

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

Case Officer: Jacqueline Houslander

Parish: Bigbury **Ward:** Charterlands

Application No: 2720/21/FUL

Agent/Applicant:

Mr David Glassock - David Glassock
Architecture
38 New Meadow
Ivybridge
PL21 9PT

Applicant:

Mr And Mrs Johnathon and Jen Marshall
Barby Lodge
Cleveland Drive
Bigbury On Sea
TQ7 4AY

Site Address: Barby Lodge, Cleveland Drive, Bigbury On Sea, TQ7 4AY

Development: Full planning application for replacement dwelling (resubmission of 2828/20/FUL)



Reason item is being put before Committee: Councillor Taylor has asked that the proposal be heard by Committee because of the number of objections to the development proposed

Recommendation: Approval

Conditions

1. Time limit
2. Accord with plans

3. Samples of materials
4. Unexpected contamination
5. Removal of PD rights to extend
6. Landscaping to be in accordance with plans and implemented in first planting season.
8. Garage to be used for parking of cars and domestic storage only
9. Adherence to ecology report
10. Soakaway or attenuation tank position to be agreed prior to commencement of development.
12. Adherence to ecology report.
13. Construction Management Plan

Key issues for consideration: Impact on neighbours, design; scale; massing; impact in the AONB

Financial Implications (Potential New Homes Bonus for major applications):

As part of the Spending Review 2020, the Chancellor announced that there will be a further round of New Homes Bonus allocations under the current scheme for 2021/22. This year is the last year's allocation of New Homes Bonus (which was based on dwellings built out by October 2020). The Government has stated that they will soon be inviting views on how they can reform the New Homes Bonus scheme from 2022-23, to ensure it is focused where homes are needed most.

Site Description: The application site is located at the corner of Cleveland Drive and Parker Road in Bigbury on Sea. The site is currently occupied by a bungalow with some under build on a rectangular plot. The current dwelling sits across the site, with its front elevation (as are most in this area) facing south west towards the sea.

Bigbury on Sea is within the area designated as South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage coast.

The Proposal: This is a resubmission of an application which was refused in June of this year.

The previous application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal by virtue of its new position on the site, creates a negative impact on neighbouring properties to the north, west and east in terms of overlooking and the perception of overlooking, being dominant and overbearing and causing a loss of outlook contrary to policy DEV1 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan and policy BP7 of the Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan and para. 127 of the NPPF 2019
2. The scale and massing of the proposed dwelling would have a negative impact on the street scene and as such be out of character with the area contrary to policy DEV20 in the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan and policy BP7 of the Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan as well as para. 127 of the NPPF 2019.

The proposal remains as a replacement of the current 3 bed bungalow with a 4 bedroom dwelling, plus snug. The proposal has changed since the previous refusal in the following ways:

- The proposals have been brought forward by 1750mm, making the rear of the proposals now in line with the store of Barby Lodge.
- Increased rear garden amenity space.
- Distance between Willows and Barby Lodge 8.9m
- The depth of the terrace along the eastern elevation is reduced by 1m
- West facing first floor window facing Durley Dene omitted.
- 2 additional roof lights proposed to south elevation in lieu of the omitted West facing window.

The proposed replacement dwelling, still provides an undercroft garage slightly deeper (measuring 5m x 7.3 m) a store room behind the garage; an entrance hall/boot room with a small shower /WC and plant room. A ground floor which provides an open plan kitchen, living and dining area, a master bedroom, a study, bathroom and separate WC. A first floor in the roof slope providing 3 bedrooms, an office, a family bathroom a further WC and a further lounge area at the eastern end of the building.

Around the east and south of the proposed dwelling is an area of decking, which extends across the front and down the eastern side up to the rear boundary (the decking along the eastern side of the house, measuring 2metres wide by 13m on the eastern side and 4.5 by 17 metres across the front. At the rear, there is a rectangular area of grass, with a raised bed adjacent to the boundary wall with the rear property Willows. The decking at the front extends over the front garden area. In the front of the proposed decking is an area of garden which will provide for the drive/parking area to allow for cars to enter from one side (off Cleveland Drive) and exit onto Parker Road. The undercroft element of the proposed dwelling is set back under the decking and as such the area of space in the front garden for the parking and turning of vehicles is slightly larger than the site plan indicates which has the decking shown. The distance between the garage front wall and the front hedge is 6.7m and from the front of the entrance door and the front of the drive is 5.5metres.

Stone boundary walls are proposed along the front boundary with planting on top to align with the existing hedgerows on the site. Along the eastern edge of the site, the grass verge which is existing will be retained, behind which is proposed a rendered wall (as existing) and laurel hedging. A pedestrian gate to the rear of the house from Parker Road is also included as existing.

The existing boundary to the north east will be retained as it is. Currently Barby Lodge and Durley Dene are joined by their respective garages. The proposal removes the garage and places it under the house. The new boundary with Durley Dene is proposed as a rendered wall. A footpath to the rear of Barby Lodge inside of the boundary wall. Further towards the front a new stone boundary wall with planting is proposed. Pedestrian access to the front of the proposed dwelling will be via the path to the west of the garden boundary walling onto the decking on front of the bedroom gable wing.

Consultations:

- County Highways Authority: No comments to make.
- Town/Parish Council:

The Parish Council considered that the revised scheme did not address the reasons for the refusal of the previous application Ref: 2828/20/FUL and bringing forward the proposed dwelling creates additional problems.

In terms of the negative amenity on the neighbouring properties to the north, west and east of the proposed dwelling the proposed development will still result in overlooking of the properties to the north (Willows), to the east (Highfield) and now direct overlooking of the living room, kitchen and

bedroom at the front of the property to the west (Durley Dene) due to the raised upper ground floor platform, which is now situated between 1.5m to 3m in front of the house.

The proposed dwelling will still be dominant and overbearing on the amenities of all of these properties due to the massing, increase on width and increase in height.

It will also result in loss of outlook from the back of Willows and the back as well as front of Durley Dene. Overshadowing of the front and rear windows of the living room and the rear patio of Durley Dene is also an issue.

