

Committee Report

Item 7B

Reference: DC/20/05586

Case Officer: Samantha Summers

Ward: Bramford

Ward Member/s: Cllr James Caston

RECOMMENDATION – GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Full Planning Application - Erection of 1 single-storey dwelling (C3) to the rear of public house (Sui Generis), with associated access, parking and landscaping (amended scheme to DC/20/02269).

Location

Cock Inn, The Street, Bramford, Ipswich Suffolk IP8 4DU

Expiry Date: 02/02/2021

Application Type: FUL - Full Planning Application

Development Type: Minor Dwellings

Applicant: Punch Partnerships (PML) Limited

Agent: Miss Lauren Parsons

Parish: Bramford

Site Area: 0.12Ha

Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit: None

Has a Committee Call In request been received from a Council Member (Appendix 1):

Councillor Caston informally spoke about calling this application to Planning Committee. However, because of the level of public interest in the application, it was deemed to be controversial and therefore should come to Planning Committee for decision.

Has the application been subject to Pre-Application Advice: Yes. A pre-application meeting with Planning, Highways and Heritage took place after the refusal of application DC/20/02269 for the erection of two dwellings on the site. The pre-application continued for some time in order to work up a design that would address the heritage and residential amenity issues.

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

The Head of Economy considers the application to be of a controversial nature having regard to the extent and planning substance of comments received from third parties.

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Core Strategy Focused Review 2012:

FC01 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
FC01_1 - Mid Suffolk Approach to Delivering Sustainable Development
FC02 - Provision and Distribution of Housing

Core Strategy 2008:

CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy
CS02 - Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment

Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998:

GP01 - Design and layout of development
HB1 – Protection of historic buildings
H13 - Design and layout of housing development
H14 - A range of house types to meet different accommodation needs
H15 - Development to reflect local characteristics
H16 - Protecting existing residential amenity
T09 - Parking Standards
T10 - Highway Considerations in Development

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Suffolk Adopted Parking Standards (2019)

Neighbourhood Plan Status

This application site is not within a Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Consultations and Representations

During the course of the application Consultation and Representations from third parties have been received. These are summarised below.

A: Summary of Consultations

Town/Parish Council (Appendix 3)

Bramford Parish Council

Bramford Parish Council OBJECTS to the application for the following reasons:

This application is not fully compliant with Local Plan policies nor the NPPF which protects community facilities and historic buildings. It is gross over development of the site, does not provide safe and suitable access for all users, and would cause harm to the surrounding listed buildings.

The Cock Inn is the last remaining public house in the village. It has been used as a community asset in recent planning applications for three large developments in the village which have been granted, an increase of 65%, and now it is being targeted by Punch Taverns to reduce the outside space significantly which will impact on its ability to serve the large growing community and for the business to grow and survive. This is against NPPF Para 92, which aims to preserve community facilities, and ensure established facilities are able to develop, modernise and enhance.

NPPF Para 180 states developments must be appropriate for its location and the impacts that could arise from the development. NPPF Para 182 also states that new development must be integrated effectively with existing business and community facilities, and they should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result. This development will have major impact to landlord/patrons of the PH and conflicts will certainly arise regarding noise/disturbance as the dwelling is within 5 metres of the PH.

Residents will have no safe means of access or egress through the existing PH car park, and entrance is in close proximity to a sharp bend on The Street with poor visibility splays and narrow footpaths, both are not in accordance with Manual for Streets Guidance. There is a lack of safe and suitable access due to the visibility splays.

Pedestrians of the proposed dwelling will have no provision for safe access, which is against NPPF Para 108 and 110. This family dwelling is located to the rear of the PH and have access through the PH Car Park, there is no alternative access for vehicles, cycles or pedestrians of these properties. It is a major hazard for pedestrians who will walk through the car park with no safe provision and may cause conflict. Servicing of the PH remains unchanged by the proposals, and with long opening hours the car park will be in constant use. Position of bins for collection, the bus stop for school children and residents immediately next to the entrance is also a concern.

NPPF Para 189 and 192 require applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, and ensure developments make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. The development makes a neutral contribution to the significance to the PH and 6, 8 & 10 The Street. The dwelling would impinge upon this historical setting and encroach upon the listed building and its land, and its significance would be harmed.

The Parish Council have made a nomination, under the Community Right to Bid relating to the Cock Public House. The Parish Council know that it is vital Bramford protects its existing Community Assets and amenities, and is essential for Bramford to remain a Core Village with a public house to continue to grow and provide its residents with the facilities required for social wellbeing now and in the future. They feel that they must preserve community facilities and guard against the unnecessary loss to ensure that established facilities are protected.

