

Parish:	Hilgay	
Proposal:	VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 20/00198/F: Proposed 4-Bed dwelling and triple garage with associated parking and private amenity space	
Location:	Mulberry House East End Hilgay DOWNHAM MARKET	
Applicant:	Mr Ben Saxby	
Case No:	22/00987/F (Full Application)	
Case Officer:	Mrs C Dorgan	Date for Determination: 1 September 2022 Extension of Time Expiry Date: 11 November 2022

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee – Called in by Cllr Holmes

Neighbourhood Plan: No

Case Summary

The site is located on the south side of East End, Hilgay, some 50m from the junction of the East End and Church Road. The site is located adjacent to the development boundaries for Hilgay as defined by the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Document 2016 (SADMPP).

This application is to vary condition 2 (the approved plans) of an extant planning consent for 'the construction of a 4-Bed dwelling and triple garage with associated parking and private amenity space' (Ref: 20/00198/F). The development has been constructed although is not fully in accordance with the approved plans. The application seeks to regularise these differences.

Key Issues

- Site History / Principle of development
- Highway / Access
- Form and character
- Neighbour amenity
- Drainage
- Other material considerations

Recommendation:

APPROVE

THE APPLICATION

The site is located on the south side of East End, Hilgay, some 50m from the junction of the East End and Church Road. The site is located adjacent to the development boundaries for Hilgay as defined by the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Document 2016.

This application is for the variation of planning Condition 2 of extant permission reference 20/00198/F 'Proposed 4-Bed dwelling and triple garage with associated parking and private amenity space'.

Condition 2 of the extant planning consent ref. 22/00987/F related to approved plans and drawings for the proposed development. The applicant has confirmed that the development has now been completed. This application is thus proposing to retrospectively amend the approved drawings to reflect what has been built. The differences to the scheme include-

- Site levels – These have increased across the site. To the north of the site, within the garden, the site level is now approx. 5.9 AOD and previously this was 5.3. Along the southern boundary of the site levels were 5.8 and now 5.99, was 5.5 and now 5.8, was 5.6 and now 5.8.
- The overall height of the dwelling is 9.1m (8.8m previously approved)
- Front elevation of dwelling – two new rooflights inserted approx. in line with front door. Amended design of front door/ canopy.
- Rear elevation of dwelling – first floor dormer window has been repositioned. Loss of two small rooflights. Fewer panels in bifold doors.
- Side elevation (east) – New window at first floor. Loss of window at ground floor and insertion of round window at first floor. Door has been repositioned.
- Side elevation (west) – Ground floor door reduced in size to two panels.
- The garages have increased in height by 0.65m to 5.65m, and the footprint is slightly larger than as previously approved.
- The footprint of the dwelling remains the same.
- The landscaping on the site has been amended.

The dwelling is situated within a substantial plot with gardens to the west and a parking and turning area to the east. The dwelling is accessed off East End and the dwelling fronts on to the road. The site is set higher than the adjacent public highway, East End.

SUPPORTING CASE

The application has been called to committee, despite having support from the planning authority, and no objections from any statutory consultees.

This application is the product of multiple rounds of discussions and revisions, there have been numerous rounds of neighbour concerns, but, through working with the planning department we feel these have been addressed and the amendments to the development have very limited adverse impact upon the surrounding area. This supporting statement is designed to address concerns over amendments from the original planning approval and subsequent discharge of conditions applications.

The design of the building echoes its surroundings with design cues including red brick, conservation style windows, plinth courses, parapet roofs, and pantile roof coverings taken from the surrounding properties. This was done to satisfy the local vernacular and ensure the property is in keeping with its surroundings. It should not be overlooked that all neighbouring properties are full 2 storey properties.

Planning Committee
18 November 2022

One of the variations from the original planning has been that of building height. Following site visits and measures from the planning department it has become apparent that the ridge lines have risen from the design drawing. It is worth noting that building tolerances should be considered as a contributing factor. A design drawing is drawn to be millimetre perfect but it is impossible to achieve these tolerances in site conditions – for example if on every brickwork joint the bricklayer is only 2mm out (less than the width of a stringline) on an 8m high gable end this would equate to over 200mm difference in height. And that is not accounting for brick tolerances, roof level tolerances etc etc. that being said the impact of the buildings height is negligible. The building is recessed over 1m into the ground and as such the impact, compared to a neighbouring house starting at the same ground level, is greatly reduced. The top of the southern fence, a 10ft fence, (where the closest neighbours are) comes to almost the underside of the first floor windows, so overlooking cannot be considered and issue.