In terms of scale and massing the building is similar in size, in fact slightly larger in floor area, and would still have a negative impact on the street scene. It would also be out of keeping with the character of the area, which in this part of Bigbury on Sea is primarily bungalows. The increased height of the dwelling will also be now more apparent when viewed from Cleveland Drive and Parker Road.

The raised platform at the upper ground floor extending across the front of the property along Cleveland Drive and down the side of the property on Parker Road is now going to result in another dominant feature detrimental to the street scene and is likely to result in significant noise nuisance to neighbouring properties due to its size and height a full storey above the Cleveland Drive street level.

A new issue now arises due the proposed dwelling projecting in front of the main building line, contrary to Policy BP7(iii).

The Parish Council also referred to the amount of floor to ceiling windows particularly at upper ground floor level as well as the large window with Juliette balcony on the first floor eastern gable end of the property. These windows will result in excessive levels of light pollution contrary to Policy BP7(vii).

A further major issue now arises due to the bringing forward of the lower ground floor as there will now be insufficient space to park three vehicles and still be able to manouver into and out of the parking area in forward gear. This will now result in problems of highway safety contrary to Policy BP(viii) of the Neighbourhood Plan. Policy BP27 – Parking provision requires space for 3 cars for dwellings of 3 or more bedrooms. This proposed dwelling is described as a 4 bedroom property but it has two studies and two large living rooms (upper ground floor and first floor) making this an extremely large house, more than 3 times the size, in terms of gross internal floorspace, of the existing dwelling which is a 3 bedroom bungalow.

It was considered that the development is an overdevelopment of the plot. It is too large in overall size for the size of the plot, the ridge height is 1.3m above its current height and still 0.5m above that of the neighbouring property, Durley Dene, and the eaves height at the rear is also a metre higher than the current eaves height.

The proposed building still extends too far back on the plot as well as too far forward causing severe harm to the amenities of Willows and Durley Dene by reason of it being overly dominant and intrusive, impacting on outlook and resulting in overshadowing of the private patio area at the rear of Durley Dene and over shadowing to the living room windows at the rear and front of the property.

There would also be overlooking of Willows at the rear, Highfield on the east side and the front of Durley Dene to the west.

As a consequence to the above the proposed development would be in conflict with Policy BP7 criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (vi), (vii) and (viii) as follows:

Criterion i) Proposals should reflect the appearance and character of the area and have regard to the design guidelines in the village studies;

Criterion ii) The height, scale and density of development should reflect the existing grain, height, density and pattern of development in the surrounding area;

Criterion iii) The front building line should be maintained;

Criterion vi) The proposals should protect residential amenity and should not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of occupiers by reason of loss of outlook, loss of important views, loss of privacy or overlooking, overbearing and dominant impact, noise and other disturbance;

Criterion vii) Proposals should be designed to limit light pollution;

Criterion viii) There should be a safe means of access to the site and adequate off street parking.

The proposed development is also contrary to the Design Guidance set out in the Bigbury on Sea Village Study (Appendix 9) including the criteria 'to reduce or retain the maximum height of roofs including those of extensions, on new builds or alterations and extensions to existing properties to that of the original, unless the increase in roof height is consistent with that of neighbouring properties and/or does not impede on the views of surrounding properties.

The Parish Council also recommended that any new development allowed on this site should be subject to the condition, now being included for any new build within the parish, that there should be no external lighting without prior approval of the local planning authority.

- Drainage: Standing advice

Representations:

Representations from Residents

Comments have been received and cover the following points:

Objections: 18 letters received.

- Massive change to the footprint and skyline
- Impact on neighbours
- The plans are not in line with the neighbourhood plan
- The proposal would create a dangerous precedent.
- Too large for the plot
- It will block crucial views and cause overlooking to neighbours
- Very little change from the previous application
- Mass and density is not in line with the Neighbourhood Plan
- The increase in size is not appropriate for the site
- Allowing the development would make a mockery of the NP
- Balconies cause loss of privacy to neighbours
- The proposal has more storey's than the existing building and will dominate the street scene
- This proposal is completely out of character due to its size, mass and scale
- Overbearing and overshadowing on the neighbouring property
- Impacts of demolition on carbon footprints – the existing building could be retained and upgraded
- Light and noise impacts from the decking
- Design is attractive but inappropriate for this site
- The amendments made to the proposal are too minor and moving it forward has other impacts
- Setting the front gable in front of the adjoining neighbour impacts on their views.
- Parking and vehicle access will be restricted.
- The front building line is no longer respected

- Bringing the proposal forward means that the proposed dwelling will look much higher from Cleveland drive.
- Increased potential for overlooking of Durley Dene from the front area of decking. The decking is 5.5m from the lounge window and 11.5 m from a front bedroom of Durley Dene.
- Overdevelopment
- 3x more internal area than the current house and the equivalent of 7 or 8 bedroom house of habitable rooms.
- The terrace area extends out the front and east of the dwelling and is approximately 1000 sq feet (approximately 92 square metres) [officer added] of space.
- All of the sites neighbours are bungalows.
- Overshadowing in the morning of the rear amenity area and lounge of Durley Dene.
- The current proposal does not address the reasons for refusal of the previous application.
- Opposed to any building in Bigbury on Sea being raised in height or exceeding its current footprint.
- The open terrace on the east will look down towards the garden, kitchen, dining area of Highfield, which will impact in terms of noise, light, overlooking.

A letter was also submitted by the Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan group with concerns about:

- The projecting front gable would now intrude on the outlook and views from the front bedroom window of Durley Dene.
- The proposal still intrudes on the outlook and views from the main bedroom window and patio at the rear.
- Increase in height and massing of the proposed dwelling as well as the large platform at the front of the proposal would be more prominent in the street scene.
- The outside terrace is likely to cause noise and disturbance to the neighbours
- The east elevation would overlook the neighbour to the east
- The terrace which will be above the hedge height of Highfield will impact on the property to the east.
- The proposed ridge height will be above Durley Dene
- The increase height width and overlooking from Barby Lodge will still impact on Willows to the north.
- Policy BP27 of the NP requires parking for 3 cars for units of 3 or more bedrooms. Garages are not counted as car parking spaces. There appears to be insufficient space on the front forecourt for 3 cars to be parked.
- Still an overdevelopment of the site and still creating a negative impact on all neighbouring properties.
- The current proposals do not deal with the perception of overlooking neither being dominant and overbearing. The revisions are still contrary to NP policies BP7 (i), (ii), (vi), BP7 (vii) and Policy BP7 (Viii) and Policy BP27 regarding access and car parking.

