policies 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 and 10; Local Plan Policies LP15, LP18 and LP19 and LP20; LP21; and the general provisions of the NPPF.

#### **Impact on Neighbour Amenity:**

**The development would retain the existing width of the original dwelling on the site, allowing for separation distances of approx. 5.1m to the western boundary (total of 8.7m flank to flank) and approx. 2.58m to the eastern boundary (total of 6m to the neighbour's side gable, which is the closest point).**

**The overall height of the two storey extensions measures approx. 7.55m to the ridge and 4.4m to the eaves. The ridge line would run parallel with the shared eastern and western boundaries and thus the roof would pitch away from the neighbouring properties, limiting any impact.**

**The space between the western neighbour's side elevation and the 1.8m close boarded timber fence and shrubs comprises a brick weave driveway leading to the attached single garage towards the rear of the property. It is unlikely that any material overshadowing would occur because of the proposed extensions due to the orientation of the buildings. Given the nature of the space adjacent**



to the proposed garage, any limited impact would not warrant refusal of the application.

There are windows to the side elevation of the neighbouring bungalow to the west which serve a study/bedroom, a WC and a door which serves a hallway. The bedroom / study benefits from another large window to the front of the dwelling and a high-level window within the apex of the side gable. There are no windows proposed within the western flank elevations of the proposed extensions. As such there would be no direct overlooking between the application site and the neighbour to the west.

Given the separation distance of 8.7m to the closest windows on the side elevation of the neighbouring dwelling to the west, together with the orientation of the buildings, it is not considered to result in significant loss of light to the neighbour's habitable rooms.

Furthermore, as stated above, the side window serving the study / bedroom is a secondary window and as such the room would receive adequate natural light from other windows on other elevations.

The presence of an existing 1.8m fence and shrubs to the western boundary would partly screen the proposed extensions. Therefore, it is not considered that the development would cause a significant overbearing effect when viewed from the neighbour's side window.

The removal of the garage from the previously approved scheme will improve the relationship with this neighbouring property. Albeit the impact was previously considered acceptable.

As above, the separation distance, together with the overall height and orientation would mean that the development would not cause a significant impact on the amenities of the neighbouring residents at No.2, in terms of overshadowing, loss of light and overbearing.

As the changes to the demolition plan relate to a technicality, it would not affect neighbour amenity.

Regarding the impact of the proposed summer house upon the amenities of No. 2, the building would be sited approx. 2.9m from the western boundary and would be approx. 2.3m to its eaves and 4.1m to its ridge. Again, given the overall scale of the building and its orientation in relation to the neighbouring property to the west, together with the fact that it would be located to at the end of a generous size garden, there would be no material impact in terms of overshadowing, loss of light or overbearing.

The only change from that previously approved includes the addition of the forward projecting gable. Whilst this arguably increases the bulk / massing of the summer house when viewed from its front elevation, this bears no adverse impact upon neighbouring residents. The ridge of the gable runs parallel to the western boundary, thus the roof pitches away from the neighbour's amenity

space and would not result in a material increase in overshadowing or overbearing impact.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development accords with Neighbourhood Plan Policy 5; Local Plan Policies LP18 and LP21; and the general provisions of the NPPF, but in particular paragraph 135.

#### **Highway Safety:**

The proposed development provides adequate on-site parking and turning for a dwelling of this scale in accordance with adopted standards.

The proposal therefore accords with Neighbourhood Plan Policy 4; Local Plan Policies LP13, LP14 and LP18; and the general provisions of the NPPF.

#### **Arboricultural Impacts:**

It is noted that a large number of trees had been removed from both the front and the rear garden prior to the submission of the application. However, the site and neighbouring land is not within the Conservation Area where the trees would be protected. Neither are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer previously requested a condition requiring the foundation design for the proposed garage given that it would overlap the root protection zone of two medium sized Leylandii Cypress Trees on Third Party land to the west, to ensure there would be no adverse impact upon those trees.

However, as the Applicant has omitted the garage from the scheme there are no further concerns, and if approved, the related condition imposed on the previous consent (condition 7) is no longer required.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer raises no objection to the current scheme, or the removal of the condition, as the remainder of the development would have no impact upon the adjacent tree.

The proposal therefore accords with the general aims and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan; Local Plan Policy LP19 and the general provisions of the NPPF.

#### **Other Material Considerations:**

**Ecology** - Under the previous application the existing dwelling on the site was assessed to have features suitable to support roosting bats. As such, an Ecology Assessment report was submitted which concluded the bungalow as negligible suitability for roosting bats.

However, ecological enhancements were conditioned in accordance with the Ecological Assessment, which include measures such as soft landscaping;

the erection of at least one integral bat box and one integral bird box; and Hedgehog access.

**BNG** - This application is exempt from having to provide the mandatory net gain as it is a householder. That said, the abovementioned enhancement measures will help towards securing measurable net gains for biodiversity in accordance with paragraph 192 of the NPPF and Development Plan Policy LP19.

**Third Party and Parish Council Concerns** - The Third party and Parish Council comments have been noted and taken into consideration in making a recommendation for this application. Some of the issues raised have been discussed and addressed in the relevant sections above.

Regarding the existing foundations, this does not fall within the scope of planning management per se. The Applicant provided a demolition plan suggesting that the foundations are adequate to accommodate the additional load. Building Control would inspect foundations and advise the Applicant if there is a requirement to underpin them to support the additional load.