The garage structure is closest to the southern boundary, but this is only a single storey building with no windows – the 10ft fence comes above the building eaves level so only the pitch of the roof is visible from the neighbouring property. Again this is significantly reduced from what would be considered typical, and as such the impact and any overlooking cannot be considered a material issue.

Other changes made are the relocation of some first floor windows, these were moved to facilitate better more balanced design and also to allow for downpipes to track down the building vertically rather than dogleg around bi fold doors. Again, none of these amendments have created any additional overlooking to any neighbouring properties.

The velux windows in the roof have not changed from the original approval but two sun tubes have been added to allow natural light into the main entrance hallway. This is effectively a reflective tube with a flat diffuser plate on the ceiling internally a small glass, velux looking, panel on the exterior of the roof. These have been strategically placed to give the overall elevation balance and by their very nature they do not create any overlooking issues.

The other changes identified are relating to the landscaping, namely a patio extending towards the southern boundary and the level of the lawn areas. The patio area extends to the back of the property and links to the garage area so it is not a widely used area. It is also bordered to the neighbouring property by the 10ft boundary treatment. The lawn area has simply been made flat – the plot originally sloped back to front so a cut and fill exercise has been undertaken to regulate the lawn area, reducing the back of the lot and raising the front of the plot. The area that has been raised is well hidden behind existing vegetation and trees on the highways verge. All areas of the lawn are surrounded by 1.8m close board fencing and does not give rise to any overlooking.

In summary, whilst there have been changes from the originally approved planning none of the changes create any additional adverse impact on any of the neighbouring properties and as such we can see no reason this application cannot be approved.

PLANNING HISTORY

20/00198/F: Application Permitted (Committee decision): 19/06/2020. Proposed 4-Bed dwelling and triple garage with associated parking and private amenity space - Land South of Brett House, East End, Hilgay.

19/01389/f: Application Refused (Delegated decision): 12/11/2019. Proposed 4-bed dwelling including detached garages, with associated parking and private amenity space - Land south of Brett House, Hilgay.

18/01890/RM: Application Permitted: 05/06/19 - Proposed 2 x 5-bed, one and a half storey detached dwellings with associated landscaping. - Land South of East End

18/01052/F: Application Permitted: 02/08/18 - REMOVAL OR VARIATION OF CONDITION 13 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 15/01830/O: Outline application for site for construction of two dwellings - Land South of East End

15/01830/O: Application Permitted: 08/02/16 - Outline application for site for construction of two dwellings - Land South of East End

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Parish Council: NO COMMENTS RECEIVED

Public Rights of Way (NCC): NO OBJECTION

Have no objections on Public Rights of Way grounds as although Hilgay footpath 5 and Bridleway 2 are in the vicinity, they do not appear to be affected by the proposals.

Local Highway Authority: NO OBJECTION

The highway considerations would be as per the previous approved application and therefore no objection to the principle of the variation of condition 2.

Environmental Quality: NO COMMENTS

Internal Drainage Board: NO COMMENTS

Community Safety and Neighbourhood Nuisance (CSNN): NO OBJECTION

The CSNN team reviewed the detailed clarifications and confirmed that the details have been of use in clarifying the site and the design. No further concerns were raised, as such no objections are raised to the proposal.

Historic England: NO COMMENTS

On the basis of the information available to date, Historic England did not wish to offer any advice in this instance.

Natural England: NO OBJECTION

Did not provide any detailed advice on the application.

Ministry of Defence: NO OBJECTION

The application site occupies the statutory safeguarding zone(s) surrounding RAF Marham. In particular, the aerodrome height and technical safeguarding zones surrounding the aerodrome and is approx. 14.9 km from the centre of the airfield. After reviewing the application documents, the MOD confirm that there are no safeguarding objections to this proposal.