Support: 4 letters received

- Modern designs should be encouraged in Bigbury on Sea
- The plans show a family home with exceptional ecological and environmental features
- A family home would have positive effects on the neighbourhood
- Minimal impact on surrounding houses and the street scene
- It fulfils all of the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan
- The building footprint is the same as existing
- The hedge lined perimeter wall provides privacy
- The current floor level of the building will remain the same as the existing building
- The main view from the rear property is from the front terrace, which is obscured by the neighbours bamboo screen
- Living opposite the property, it will be beautiful to look at
- The increase in height is not significant and the footprint is the same as existing.

Relevant Planning History

2828/20/FUL

Barby Lodge, Cleveland Drive, Bigbury On Sea, TQ7 4AY

Application for replacement dwelling

Refused, 3/6/2021

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development/Sustainability:

The proposal must initially be considered against the fundamental approach to development contained in the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan, which promotes sustainable development. Policies SPT1 and SPT2 provide guidance both on the principle and detail of sustainable development and TTV1 provides the hierarchy for growth in the Thriving Towns and Villages Policy Area.

Bigbury is not identified in the Plan as a Sustainable Village because of its location within the South Devon AONB. Para. 5.165 in the Plan acknowledges that “great weight should be given to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty in such settlements.

Neighbourhood Plans can however bring forward positive allocations to meet local housing need.” However proposals must be considered against policy DEV25. This consideration will be provided in the landscape section below.

Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan is a Made Plan and so therefore is a formal part of the Development Plan.

The site is within the settlement boundary allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan.

The proposal is in compliance with BP2 , which allows for “Replacement of existing dwellings, providing these are not shown in the Plan as statutory or local heritage assets, will generally be supported providing the proposed development accords with the Policy BP7 – General design principles for new development and other relevant Policies of the Plan.”

Policy BP4, relates to principal residency, but the policy specifically excludes one for one replacements which is the case here.

The principle and sustainability of the proposal is policy compliant.

Design

NP policy BP7 General Design Principles for new development, sets out the Neighbourhood Plan requirements for design of new development. Policy DEV20 in the Joint Local Plan also contains design requirements for new developments.

Policy DEV20 in summary seeks to ensure that developments meet a good standard of design; use of locally distinctive materials and relationship to context; have regard to the pattern of local development; achieving a good quality sense of place; appropriate landscape design; community safety is considered and where possible rectifying environments which have been damaged in the past.

Policy BP7 in the BNP, seeks development to be locally distinctive, and to reflect the character of the area, but also accepts innovative contemporary design provided it does not have a harmful impact on the overall appearance and character of the area.

Part ii of the policy seeks to ensure that height scale and density of development should reflect the existing grain, height density and pattern of development in the area. And natural materials are preferable. Part iii relates to the front building line which should be maintained

and part iv seeks to protect the verges in front of properties. Part v also seeks to protect front boundary walls and hedges.

Part iv looks to protect neighbour amenity and part vii seeks to restrict light pollution. Part viii seeks a safe access to the site; and adequate off road parking; and parts ix, x and xi seek to ensure appropriate infrastructure is provided, natural features and heritage assets are protected.

In terms of local character, there is an eclectic mix of properties in this part of Bigbury, some of which have been extended in recent years. The property behind the site, Willows whilst a bungalow, has been built up at its southern end to take account of the sloping land. It also has permission to increase the roof height in order to accommodate a loft conversion. The adjoining bungalow (which would be separated from the property as a result of this development), Durley Dene is modest in scale and height, although higher than Barby Lodge at present. It is single storey in nature. Further to the north there is a large two storey dwelling in a very large plot. In front of the site there is a wider larger bungalow.

In the area there are a variety of property types, although a predominance of bungalows in the immediate vicinity. Along Ringmore road there is a recent 3 storey development of apartments. The properties in the area are all detached and set in their own plots. Materials, age and dwelling types in the area do vary quite considerably, although there is a predominance of render finishes on many of the properties as existing.

In this case the existing bungalow on the site is of a modest scale and is attached via the garages to the adjacent and similar style bungalow to the east. The design of the development proposed is larger than the existing property, which has still been raised as a serious concern by a number of residents, the NP committee and the Parish Council. The applicant has suggested that he is keen to provide a larger dwelling for his family whilst also trying to respect the design of the properties around it and meet the NP policies.

The ridge height has increased by approximately 1.3m. The footprint of the dwelling has also increased by 15 square metres. The architect has increased the overall amount of accommodation by utilising the space underneath and the roof space, without increasing the footprint significantly. The slope on the site has been utilised to create a garage space underneath the dwelling and the bungalow finished floor level above has been retained with an increase in the roof height to accommodate rooms in the roof space. Roof lights have also been added to the roof slope. The glazing design proposed is a more contemporary approach and proposes a number of floor to ceiling windows and doors.

For this revised application the proposed dwelling has been moved forwards on the site by 1.7metres. In all other respects in terms of the size the proposed building remains the same.

In terms of the size of the property, there is no planning policy in either the JLP or the NP which prevents this occurring. The Supplementary Planning Document does make reference to size in relation to replacement dwellings. Whilst it is guidance and not policy it states:

“11.78 With regard to the size of a replacement dwelling, there will be two key elements taken into account when considering if the proposal represents a ‘significant’ change: Whether the proposal will result in a harmful landscape or visual impact, and,

Whether the proposal changes the size of dwelling, by number of bedrooms, to such a degree that it fails to meet the household needs of the area.

11.79 The size of the replacement dwelling should be considered within the wider site context. If a replacement dwelling represents a similar massing and form to the building it is replacing, it is unlikely that it will be considered to have a 'significant' impact.

Enhancements in terms of design, and positive responses to the constraints and opportunities of a site will be taken into account when considering the impact of the replacement dwelling when compared the dwelling it is replacing."