Sproughton Parish Council

Sproughton Parish Council Objects to this planning application. The Wildman Public House in Sproughton is currently closed. The Bramford Cock is within safe walking distance of our parish, therefore this is a community resource that is used by our Parishioners, making it an important facility for our parish. It would also have a detrimental effect on the listed public house and historic setting if this application was granted. As such we fully support all objections made by Bramford Parish Council.

County Council Responses (Appendix 4)

Highways

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:

The visibility splays shown on Drawing No. VS03 cannot be considered acceptable to facilitate the intensification of use and consistent flow of vehicle movements associated with a Class C3 dwelling.

Drawing No. VS03 denotes an x=2m by y=56m splay to the South cannot be considered acceptable, the 'y' dimension is not tangential to the nearside edge of the highway and a blind spot is apparent in this direction.

Additionally, SCC requires a setback distance of 2.4m and not the 2m shown on Drawing No. VS03. MfS states 'A minimum figure of 2m may be considered in some very lightly-trafficked and slow-speed situations'. However, The Street is the B1067 which is on the strategic highway network and heavily trafficked. Allowing a 2m set back would mean vehicles would protrude into the B1067 before being able to utilise the available 'y' dimensions.

The speed survey results make the required dimensions for visibility splays unequivocally clear, minimum dimensions of x=2.4m by y=32m should be provided. However, no visibility splays have been submitted which demonstrate that x=2.4m by y=32m is in fact achievable.

An intensification of use of a substandard access is considered detrimental to highway safety. Unless the aforementioned can be overcome, SCC will continue to uphold a recommendation of refusal for DC/20/05586 under highway safety grounds.

Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 5)

Heritage

This application is for the erection of one single-storey dwelling with associated access, parking and landscaping. The issues of the Heritage Team's concern relate to the potential impact of the proposals on the setting and subsequently the significance of the Grade II listed The Cock Inn, as well as the Grade II listed '6, 8 & 10 The Street' to the north east.

This application follows a recent refusal for the erection of two dwellings (DC/20/02269) and subsequent pre-application advice with both the Planning and Heritage Teams. The proposals have been reduced to one single-storey dwelling. The application is largely in line with the advice provided and so I raise no objection.

The dwelling would be tucked behind the pub and in turn would retain a sense of the openness still present to the south of the pub, which might have formerly been a kitchen garden – according to historic OS maps. The proposed location of the dwelling to the rear (west) of the pub, is where former outbuildings were positioned. It is highly likely that they would have been functionally associated to the pub but were removed and/or altered sometime in the early to mid-20th century. Therefore, the principle of an appropriately scaled and detailed building in this location is not opposed but is subject to acceptable details to be agreed by condition.

The now proposed single-storey L-shaped building would achieve acceptable levels of subservience to the modestly scaled 1.5 storey listed building and would give the impression of an outbuilding associated to the pub through its architectural language. Its utilitarian character and scale would reflect this traditional relationship and maintain an appropriate hierarchy. The proposed red brick boundary wall to the east could reflect the character of the former kitchen garden and so would not be inappropriate within the grounds of the pub. This is, however, entirely subject to appropriate materials and detailing. The green boundaries which are maintained, as well as the additions to the east, are not opposed as this also might refer to the pub's former edge of settlement location.

However, minor amendments have been made to the boundary treatments with the addition of a pedestrian gate to the east of the dwelling and a close boarded fence to the west to subdivide the front garden from the rear. These should be replaced with a brick boundary wall to reflect the eastern brick boundary wall. This would provide a more coherent approach to the scheme and would give the impression of the kitchen garden wall detail throughout the site from within the pub's grounds. This detail could be agreed by condition if appropriate.

I therefore consider the proposal would cause no harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets, subject to details. As such, it would accord with National and Local Planning Policies and it is for these reasons that I raise no objection.

Environmental Health – Noise

The Airtight and Noisecheck Ltd, Acoustic Testing Desk Top Report :18342 dated 17th February 2021 assessment indicates that the criteria for indoor ambient noise levels for the proposed dwelling can be met by installing double-glazed windows and trickle ventilators. I would ask that the following are conditioned:

1. All bedrooms and living rooms identified in the Airtight and Noisecheck Ltd, Acoustic Testing Report:18342 dated 17th February 2021 shall be constructed with the relevant glazing scheme as specified in section 17.7 All other rooms shall be fitted with double glazing with a sound insulation rating of Rw30 or better.
2. Acoustic trickle vents shall be fitted to achieve the specification recommended in section 17.2 of the above report.