REPRESENTATIONS

SIX OBJECTIONS have been received to the application. These are summarised below-

- Variation in excess of previous plans – misleading. Seems to be two sets of plans – one for Council approval and one for construction – as both drawings dated same time
- Disingenuous approach by applicant to not build in accordance with plans and then to apply for amendments retrospectively
- Doubts around garage height, dwelling height, ground levels, wrong fencing line, no acoustic fencing
- More of a point should have been made to clarify that the house is now 6 bed rather than the 4 bed originally approved
- No detailed narrative justifying why changes are required
- Out of place & unsuitable for the location. Out of proportion, due to increased garage height building seems top-heavy.
- Planning creep as developer initially had consent for a smaller dwelling
- The fence to the north boundary is too high and does not fit into the street scene
- No acoustic fence, although was required by extant consent
- Temporary fencing surrounding development plot
- Traffic generated from increase to 6-bed house
- Raising site levels risks flooding into the properties to the south
- Expanse of the roofline affecting view from neighbours' windows
- Garden levels have been raised taking away the privacy of the adjacent properties
- Garage height increased by 0.5 metres
- Height of the structure of the play area (near southern boundary)
- Any increase in height of dwelling or site levels is unwelcomed
- Overlooking into neighbour's gardens

Cllr. Alan Holmes commented the following:

“ This seems to me to amount to a quite different building and development than the original application. Very concerned that none of this was brought back to us as a planning authority before building was commenced or alterations to the agreed application were commenced. It also seems to me that the architect who provided the revised drawings should have made sure that these dramatic changes were referred back to us, especially as the garden ground level is substantially altered, and that this now appears to be a 6/7-bedroom property, which was definitely not what the Planning Committee granted permission for. And I feel strongly that the reasons for these alterations were necessarily needs to be provided.”

LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

CS02 - The Settlement Hierarchy

CS06 - Development in Rural Areas

CS08 - Sustainable Development

CS11 – Transport

CS12 - Environmental Assets

SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES PLAN 2016

DM15 – Environment, Design and Amenity

Planning Committee
18 November 2022

DM17 - Parking Provision in New Development

DM2 – Development Boundaries

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
National Design Guide 2019

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main issues are:

Site History/ Principle of development
Highway/ Access
Form and character
Neighbour amenity
Drainage
Other material considerations

Site History/ Principle of Development:

Hilgay is classed as a Rural Village in the adopted Local Plan, and as such has a development boundary. The application site itself lies adjacent to but outside of the development boundary. Therefore, in line with Policy DM2 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMP) (2016) housing would normally be restricted in this location.

However, the principle of development has been established on this site by the extant planning consent 20/00198/F which is a material consideration in the determination of the application. This application, for a large 4-bed residential dwelling with associated parking and amenity space was permitted by Planning Committee in June 2020.

Following granting of permission, the applicant has built out the dwelling, however the final design of the built development is not in accordance with the approved plans for the extant permission. Consequently, this application has been made to consider the changes made to the development permitted and whether the impact of these changes is material and beyond that previously considered acceptable under the approved scheme. It is important to remember that this application solely considers the retrospective changes made to the development.

The principle of development in this location is acceptable, subject to compliance with the other policies in the Local Plan.

Highways / Access:

Neighbour objections have been received relating to the increased traffic as a result of expanding the dwelling to 6 bedrooms, rather than the 4-bed previously approved, and that this additional traffic will cause disturbance for residents and increased risk for pedestrians.

The proposed dwelling is to be served by one vehicular access off East End. While the objections raised have been noted, the principle of development has already been

established by the existing planning consent and the scheme provides adequate parking for a dwelling of this size.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has not raised any objections to the proposed scheme and has commented to say that all highway considerations would be as per the previous approved application and therefore they had no objection to the principle of the variation of condition 2.

Thus, in highways terms, the proposal is considered to not be materially different to the development previously permitted on site, so the proposal complies with Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM15 of the SADMPP 2016.

Form and character

The site is located on the south side of East End in an elevated location. It is surrounded on three sides by residential development and with open countryside to the south.

The nature of the scheme is residential and minor changes are proposed to the design of the scheme, which are not considered to be significant in the context of the overall scale, design and character of the development as built, both individually and cumulatively.

Height of the building -

The latest plans submitted demonstrate an increase in height of the overall dwelling built by approximately 0.3m (from 8.8m to 9.1m)

It is noted that the previously approved scheme (20/00198/F) granted permission for a 4-bedroom house laid out over two floors – ground floor and first floor, while the scheme hereby being considered seeks consent for an increased capacity of the house to 6 bedrooms spread over three storeys -ground floor, first floor and second floor (by inserting an additional floor internally). The building height will increase by 0.3m as a result. Thus, the changes proposed concern the layout and floor heights of each story internally, and the impact of the proposed changes to the external envelope of the building would be the increase of the building in height by approximately 0.3 metres.

Although it is acknowledged that the increase in height of the building could have an increased impact on the overbearing aspects of the proposed development, in this case the increase in height is not considered significant given the size of the site, and the separation distances to neighbouring dwellings.