In terms of footprint the proposed dwelling is approximately 0.5metres deeper and 2 metres wider than the existing dwelling and adds a forward facing extension. The plans also indicate an area of decking around the dwelling which makes the size of the replacement appear much larger. The decked area has decreased in size since the previous application. It has been brought back from the Eastern side by approximately 1 metre and at the front 300mm has been taken off. Decking is a form of amenity space in the same way as a lawn or planted areas or hard surfacing. The existing property already has a hard landscaped rear area which is walled and extends up to the boundary with the neighbouring property's Willows and Durley Dene. However the issue with the decking in this case is that whilst it is at the same level as the ground floor of the dwelling, because of the proposed under croft, the decking is raised off the ground at the front and parts of the side of the proposed dwelling.

The proposed dwelling is higher than the existing dwelling by 1.3 metres and higher than Durley dene by 0.5 metres. The NP Plan policy BP7(ii) *"The height, scale and density of development should reflect the existing grain, height, density and pattern of development in the surrounding area. The materials used for the external elevations should preferably be natural materials and be consistent with those used for other buildings in the locality."*

In this case, the proposed replacement dwelling is higher than the building it is replacing but only 500 mm higher than the adjacent dwelling – which is the only other dwelling along this part of Cleveland Drive on the same building line as the proposal site. In considering the height in isolation, what harm is caused by this relatively minor increase in overall height in relation to the adjacent property? The policy indicates that the height scale and density should 'reflect' the existing grain, height, density and pattern of development. Officers consider that a .55 increase on a neighbouring property would not be sufficient to indicate that the proposal does not reflect the existing, when there are properties of many different heights within the vicinity.

Clearly it is not appropriate to take just the height into account, as the scale of the development is also relevant. The applicant is seeking to increase the overall size of his property by utilising the levels change on the site to incorporate an under croft area for parking and utility space. This leaves the ground floor of the proposed dwelling at the same height as it is currently and aligns with the ground floor level of Durley Dene. This remains the case with the revised plans.

The use of the under croft area allows for the site to accommodate garage space under the existing footprint, whilst maintaining the ground floor level in line with the adjacent property.

By moving the proposal forward on the site the bulk of the building moves forward such that the amount

In terms of materials the proposal indicates the use of a slate roof; photovoltaic slate like tiles; white render for the walls; stone facing to the front wall of the under croft area; timber

garage doors; grey aluminium windows with timber sliding louvre sections to provide internal shade and externally to break up the amount of glazing. Steel columns are proposed to hold up the brise soleil on the front terrace and timber panelling to break up the amount of glazing to the front and side elevations.

Whilst the use of slate is a good quality natural material, there is little of it in the immediate area, which is generally concrete or manmade tiles. It is officers view that the use of natural slate is preferable to the use of concrete tiles on the roof, so whilst it is not commonplace locally, it is a quality and robust material, which is still considered to be appropriate and in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan BP7 (*The materials used for the external elevations should preferably be natural materials and be consistent with those used for other buildings in the locality, providing these do not detract from the appearance and character of the surroundings*).

Appendix 9 of the NP is a useful description of the historical development of Bigbury on Sea and makes many references to the area within which the application site is located. There is concern expressed in the Appendix about the fact that *“Many plots are now being redeveloped in a way which seeks to maximise the value of the site with little consideration being given to the amenity of the existing residents.”* And in referencing the layout of this part of Bigbury on Sea it states *“The development was designed in a grid form layout with careful attention being given to the location, height and spacing between properties to ensure that at each level the occupiers of all properties would have the advantage of good views of the beach, sea and coastline. The local community consider that the ethos behind this existing planned development should be protected and any new development should fully respect this important concept.”*

In considering this part of the Neighbourhood Plan, the applicant has attempted to preserve the footprint of the existing development, only increasing it by 15 metres squared. The proposal also makes use of the slope upon which it is located to provide additional accommodation within the footprint. Additional accommodation is also proposed within the pitched roof. This has involved an increase in height of 1.3 metres.

Officers do not consider that the proposal harms the planned layout and form as described in Appendix 9 in the NP. The proposal does increase the amount of accommodation, but this has been achieved by making the best use of the slope on the site and incorporating space in the roof space. The front and side hedges will be retained (apart from the area where the exit is proposed). The front building line has been maintained; An access is provided; The grass verge which is a common feature along these roads has also been preserved. The amount of space the proposed dwelling occupies on the site is in relative terms only marginally larger than the existing dwelling and is still smaller than Durley Denes' footprint.

Officers consider that the proposal meets policy BP7 and has respected the planned development form in this part of Bigbury on Sea as identified in Appendix 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The revised submission must address the previous reasons for refusal which relate to the position of the dwelling on the site and the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring properties and the scale and massing of the proposal and its impact on the street scene.

In terms of impact on the neighbours, the current proposal has removed the high level window on the northwest elevation adjacent to Durley Dene and the remaining two

windows are high level with opaque glass. The bulk of the dwelling has moved forward on the plot such that the impact in terms of being overbearing has been reduced. The neighbour however still has concerns about this aspect of the proposal.

By moving the dwelling forward the front gable of the proposal also moves forward, The neighbour has provided photographs which indicate that the gable will impact on his views, however officers are not able to verify the accuracy of these photos and it must be stressed that the front gable does not extend any further forward than that of the front gable on Durley Dene.

Officers do acknowledge that there will be an impact on some of the views from Durley Dene, when looking towards the extreme south east. however it is a small part of these views and it must also be remembered that private views are not a material consideration in the planning process. It is public views which are material.

The proposal is also now further away from Willows behind the site. There is therefore now a distance of 7.5 metres to the boundary and 8.5 metres to the wall of Willows. There is a secondary window on the elevation of Willows facing the development, which the existing property blocks views from this window. So the proposal whilst higher will not make the situation any worse. As previously stated private views are not material considerations.

In terms of potential for overlooking. The Willows is set approximately 1.4metres above the ground floor of the proposed dwelling. In addition there is a wall and fence of 1.8 m high between the application site and the Willows. The distance between the proposal rear wall and the approved conservatory on the Willows is 12.6 metres, and is from an office window as opposed to a main living space. The existing dwelling has rear windows only 11 metres from the side wall of the Willows, so the proposal is making the situation worse by 1 metre, which officers do not consider to be significantly more than the current situation.