As this report is based on a desk top exercise and to ensure that the internal and external noise levels are within the BS 8233:2014 criterion for both internal ambient noise levels and those for outdoor amenity spaces. I would suggest that a condition requiring pre-occupation independent testing would be required to ensure that WHO and BS8233 values are met:

3. Prior to first occupation, the dwelling shall be independently tested to ensure that WHO and BS8233 internal values are being met. The report shall be submitted to and any further mitigation required agreed by the LPA.

Land Contamination

No objection.

B: Representations

At the time of writing this report at least 155 (from 137 different households) submissions have been received. It is the officer opinion that this represents 151 objections and one supporting submission. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below:

- Overdevelopment
- Unsafe vehicle and pedestrian access
- Public house beer garden is not underutilised
- Loss of space for a community facility
- Unacceptable loss of public house parking spaces
- Harm to setting of designated Grade II listed public house
- Public house noise impacts on future occupants of proposed dwelling
- Conflict with local development plan
- Impact on viability of the public house
- Overlooking school – safeguarding issues

(Note: All individual representations are counted and considered. Repeated and/or additional communication from a single individual will be counted as one representation.)

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REF: DC/17/04057	Erection of a new dwelling	DECISION: WDN 05.09.2017
REF: DC/20/02269	Full Planning Application - Erection of 2No detached dwellings to the rear of the public house, with associated parking and landscaping.	DECISION: REF 18.08.2020

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1.0 The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The site is located on the western side of The Street, in the village of Bramford. It comprises part of a large amenity area (beer garden) to the rear of the Bramford Cock Public House, a Grade II listed building. It is mainly grassed but with some trees on the western boundary adjoining the Bramford CE Primary School. The site is within the village settlement boundary. The southern site boundary adjoins the rear garden of a residential property 2 Vicarage Lane.
- 1.2 The public house includes a carpark on its northern side. Directly across the road from the carpark are 6, 8 and 10 The Street, all Grade II listed buildings in residential use. The site is not in a Conservation Area.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a detached, single-storey, three-bedroom dwelling. The dwelling is proposed to be served by two car spaces, located to the front of the dwelling in the form of a hardstand (resin bound gravel). The parking areas are accessed via the public house's northern carpark and existing access arrangement via The Street.
- 2.2 The dwelling incorporates slate clad pitched roofs, horizontal timber cladding and timber-framed openings.
- 2.3 A 1.8-metre-high red brick wall is proposed to demarcate the common boundary between the proposed plot and the public house. A 1.8 metre-high close-boarded timber fence is proposed to the southern side boundary adjoining 2 Vicarage Lane. Landscaping includes low-level shrubs to the front of the dwelling and a laurel hedge along the common boundary between the public house and the development. The existing trees along the rear boundary, together with the hedge along the southern side boundary, are to be retained.
- 2.4 The existing public house access arrangements are to serve the proposed dwelling. The proposal results in a reduction of spaces for the public house carpark, reducing from 23 to 20 spaces. Two accessible spaces are retained.

3.0 Policy Context

- 3.1. The starting point for any planning decision is the development plan, as identified in Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Determination of any application must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. A key material consideration regarding the principle of development is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019.
- 3.2 The NPPF requires the approval of proposals that accord with an up to date development plan without delay, or where there are no policies, or the policies which are most important are out of date, granting permission unless the NPPF policies provide a clear reason for refusal, or adverse impacts of doing so would demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The age of policies itself does not cause them to cease to be part of the development plan or become "out of date" as identified in paragraph 213 of the NPPF. Significant weight should be given to the general public interest in having plan-led decisions even if the particular policies in a development plan may be old, and weight can be attributed to policies based on their compliance with the requirements of the NPPF.
- 3.3 Mid Suffolk currently benefits from a housing land supply in excess of five-years, as set out in the Council's Housing Land Supply Position Statement and Joint Annual Monitoring Report, both published in October 2020. There is, therefore, no requirement for the Council to determine what weight to attach to all the relevant development plan policies in the context of the tilted balance test, whether they are policies for the supply of housing or restrictive 'counterpart' policies, such as countryside protection policies. This said, there is a need for Council to determine whether relevant development policies generally conform to the NPPF. Where they do not, they will carry less statutory weight.
- 3.4 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF explains that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development which comprises economic, social and environmental objectives. It goes on to indicate that where the development plan is absent, silent or policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless any

adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the NPPF as a whole; or unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate that development should be restricted.