Footprint of the dwelling -

The plans submitted for approval under this application do not show any changes to the building footprint when compared to the plans already approved under reference 20/00198/F. As such, no material changes to the building footprint are under consideration as part of this application.

Site levels -

The site levels have been increased across the site, to that was originally approved. To the north of the site, within the garden, the ground level is now approx. 5.9 and previously this was 5.3. Along the southern boundary of the site levels were 5.8 and now 5.99, was 5.5 and now 5.8, was 5.6 and now 5.8.

This increase in site levels has resulted in concerns raised by neighbours that this would cause the built dwellinghouse and all development onsite to be higher visibly and physically.

The largest increase in site levels is along the northern boundary where the change is 0.6. However, given the distance between this boundary and the dwelling, and then also the neighbouring dwellings, the increase is acceptable in terms of form and character.

Front (North) Elevation -

The changes to the front elevation have included the addition of two new rooflights/ suntubes and an amended front door and canopy to the principal elevation of the dwelling built.

The two additional rooflights/ suntubes are proposed at a lower level than the existing 6 rooflights on the northern elevation to the building, however as the submitted section drawing demonstrates, these are to provide additional light into the landing areas within the building.

The design of the front door has also been amended. The previously approved elevations permitted a double door and canopy, while the final design of the dwelling is with a single door with the same canopy as is shown on the plan.

Rear (South) elevation -

The changes to the rear elevation have included the repositioning of a first-floor dormer window, increase in height of the Orangery room, the loss of two small rooflights and fewer panels in the bifold doors. The change in the height of the Orangery would resemble an increase in height from the approved 2.9 metre height to 3.35 metres as built. This change would result in a net increase of under 0.5 metres in height, and as such would not be material/significant to the impact of the proposal on the locality.

Side (east) elevation -

The changes proposed to the east elevation include the addition of a new window at first floor, the loss of a window at ground floor, repositioning of the door and the insertion of round window at ground floor. The loss of a ground floor window, addition of a round window to the side of the front porch and the repositioning of the side door to this elevation individually as well as cumulatively do not present any additional impacts on neighbour's amenity beyond what had previously been approved under application ref 20/00198/F. As such these amendments are considered minor design changes and are acceptable. Given that this elevation (east) overlooks the applicant's driveway, the addition of a window to the first-floor elevation is considered acceptable.

Side (west) elevation -

The only change proposed to this elevation is the ground floor door being reduced in size to two panels, whilst previously approved for three panels. This change is not considered to materially affect the proposal, and as such is considered acceptable.

Garage height and size -

Neighbour objections refer to the increased height of the garage proposed, the structure built appears to be larger than that originally permitted. The approved height for the triple garage building was 5m (under permission ref. 20/00198/F).

The garage built has an increased height of 0.65m, with the overall ridge height now standing at 5.65m high; the footprint of the building remains largely as previously approved. However, the submitted plans do show a change in the layout of the garages internally, with the addition of 215mm separation walls between the car parking spaces within the garage. Another change to the design of the garage is the addition of six 440mm by 350mm solid brick piers externally along the southern and eastern elevations of the garage building. The addition of these brick piers increases the overall footprint of the garage by an approximate additional 250mm in width and an approx. additional 250mm in length.

As such, although the internal measurements of the garage according to the submitted plans would remain, the overall footprint of this garage building has increased marginally to 16.3m in length and 7.5m in width.

Landscaping -

The key changes to the landscaping proposed on site include an increased area of patio to the rear and sides of the development, with the addition of two sets of stairs to connect the patio area to the wider private garden on site, hedging to the perimeter of the built dwelling as well as to the perimeter of the patio areas, more delineated driveway area east of the dwelling and more refined and detailed proposals in terms of shrub planting and placement within the site. As approved, the 1m wide by 1m high planter and gravel margin between the patio and the southern boundary are retained.

The acoustic fence has been omitted from the scheme as it was a derivative of having a 'golf' room closest to the boundary within the room with the patio door. As the layout was changed, moving the 'golf' room inwards circa 20m from the boundary to a room with no external doors, the acoustic fence was no longer required. All openings on the southern elevation of the building are over 20m from the southern boundary. A 1.8m close boarded fence is proposed in the place of the acoustic fence. No objection has been raised by CSNN to the removal of the acoustic fence.