With regards to Highfield which is located on the other side of Parker Road, as previously determined the window to window distance between the two properties is just over 21 metres which is identified in the SPD as being a sufficient distance between two windows. It also has to be acknowledged that there is an existing window on the same elevation. Officers can acknowledge that the perception of overlooking is increased as a result of the increased height of the window, however because the distance complies with guidance in the SPD a reason for refusal cannot be justified.

Landscape:

The site and surroundings lie within the South Devon AONB. Policy DEV25 in the JLP states that this designated landscape must be given great weight in the decision making process and landscape quality and scenic beauty should be conserved and enhanced by development. Policy BP18 in the NP also seeks to protect this valued landscape, also referring specifically to the need to conserve and enhance the natural landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB, as well as wildlife; cultural heritage, built heritage; avoiding light pollution; avoiding development which would cause undue noise or disturbance and retaining the winding paths and lanes in the area.

In this case, it is clear that the applicants want to create a bigger house, but it is also clear that they have attempted to produce the larger house in a way which does not impact significantly on the built form in the surrounding area and respects the building lines, ridge heights, boundary treatments, materials and footprints of surrounding houses. The proposal does introduce more areas of glazing than currently exist, which may have an

impact in terms of more light spill. However the plot is located within an already developed area, set within other dwellings, which will both screen and reduce the impact of light pollution and be seen as part of an area of built development which will already cause some degree of light spill. As the site is well within the built form the impact of the proposed dwelling will not stand out from the surrounding development. By keeping the building low, the proposed building will be seen within and as part of the settlement.

In terms of the proposal conserving and enhancing the natural landscape and scenic quality of the AONB, the site lies within the built up area of the village and the attempts to limit the increase in ridge height; the respect for existing building lines; the retention of the existing boundary treatments, the use of render, which is very common in the area, will all contribute towards conserving the existing character of the area. The natural qualities of the AONB are a short distance away and so the proposed replacement dwelling will not impact on the natural qualities of the wider AONB landscape, but neither will it stand out as something which is incongruous, because of the attempts to limit its impact as discussed above.

The policies also seek to ensure that the proposal enhances the AONB landscape. The proposal retains the grass verge around the site which is a common feature in this part of Bigbury and also proposes enhanced landscaping along the boundaries. A natural stone slip cladding along the lower ground frontage will ensure that this part of the building is recessive. The low boundary wall at the front of the site is also retained with planting above. These measures will ensure that the proposal will blend into and appear an intrinsic part of the area more quickly than if a totally different external finish and boundary treatment were proposed.

It is concluded therefore that the proposal does serve to conserve and enhance the landscape qualities of the AONB by retaining many of the features required in the NP which will allow the proposal to blend more quickly into its context. The proposal meets policy DEV25 of the JLP and Policy BP18 of the NP.

Neighbour Amenity:

There have been a number of letters of objection to this proposal, although less than for the previous proposal as well as some letters of support. As with the previous application, the report will focus on the properties immediately to the north, northeast and south of the property.

Willows

The revised proposal sees the dwelling is located 1.7 metres further towards the front (south) of the site meaning that the bulk of the dwelling will now be 9 metres away from the wall of the neighbouring dwelling to the north (Willows). The dwelling, Willows is located approximately 1.2 metres from the boundary with Barby Lodge.

In terms of loss of privacy to the Willows, there are 3 high level windows in the rear of the proposed dwelling with roof lights above. The room is not a main living area and the high level windows will reduce the ability to overlook the Willows. The proposed dwelling is also set down the hill from the Willows. There is an existing wall and fence along the rear boundary which is approximately 2.3 metres high. There is one window in the end elevation of Willows. The primary windows for the Willows face east and west, where there are equally good views of the coastline and sea. With the lower floor level of the proposed dwelling it is more likely that the Willows would overlook the proposed property rather than the other way around. This was the case with the previous application and the current one.

The proposed dwelling has moved nearly 2 metres back and is now only 2 metres closer than the existing dwelling as opposed to 4 metres closer for the previous application. There is one window in the side elevation which would not be considered to be a primary window. The difference in finished floor levels between the two properties means that the window in the side elevation currently looks at the roof of the existing dwelling. The additional height will not make any difference to the view, because there is currently no view from the side window. In planning law there is no right to a view and so as such there would be no reasonable ground to refuse the application on the basis that a view from a side window would be blocked by the development.

Officers consider that the current proposal is an improvement from the perspective of the the property know as Willows.

Highfield

Concern has also been raised from the neighbour to the south east of the site in a property known as Highfield. Photographs have been supplied that indicate views of the existing dwelling from the garden of this property as well as inside the house. The height and mass of the proposed dwelling at Barby lodge will increase from the perspective of this neighbour. The dwelling will also be approximately 1 metre closer to Highfield. However the wall to wall distance between Highfield and the proposed dwelling would be just over 21 metres. There will also be a boundary wall along the eastern boundary of the proposed replacement dwelling and there is a boundary hedge along the boundary of Highfield.

From the photographs submitted, as existing there is a window in Barby Lodge which faces Highfield. With the proposed plan there are 2 large ground floor windows and a floor to ceiling first floor window proposed, with a Juliette glazed balcony facing Highfield. The revised plan indicates a slight decrease in the size of the floor to ceiling window. The ground floor windows are obscured by the boundary planting along the application site and along the boundary of Highfield.

The proposed window is larger than the existing window on the side of the dwelling. It also has a Juliette balcony (glazed) on the outside of it. This is a building regulation requirement where there is a floor to ceiling window at height. However officers can understand that the occupiers of Highfield would be concerned because of the balcony that occupiers would be standing at the window taking in the views. The Supplementary Planning Document suggests 21 metres is an acceptable distance between windows of properties in terms of overlooking. In this case the windows will be 21 metre away and so as such the proposal complies with the SPD guidance.

The proposal is in compliance with the relevant guidance on distances and so therefore does not impact on the property Highfield.

Durley Dene.