- 3.5 In view of advice in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF, it is necessary to consider how consistent the most important policies in the development plan are with the NPPF, to assess what weight should be attached to them. Paragraph 213 explains that due weight should be given to relevant policies according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF, the closer the policies in the plan to those in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given.
- 3.6 The development plan for the area comprises a combination of the Core Strategy 2008, the Core Strategy Focused Review 2012, and 'saved' policies of the Local Plan 1998. The Joint Local Plan is emerging, currently in Regulation 18 phase with the consultation period recently completed. In accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 48 of the NPPF, very limited weight is attached to the emerging Joint Local Plan in consideration of the merits of the proposal, given the preparatory stage of the document.
- 3.7 The application is made in full. Local policies concerned with detailed design and residential amenity, including saved Policy GP1 and H16 respectively, are deemed 'most important', noting their consistency with national policy.
- 3.8 Saved Policy HB1 is a heritage policy that generally reiterates the statutory duty in relation to heritage assets. It is not considered up-to-date as it does not allow for the weighing of public benefits against heritage harm, a key tenet of the NPPF. For the same reason CS Policy FC01_1 is deemed not up-to-date.
- 3.9 Having regard to the absence of a balanced approach as favoured by the NPPF, the policies most important for determining the application are deemed out-of-date, a position well established by the Inspectorate in recent Mid-Suffolk appeals. This conclusion is reached irrespective of Council's five year housing supply position. As a result, the weight to be attached to these policies has to be commensurately reduced and the default position at paragraph 11d of the NPPF is engaged, that is, granting permission unless:
 - (i) the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development or
 - (ii) the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
- 3.10 Turning first to (i) above, footnote 6 at NPPF paragraph 11d states that the policies referred to at 11d are those in the NPPF relating to: habitats sites and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets; and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change. Of these areas/assets, only designated heritage assets are potentially affected by the scheme.
- 3.11 The heritage assessment below concludes there is an absence of harm to the significance of neighbouring heritage assets. Paragraph 11d(i) therefore cannot be used to resist granting planning permission.
- 3.12 This leaves the second limb of the paragraph 11d test, requiring an assessment of the adverse impacts and benefits of the proposal, and the associated balancing exercise. In this context the key issues are:

- a) The effect of the proposed development on the setting of the Grade II listed Cock Inn public house;
- b) The effect on residential amenity, including potential for adverse noise and disturbance impacts on the future occupants of the dwelling arising from the use of the public house;
- c) The effect of the proposed development on highway and pedestrian safety.

4.0 Heritage Character

- 4.1 The application is supported by a Heritage Statement that has been reviewed by the Heritage Officer. The Statement concludes that there will be no harm to the heritage values constituting the significance of either the Grade II listed public house or to that of the Grade II listed 6, 8 and 10 The Street. The Heritage Officer does not object to the proposal, observing that the design has been informed by pre-application heritage feedback.
- 4.2 Officers agree with the Heritage Officer comments, in that the dwelling is: modest (ridge height set well below the ridge height of the public house); subservient to the public house; located where built form (outbuildings) once most likely existed; and is sited in a manner that a sense of openness is retained around the public house. The Heritage Officer recommends some minor hard landscaping changes, and these can be addressed by planning conditions.
- 4.3 The position regarding heritage harm put forward by the applicant's Heritage Consultant, Council's Heritage Officer and planning officers is shared - the proposal would cause no harm to the significance of neighbouring designated heritage assets. On this basis there is no conflict with local or national heritage policies.
- 4.4 Given that Officers deem there to be no heritage harm, the balancing exercise at paragraph 196 does not engage.

5.0 Design and Layout

- 5.1 The proposal comprises backland development, set behind the public house. This type of land use planning outcome is not alien to the local area, noting the relatively recent granting of planning permission for a similarly-sited development immediately to the north; to the rear of 3-5 The Street (DC/18/00745). The proposed plot does not project beyond the rear boundary of the neighbouring plots to the north or south. In other words, the plot aligns with the existing curtilage boundaries of the public house. Confining the development in this way results in only a very localised character impact. The single-storey scale of development means essentially only roofscape will be visible from neighbouring properties, an acceptable townscape response for a built up, urban environment.
- 5.2 Although backland development, the dwelling will be visible from The Street because of its location south of the public house. However, the considerable setback from The Street, coupled with intervening vegetation and playground equipment associated with the public house, limits direct views. The proposed red brick boundary wall and hedging will also assist in filtering views from the street. The development's streetscene impact is deemed negligible.
- 5.3 The change in local character is also tempered by the retention of the mature trees along the rear (west) and side (south) boundaries. A condition can secure the protection of these trees, by requiring protection measures deployed during construction to be undertaken in accordance with the supporting arboricultural report. Red brick boundary treatments, a laurel hedge to the public house common boundary and low-level shrubs to the dwelling frontage, all combine to further integrate the development into its already built-up surroundings.