Full details of the boundary treatments were conditioned and the details discharged under application ref 20/00198/DISC A. However, this application seeks to amend these again to include 1.8m close board fencing along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. This was contrary to previous discussions and the 1.8m close board fencing on the northern boundary fails to have a positive impact on the street scene. However, the applicant is required to plant a hedge along the front of the fence which has been done, and this hedge will be retained via condition. Once this hedge has become established and has grown this will detract somewhat from the impact of the fencing. On balance, with the planting/ hedging in place, it is not considered the 1.8m fencing warrants refusal of the application. However, Members will need to take a view with regard to this impact on the street scene.

Approximately 50% of the plot has been lowered circa 1m to accommodate the ridge height of the building at early planning stages. This has been retained as approved and the lowered sections of the site have been bordered by a sleeper wall.

The proposed amendments to the landscaping are contained within the site boundaries and as such are barely visible from the public highway. As a result the landscaping proposals are considered acceptable.

In summary the proposal is considered to be acceptable in relation to the overall impact of the changes to the appearance, form and design of the development as built and their impact on the character of the local area. As such the amendments to the design of the dwelling and the landscaping are considered acceptable and in accordance with the NPPF, Policy CS08 of the CS and DM15 of the SADMPP.

Neighbour amenity

An assessment has been made of each of the proposed changes to the scheme and any impacts of these to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

The impact of the increased height of the dwelling (by 0.3m) would not result in a scheme which is materially different to that previously approved, and given the distances between existing dwellings and the application dwelling, the impact of this change is not considered to be significant and would not give rise to overlooking or overshadowing as a result.

The change in the land levels of the garden does not create an increased level of overbearing, as it is only the garden which has been raised, the house remains set down within the plot. It is not considered that this change in levels is significant enough, in contrast to that already approved, to be a material change in the nature of the proposal, as such on balance this is considered acceptable. The boundary treatments proposed are sufficient for a residential garden at approximately 1.8m close board fencing and so the amendments do not give rise to overlooking/ a loss of privacy as a result.

The amendments to the elevations in terms of changes to the windows, doors and rooflights/ suntubes are not considered to be significant in terms of their impact upon neighbour amenity. Due to their positioning within the dwelling and the plot they do not give rise to increased overlooking/ loss of privacy as a result and as such the changes are considered minor and acceptable in this instance. As the submitted section drawing demonstrates, it will not be possible for residents to look out of the proposed new rooflights on the front elevation of the dwelling, and the new first floor window on the east elevation will overlook the driveway/ parking area for the dwelling.

Given the garage is single storey it is not considered that the increase in height and the building footprint would give rise to any overlooking and would not be considered overbearing. While the garage roof is now more visible to neighbours, there is no right to a view. Therefore, in the context of the approved development, the increases of around 0.5m in terms of the height, and 0.25m in terms of width and length of the garages proposed are considered acceptable in terms of neighbour amenity.

Overall, it is considered that the changes made to the built dwelling on site would not result in a scheme which is materially different to that previously approved. It is considered that due to the siting, spacing and orientation of the proposed dwelling, the scheme as built does not overshadow neighbouring dwellings, is not overbearing and does not result in a loss of privacy. There is still sufficient separation distance between the site and surrounding dwellings and as a result the dwelling and garages as built would not result in a loss of amenity for existing dwellings.

Concerns were raised by objectors, and initially the CSNN officer, regarding the potential impacts on neighbouring residents from the multitude of changes hereby proposed in this application. However, following further clarification, CSNN do not object to the scheme based on the information submitted and therefore the scheme is in accordance with the NPPF, Policy CS08 of the CS and Policy DM15 of the SADMPP.

Drainage

Due to the increased land levels across the garden of the site, some concerns from members of the public were raised regarding the surface water drainage impacts.

The garden levels to the surrounding dwellings to the south are higher than the top of the sleepers within the proposed site, so any surface water run off would be onto the application site itself rather than from it, as the site has been lowered a 1m. Therefore, there is little potential for surface water on site to run off into the neighbours' gardens.

The designed soakaways as approved have been installed in specific locations and land-drains encompass the whole perimeter. Any surface water run off possible on to the highway to the north is from the existing houses and the hard surfaced driveways that have been in place for a number of years, rather than from this site.

The western boundary of the site has a 3m wide planter with a 1m high sleeper border and then a 1.8m fence. Behind this fence is a 1m wide gap with a French drain in it to prevent run off into the backs of the adjoining gardens to the west. The neighbours also have their own either low level or 1.8m close boarded fences.