The proposal is closer to the boundary with Durley Dene than the existing which has a garage width between the two properties. The current proposal reduces the amount of wall which would be visible from the rear garden of Durley Dene, but there is more visible than the existing situation. Whilst it is accepted that the proposal will increase the amount of visible wall, that amount is reduced by approximately 2 metres with the current proposal.

Currently there is a wooden fence and planting on the Durley Dene side of the boundary and a rendered wall on the Barby Lodge side of the boundary. The proposal indicates a

rendered wall, the height of which is not specified on the plans. There is a balance between providing a boundary which prevents loss of privacy and one which appears overbearing. If approved Officers would recommend a condition to secure more details of the boundary with Durley Dene.

There is concern that the rear windows of the proposed dwelling would overlook the garden area of Durley Dene and with the proposed dwelling moving forward on the site, this could be argued to be more likely. However as with many houses located along a road, there is invariably an amount of overlooking to neighbours garden areas. However with the building located where any overlooking would be from an oblique angle and only to the rear of the garden at Durley Dene.

Concerns about the impact of the front facing gable part of the proposed scheme have been raised and photographs with the extension superimposed on to it have been provided by the objector to demonstrate the impact of both the gable itself and also the area of balconied decking in front of the gable. In reviewing the impact of the gable, it does extend in front of the building line and as a result does impact slightly on the view currently enjoyed by the occupiers of Durley Dene. However as previously stated in planning lay private properties are not entitled to a view. However it should be noted that Durley Dene as indicated in the photos has a view from the headland in front of Bantham across the bay over the top of the bungalows in front on Cleveland Drive to Burgh Island and beyond.

The additional concern by this neighbour is that because of the area of decking in front of the gable, there will be an opportunity to overlook their front garden and potentially look into the windows of their property. The applicant has responded to this issue by reducing by 300 mm the width of the decking to 1.5metres and also indicates that the purpose of the decking in this location is not for sitting out purposes as there is plenty of other space for sitting out, but as a means of accessing the decking from the pedestrian access along the side of the proposed dwelling. If this is the case the only overlooking possible would be when [people are exiting the decking from this point. The potential for this route to cause harm by overlooking is therefore minimal.

The occupiers of Durley Dene, in their letter of representation provided images of the shadowing diagrams submitted with the planning application. The objector suggested that the increased height of the proposal dwelling would lead to a considerable loss of light into their rear garden.

Having reviewed the photographs submitted and considered the proposal against the SPD, it is considered whilst there may be some small loss of light for some parts of the day (in the morning) in the winter months, but not so much that it would harm the residential amenities to any great extent.

It is considered that the impact on the neighbouring properties will not harm their residential amenities any more than is already the case.

Highways/Access:

Access to the plot remains as existing, with an additional opening proposed onto Parker Road, so as to allow for an in and out flow for vehicles. The Highway Authority have not made any comments on this and it is considered that the area does not suffer from any passing traffic and only those that reside in the properties in this part of Bigbury use the roads. The roads are relatively narrow and so excessive speeds are not possible. The proposal is for a replacement dwelling and therefore there will not be any significant

increase in traffic as a result of the development. As such the use of the additional egress point for the one family that will occupy the property, is acceptable from a highway safety perspective.

Drainage:

The proposal for drainage is to retain the link to the foul sewer and South West Water have confirmed that this is acceptable to them. They have also confirmed that an attenuated surface water discharge is acceptable if soakaways are not acceptable. The proposal indicates that surface water will be disposed of in the existing main sewer, which is as existing. Policy DEV35 in the JLP requires that drainage solutions should provide sustainable urban drainage systems, such as soakaways or attenuation, or other more natural forms of surface water management on site. The site lies in Flood Zone 1 where the likelihood of flooding is of lowest risk. As a detailed scheme for the disposal of surface water run off has not been provided, I will add a condition to the consent for a soakaway or attenuation tank proposal for surface water drainage to be submitted prior to the commencement of development. It is considered that it is needed prior to commencement because drainage will be one of the first aspects to be considered when undertaking ground works on a site.

Ecology:

An ecology report was submitted in support of the application, which identifies that “The proposed demolition of the bungalow will not disturb or harm bats; will not disturb, obstruct or destroy any areas used by bats for roosting; will not affect the distribution or abundance of local populations; will not impact on any potential foraging habitat; and will not have an adverse impact on any commuting activity.

No further survey work or mitigation is necessary.”

Neither were there any signs of bird nests or bird nesting activity. No reptiles were found at the time of the survey, however there was some habitat which would be suitable for slow worms and whilst none were found, the report suggests a precautionary approach at the commencement of development.

Two bat boxes are recommended to help achieve net gain in biodiversity. It is proposed to place a condition on the consent to ensure adherence to the ecology report and its recommendations.

Climate Change: The proposal has identified a number of ways in which carbon reduction measures can be incorporated within the scheme,

The roof is proposed as slate, but will also incorporate PV slates.

Air source Heat pump and water recycling

Use of Nudura which is an insulated concrete formwork for construction, which has very little waste products.

Policy DEV32 seeks to ensure that any new development reduces its carbon footprint. It is considered that the measures proposed would help reduce the developments carbon footprint in accordance with the policy.

Objections from the Parish Council and the Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan Group.

Many of the concerns raised by objectors to the proposal, the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan group have been discussed in the report, particularly with regard to

the JLP and the NP policies, however this section deals with those concerns not previously covered.

The impact of the dwelling on the corner of the junction of Cleveland Drive and Parker Road and the impact on the street scene. The Parish express the view that this will be more significant now because of the fact that the dwelling is further forward on the site. Bringing the dwelling forward will mean that it is closer to the corner and because the land slopes down Parker Road, the proposed dwelling will seem more prominent on the corner. However it is still not as far forward as the existing dwelling on the site. The Parish contend that this impacts on the character of the area as the area is predominantly bungalows. The presence of the proposed dwelling on the corner will be more than the previous proposal, but what must be examined is the harm that will cause. The dwelling itself is slightly higher and the undercroft will be mainly hidden from the road by the walls and hedging along the boundaries of the site. Officers are not convinced that the harm would be significant.