With reference to the Parish Council concerns that the 'variation of condition would increase the overdevelopment of the plot', this would not be the case. There are only minor changes to the summer house, which mostly affects its form and external appearance and a very limited increased in footprint (from approximately 62 square metres to 64 square metres). There are no changes to the main resulting dwelling, with the exception of the removal of the garage, which would reduce the footprint of the dwelling creating more separation between the site and the neighbouring dwelling to the west. The proposed development is not considered to be overdevelopment of the plot.

**Crime and Disorder** - Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires Local Authorities to consider the implications for crime and disorder in the carrying out of their duties. The application before the Committee will not have a material impact upon crime and disorder.

## **CONCLUSION:**

The principle of the proposed extensions, alterations and remodelling of the original dwelling and construction of a detached summer house were considered acceptable at the April 2025 Planning Committee.

The current application seeks retrospective consent for the abovementioned works without complying with conditions attached to the previous consent. S73A of the TCP Act 1990 is a legitimate mechanism to regularise development which has started on site and breaches conditions on the planning permission. This regime was introduced to allow Applicants to correct issues with approved development after the fact, rather than requiring a full new application or through enforcement action. That said, if approved, it would

result in a new consent which supersedes the previous consent as opposed to 'running alongside it'.

Although the overall development must be fully considered under this application, significant weight is afforded to the planning history, in this case the recently approved scheme, which went before Members in April of this year and would ultimately result in the same development when complete.

Whilst the development would result in a dwelling of a noticeably different scale and appearance to that which previously existed on the site, for the reasons set out above in the report, it is considered that the proposed extensions and resulting dwelling, by virtue of its scale, mass, design, appearance and use of materials would be compatible with the appearance of the adjacent properties and the amenity of their occupiers. Further, Members have already considered this scheme acceptable in approving application 24/01167/F. There are no other outstanding concerns with regards to matters such as highways, ecology and trees. Relevant conditions have been recommended in relation to such issues which require control.

The breach of condition was a consequence of demolishing additional small sections of wall which were previously shown to be retained. Therefore, the variation to the demolition plan is a process issue. Ultimately, consideration should be given to what additional harm would result from that already approved in the specific circumstances of this case. The outcome of the development would be exactly the same as previously approved. Notwithstanding the fact that small sections of wall shown to be retained have been demolished, case law suggests that as long as the development uses the same surface materials and the overall profile and footprint are exactly the same when complete (with the exception of the other amendments - garage and summer house) it would conform to the permission that had been granted.

The development therefore accords with Neighbourhood Plan Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 and 10; Local Plan Policies LP13, LP14, LP16, LP18, LP19, LP20 and LP21; and the general provisions of the NPPF.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- 1 Condition: The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans drawing nos:
  - 24017 02 Revision I: Proposed Floor Plans,
  - 24017 03 Revision I: Proposed Elevations, Sun Room and Site Plan, and
  - 24017 04 Revision B: Demolition Plan.
- 1 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- 2 Condition: Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted the proposed on-site car parking/turning area shall be laid out, levelled, surfaced and drained in

Planning Committee  
3<sup>rd</sup> November 2025

accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.

- 2 Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of the parking/manoeuvring areas, in the interests of satisfactory development and highway safety, in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan Policy 4; Local Plan Policies LP13, LP14 and LP18; and the provisions of the NPPF.
- 3 Condition: No development shall commence on any external surface of the development until a sample panel of the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building(s) and/or extension(s) hereby permitted has been erected on the site for the inspection and written approval of the Local Planning Authority. The sample panel shall measure at least 1 metre x 1 metre using the proposed materials, mortar type, bond and pointing technique. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
- 3 Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and grouping of materials in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2; Local Plan Policies LP18, LP20 and LP21; and the general principles of the NPPF.
- 4 Condition: Construction or development work on site, along with collections and deliveries of waste products, material and equipment, shall only be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800 weekdays, and 0900-1300 on Saturdays, with no work allowed on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays. Piling, where applicable, shall only be carried out weekdays between the hours of 0900-1700.
- 4 Reason: In the interests of the amenities of local residents, in accordance with Local Plan Policies LP18 and LP21; and the provisions of the NPPF.
- 5 Condition: On-site parking for construction workers must occur for the duration of the works until the development is completed.
- 5 Reason: In the interests of the amenities of local residents, in accordance with Local Plan Policies LP18 and LP21; and the provisions of the NPPF.
- 6 Condition: The use of the summerhouse hereby approved shall be limited to purposes incidental to the needs and personal enjoyment of the occupants of the dwelling and shall at no time be used for business or commercial purposes.
- 6 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the building is not used for unrelated purposes that would be incompatible with the provisions of the NPPF and Development Plan Policies LP18 and LP21.
- 7 Condition: The Mitigation of Construction Impacts and Ecological Enhancements and Opportunities set out in paragraphs 7.9 – 7.11 of the Ecological Assessment prepared by Hopkins Ecology, dated 21 November 2024, shall be adhered to during the course of the construction, and in relation to enhancement measures, shall be carried out prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, and retained thereafter as such.
- 7 Reason: In the interests of ecology and biodiversity, in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan Policy 10; Local Plan Policy LP19; and the provisions of the NPPF.