In accordance with the information submitted on the site plans, and following detailed clarification from the applicant, CSNN has confirmed they have no objection to the scheme including in relation to drainage. Therefore, based on the information submitted it is considered that drainage arrangements are acceptable for the site and scale of development as proposed. The scheme is in accordance with the NPPF, Policy CS08 of the CS and Policy DM15 of the SADMPP.

Other material considerations:

No objections have been received from the Public Rights of Way Officer, Environmental Quality, the IDB, Natural England and the Ministry of Defence. No comments were made by Historic England. The Parish Council have not commented on the application.

The applicant is not required to justify the reasons for the changes to the design as such, and has not sought to do so.

The applicant does have play equipment (a climbing frame) within their garden and this has been measured and falls within permitted development.

CONCLUSION

The principle of the dwelling of the same footprint has already been established. The changes to the scheme proposed retrospectively as part of this application have been thoroughly considered and assessed in detail in terms of their impact of neighbour amenity, and design and appearance.

Both individually and cumulatively the changes proposed under this application do not result in a scheme which is materially different from the approved dwelling under the previous permission ref. 20/00198/F, as a result of the proposed amendments.

As such all changes proposed as part of this application would result in a development of a similar nature and would not cause any undue significant adverse impacts or harm to the locality beyond that previously considered acceptable, and therefore the variation to condition 2 of planning permission ref 20/00198/F can be reasonably approved in this case in accordance with the NPPF, Policies CS06, CS08, CS11 and CS12 of the CS, and Policies DM2, DM15 and DM17 of the SADMPP.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

- 1 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans –

Drawing Nos 2343 001 A, 2343 003 A and 2343 004 A received 21 October 2022,
Proposed Section Plan received 16 Sept 2022.

- 1 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Planning Committee
18 November 2022

- 2 Condition: The vehicular access / over the verge shall be retained at the position shown on the approved plan and in accordance with the highways specification TRAD 5 . Arrangement shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposal of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway.
- 2 Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory access and to avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway in the interests of highway safety.
- 3 Condition: Any access gates / bollard / chain / other means of obstruction shall be hung to open inwards, set back, and thereafter retained a minimum distance of 5 metres from the near channel edge of the adjacent carriageway.
- 3 Reason: In the interests of highway safety enabling vehicles to safely draw off the highway before the gates/obstruction is opened.
- 4 Condition: The gradient of the vehicular access shall not exceed 1:12 for the first 5 metres into the site as measured from the near channel edge of the adjacent carriageway.
- 4 Reason: In the interests of the safety of persons using the access and users of the highway.
- 5 Condition: A 2.4 metre wide parallel visibility splay (as measured back from the near edge of the adjacent highway carriageway) shall be provided across the whole of the site's roadside frontage and shall be maintained at all times free from any obstruction exceeding 1.05 metres above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.
- 5 Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.
- 6 Condition: The development shall take place in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation submitted and agreed under application 20/00198/DISC A.
- 6 Reason: To safeguard archaeological interests in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.
- 7 Condition: No demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under Condition 6.
- 7 Reason: To safeguard archaeological interests in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.
- 8 Condition: Within three months of the date of this consent (unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) the site investigation and post investigation assessment shall be completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under Condition 6 and the provision to be made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.
- 8 Reason: To safeguard archaeological interests in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.
- 9 Condition: The development hereby approved shall be built in accordance with the following details for the Air Source Heat Pumps –

- * Drawing No 001 Proposed Site & Location Plan, received 2nd February 2022
- * Daikin Altherma 3 Heat data sheet, received 2nd February 2022
- * Daikin Altherma H-Split (R32) data sheet, received 2nd February 2022
- * Flexi Foot Strut data sheet, Pump House, Diversitect Company, received 2nd February 2022

The scheme shall be implemented as approved and thereafter maintained as such.

- 9 Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.
- 10 Condition: All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation or use of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants that within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species as those originally planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written approval to any variation.
- 10 Reason: To ensure that the work is carried out within a reasonable period in accordance with the NPPF.
- 11 Condition: No existing trees, shrubs or hedges within the site that are shown as being retained on the approved plans shall be felled, uprooted, willfully damaged or destroyed, cut back in any way or removed without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any trees, shrubs or hedges removed without such approval or that die or become severely damaged or seriously diseased within 5 years from the completion of the development hereby permitted shall be replaced with trees, shrubs or hedge plants of a similar size and species in the next available planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written approval to any variation.
- 11 Reason: To ensure that the development is compatible with the amenities of the locality in accordance with the NPPF.