The timber decked terrace would be a dominant feature. Officers concede that the timber decking does make the appearance of the proposed dwelling larger, this is because of the fact that the undercroft level has been built and so the decking appears to be at a higher level. However it is no higher than the existing ground floor of the dwelling on the site. As the land in front and underneath the proposed dwelling will be excavated, the impact of the decking is emphasised. In this application the size of the deck has been reduced.

Lack of space to park 3 cars.

The area of land at the front of the proposed dwelling has been reduced in size as a result of bringing the building forward. The space now measures 17 metres across by between 5.7 metres and 5.5 metres. A standard parking space is 2.4 m by 4.8 m, so 3 cars would be able to be parked in front of the property.

Officers do not consider that the replacement dwelling will be out of proportion by virtue of the fact that the ridge height has increased by a minimal amount; the footprint is only marginally larger. It is just that the architect has utilised the sloping nature of the site to accommodate garaging and has incorporated rooms in the roof in order to reduce the impact of the increase in size of the accommodation. In relation to the accommodation provided the mass and scale and bulk has been kept to an absolute minimum.

Noise impact

The design does include a lot of decking, which does give the impression that the proposal is larger than it actually is. However the use of decking in garden areas is not a policy concern. Use of garden areas for play, socialising and so on could occur in any of the gardens in this area and is not made worse by the use of decking instead of grass.

Overdevelopment of the plot

The garden area around the proposed dwelling meets the SPD guidance for garden/amenity space for a detached dwelling. It is therefore not considered to be an over developed plot.

The NP seeks to not raise ridge heights.

The NP policy, in relation to ridge heights states following:

“Reduce or retain the maximum height of roofs including those of extensions on new build or alterations and extensions to existing properties to that of the original, unless the

increase in roof height is consistent with that of neighbouring properties and/or does not impede on the views of surrounding properties.”

The proposal is consistent with the general roof heights in the area. There is not a consistent ridge height along Cleveland Drive. The proposal changes the roof height such that it is 500mm above Durley Dene. Currently Durley Dene ridge height is 870mm higher than Barby Lodge. These figures do not however indicate significant increases in ridge height and in line with the NP policy BP7.

Conclusion

This previous planning application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal by virtue of its new position on the site, creates a negative impact on neighbouring properties to the north, west and east in terms of overlooking and the perception of overlooking, being dominant and overbearing and causing a loss of outlook contrary to policy DEV1 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan and policy BP7 of the Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan and para. 127 of the NPPF 2019
2. The scale and massing of the proposed dwelling would have a negative impact on the street scene and as such be out of character with the area contrary to policy DEV20 in the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan and policy BP7 of the Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan as well as para. 127 of the NPPF 2019.

In reviewing this proposal against the reasons for refusal, officers consider that the relocation of the dwelling reduces the amount of wall on the boundary with Durley Dene at the rear; prevents overlooking of the rear garden by taking out the long window and obscure glazing the high level windows. It does result in the front gable extending forward of Durley Dene and thereby blocking out a small part of the view when looking to the south east. The coastline along from Bantham and the sea at Bantham and the sea along to Burgh Island remain in that view. Officers have concluded that this small obstruction to the view is not significant enough to warrant refusing the application. With regard to the potential for overlooking from the narrow part of the decking in front of the proposed bedroom gable, this will form the entrance onto the balcony and so is not likely to be a space where people will stand and look into the adjacent property at an oblique angle.

For Willows, the dwelling is moved to 9 metres away and there is an increase in height of just under a metre, which was the same as previously. There is no loss of view to the south west as the existing dwelling already blocks that view. The relocation does create a little more space between Willows and Barby Lodge and the difference between the existing dwelling and proposed is now reduced to 2 metres. Officers do not consider that the proposal impacts negatively on the residential amenity currently enjoyed by the occupants of Willows.

With regard to Highfield the changes made, indicate a reduction in the width of the decking along the eastern boundary of the site. The owners of Highfield were concerned about the potential for noise from the decking. The decking along the eastern edge has been reduced to a width of 2 metres, which could still be used for sitting out and until the hedge grows up along the side of the proposed dwelling, could result in overlooking from a standing position. However the distance between the decking and Highfields is 21 metres or more and noise can emanate from nearby properties whether there is decking, grass or hardstanding in the garden.

Conclusion

Officers consider that the revised scheme has overcome the first reason for refusal. With regards to the second reason for refusal, the proposed revisions have not reduced the size of the proposed replacement dwelling.

Officers recommended the previous application for approval because it was their professional opinion that the proposal was acceptable and met planning policy. The revised scheme in essence is the same as the previous proposal but essentially moved forward in the plot to reduce the impact on the two closest neighbours. Officers are still of the view that the proposal is acceptable and meets planning policy but the revised scheme does not address the 2nd reason for refusal as no reduction in size has been achieved. As officers were of the view that the scale was not an issue previously then the recommendation for this application must be to approve the scheme.

This application has been considered in accordance with Section 38 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Planning Policy

Relevant policy framework

Section 70 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act requires that regard be had to the development plan, any local finance and any other material considerations. Section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compensation Act requires that applications are to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the purposes of decision making, as of March 26th 2019, the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014 - 2034 is now part of the development plan for Plymouth City Council, South Hams District Council and West Devon Borough Council (other than parts of South Hams and West Devon within Dartmoor National Park).

On 26 March 2019 of the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan was adopted by all three of the component authorities. Following adoption, the three authorities jointly notified the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) of their choice to monitor at the whole plan level. This is for the purposes of the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) and the 5 Year Housing Land Supply assessment. A letter from MHCLG to the Authorities was received on 13 May 2019. This confirmed the Plymouth, South Hams and West Devon's revised joint Housing Delivery Test Measurement as 163% and that the consequences are "None". It confirmed that the revised HDT measurement will take effect upon receipt of the letter, as will any consequences that will apply as a result of the measurement. It also confirmed that that the letter supersedes the HDT measurements for each of the 3 local authority areas (Plymouth City, South Hams District and West Devon Borough) which Government published on 19 February 2019. On 13th February 2020 MHCLG published the HDT 2019 measurement. This confirmed the Plymouth, South Hams and West Devon's joint HDT measurement as 139% and the consequences are "None".

Therefore a 5% buffer is applied for the purposes of calculating a 5 year land supply at a whole plan level. When applying the 5% buffer, the combined authorities can demonstrate a 5-year land supply of 6.1 years at end March 2020 (the 2020 Monitoring Point). This is set out in the Plymouth, South Hams & West Devon Local Planning Authorities' Housing Position Statement 2020 (published 22nd December 2020).

The relevant development plan policies are set out below:

The Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan was adopted by South Hams District Council on March 21st 2019 and West Devon Borough Council on March 26th 2019.

SPT1 Delivering sustainable development
SPT2 Sustainable linked neighbourhoods and sustainable rural communities
SPT3 Provision for new homes
SPT14 European Protected Sites – mitigation of recreational impacts from development
TTV1 Prioritising growth through a hierarchy of sustainable settlements
TTV2 Delivering sustainable development in the Thriving Towns and Villages Policy Area
TTV29 Residential extensions and replacement dwellings in the countryside
DEV1 Protecting health and amenity
DEV2 Air, water, soil, noise, land and light
DEV8 Meeting local housing need in the Thriving Towns and Villages Policy Area
DEV9 Meeting local housing need in the Plan Area
DEV10 Delivering high quality housing
DEV20 Place shaping and the quality of the built environment
DEV23 Landscape character
DEV24 Undeveloped coast and Heritage Coast
DEV25 Nationally protected landscapes
DEV26 Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation
DEV28 Trees, woodlands and hedgerows
DEV29 Specific provisions relating to transport
DEV32 Delivering low carbon development
DEV35 Managing flood risk and Water Quality Impacts

Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan is a Made Plan.

The relevant policies are:

BP2 Other housing development
BP4 Principal Residence
BP9 Design

Other material considerations include the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and guidance in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Additionally, the following planning documents are also material considerations in the determination of the application:

South Devon AONB Management Plan and Planning Guidance

Considerations under Human Rights Act 1998 and Equalities Act 2010

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and Equalities Act 2010 have been taken into account in reaching the recommendation contained in this report.

Proposed Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).

2.The development hereby approved shall in all respects accord strictly with drawing number(s) DGA P01 Location Plan: DGA P11 Proposed elevations received on 14/07/2021
DGA P12 Rev A Proposed elevations
DGA P12 Rev A Proposed elevations, received on.
DGA P08 Rev A Proposed site plan
DGA P06 Rev A Proposed ground floor plan
DGA P09 Rev A Proposed entry level plan
DGA P07 Rev A Proposed first and roof plan, received by the Local Planning Authority on , 10/09/2021.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development is carried out in accordance with the drawings forming part of the application to which this approval relates.

3.No development shall commence beyond slab level until a schedule of materials and finishes, and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces, including roofs, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the details so approved.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to consider the details of the materials.

4.If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for, an investigation and risk assessment and, where necessary, a remediation strategy and verification plan detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.
Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation strategy and verification plan and prior to occupation of any part of the permitted development, a verification report demonstrating completion of the works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Reason: No site investigation can completely characterise a site. This condition is required to ensure that any unexpected contamination that is uncovered during remediation or other site works is dealt with appropriately.

5.Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting this Order) no openings other than those authorised by this permission shall be at any time be inserted in the west elevation of the development hereby permitted, without the prior permission, in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbours.

6.Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) or any Order revoking and re-enacting this Order, no development of the types described in Part 1 of the Schedule 2 shall be undertaken without the express consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority other than those expressly authorised by this permission.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control over development, which could materially harm the character and visual amenities of the development and locality in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

7. Notwithstanding the plans approved under this consent no new windows shall be installed in the west elevation of the dwelling hereby approved unless otherwise approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the privacy of the neighbours rear garden.

8. Prior to commencement above slab level a landscaping scheme for the site, to include boundary planting shall be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed plans

The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented in the next available planting scheme after completion of the development hereby approved and shall be maintained and replaced as necessary for a period of 5 years from the date of implementation.

9. The garage hereby approved shall be used for the parking of vehicles and domestic storage only and shall not be used for any other purpose without the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent use of the garage for purposes which are unsuitable in a residential area.

10. The recommendations, mitigation and enhancement measures of the Ecological Report, by Butler Ecology on 3rd September 2020, shall be fully implemented prior to the commencement of the use hereby approved and adhered to at all times. In the event that it is not possible to do so all work shall immediately cease and not recommence until such time as an alternative strategy has been agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the interests of protected species.

11. No development shall commence beyond the demolition of the existing building until the details of the surface water and foul water system to be installed is submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The foul and surface water drainage shall be submitted in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure there is appropriate drainage installed on the site which meets policy DEV35 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan.

12. Prior to commencement of any part of the site the Local Planning Authority shall have received and approved a Construction Management Plan (CMP) including

(a) the timetable of the works

(b) daily hours of construction

(c) any road closure

(d) hours during which delivery and construction traffic will travel to and from the site, with such vehicular movements being restricted to between 8.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m. Mondays to Fridays inc. 9.00a.m. to 1.00 p.m. Saturdays and no such movements taking place on Sundays or Bank holidays unless agrees by The local Planning Authority in advance.

(e) the number and sizes of vehicles visiting the site in connection with the development and the frequency of their visits

(f) the compound/location where all building materials, finished or unfinished products, parts, crates, packing materials and waste will be stored during the demolition and construction phases

(g) areas on site where delivery vehicles and construction traffic will load or unload building materials, finished or unfinished products, parts, crates, packing materials and waste with confirmation that no construction traffic or delivery vehicles will park on the County Highway for loading or unloading purposes unless prior written agreement has been given by the Local Planning Authority;

(h) hours during which no construction traffic will be present on the site;

(i) the means of enclosure of the site during construction works;

(j) the details to promote car sharing amongst construction staff in order to limit construction staff vehicles parking off site;

(k) details of wheel washing facilities and obligations;

(l) the proposed route of all construction traffic exceeding 7.5 tonnes;

(m) details of the amount and location of construction worker parking; (n) photographic evidence of the condition of adjacent public highway prior to commencement of any work.

Reason: In the interests of Highway Safety.