5.4 The development would not be harmful to the settlement pattern. The development responds favourably to local design Policies GP01, H13 and H15.

6.0 Residential Amenity

6.1 The development would not unduly impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents, given the physical relationship to the nearest dwellings. The rear garden of the dwelling provides an effective buffer to the rear gardens of the neighbouring southern properties, mitigating overlooking and visual bulk effects. The modest, single-storey scale of the dwelling also helps to mitigate adverse amenity impacts.

6.2 Many objectors raise concern with the potential for the public house to cause adverse amenity impacts (noise and disturbance) for the future occupants of the dwelling and this, in turn, could threaten the viability of the public house business. This is a legitimate planning concern given the very close physical relationship between the public house and proposed development and the direction of national policy, in particular paragraph 127(f) of the NPPF, which states that developments should create places with a high standard of amenity for future users.

6.3 In response to the concerns raised, the applicant has provided a noise assessment report. The Environmental Protection Team has examined the assessment and is content with its findings. Three conditions are required to ensure the residential amenity for occupiers of the proposed dwelling. The conditions would ensure that glazing, insulation and trickle vents are of a sufficient standard to mitigate any noise from the public house garden. The third condition is required because the noise assessment was completed during Covid Lockdown and, therefore, actual noise from the public house could not be measured as there were no customers using the public house at that time. The condition requires pre-occupation independent testing to be carried out to ensure that WHO and BS8233 values are met by the completed building.

7.0 Highway Safety (Parking, Access, Layout)

7.1 The application seeks to rely on the existing public house access arrangements to serve the proposed dwelling.

7.2 The Highway Authority states that the required visibility splays at the existing access cannot be achieved, intensification would therefore be detrimental to highway safety, and refusal is recommended.

7.3 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment (TA). The TA notes that The Street is subject to a 30mph limit. The TA sets out the personal injury collision data for the area and concludes that for the last 20 years there have been no incidents at, or immediately adjacent to, the existing site access. The TA also details findings of a speed survey undertaken in November 2020. The 7-day average daily 85%tile speed was 24.2mph northbound and 24.4mph southbound. Less than 1% of recorded speeds exceeded the 30 mph speed limit. The TA advises that using the stopping sight distance calculation set out in Manual for Streets would suggest that traffic speeds on The Street would require a visibility splay of 31.3 metres. The TA acknowledges this required distance is slightly greater than the existing 25 metres to the left of the site access.

7.4 The proposed intensification of the existing access is very low. The single dwelling will generate a peak hour two-way flow of less than one vehicle, as noted by the TA - a level of traffic that would fall within the daily variation of traffic using the existing public house car park. Given these considerations, and the only marginal level of non-compliance with the required 31.3 metres

visibility splay, Officers are of the view that the development will not unacceptably endanger other road users and pedestrians.

- 7.5 The development would provide 20 spaces in the reconfigured carpark for the public house. As a consequence, the amount of parking proposed is adequate and commensurate with the public house's location in a built-up part of the village within easy walking distance of local residents. Vehicle parking provision for the dwelling is also standard compliant. Cycle storage is provided for the dwelling, located in the proposed rear garden. The proposed refuse store location, adjacent to the frontage to The Street, is acceptable.
- 7.6 Notwithstanding the views of the Highway Authority, for the reasons above it is Officers' opinion there are insufficient highway safety grounds to resist the proposal.

8.0 Loss of Community Facility

- 8.1 A large number of the objections received to the application are concerned with the extent of loss of the outdoor amenity area (beer garden) associated with the public house, and the potential for this to threaten the viability of the public house business in the longer term. There is no evidence before Officers to indicate that this would be the case. The balance of the retained outdoor area would remain extremely generous, far exceeding the total floor area of the public house itself, and much larger than many beer gardens in countryside villages across the district and beyond. The residents' concern in this regard is not substantiated and is not a reason to withhold planning permission.
- 8.2 It is noted that the public house has been registered as a Mid Suffolk District Council Asset of Community Value. A decision was made on the 27th January 2021 and will expire on the 27th January 2026. It is understood that the public house will continue trading and there are no plans to close or sell the public house at this time.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

9.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 9.1 The development plan policies most important for determining the application are deemed out-of-date. Irrespective of the Council's five-year housing supply position, the weight attached to these policies has to be commensurately reduced and the default position at paragraph 11d of the NPPF engages. The principal test is determining whether the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
- 9.2 The benefits in social, economic and environmental terms are modest. Notably, the housing need in the District is being met, in this circumstance a single dwelling in housing supply terms offers limited public benefit.
- 9.3 The proposal is not harmful to the significance of neighbouring heritage assets. Character impacts are very much localised, and the development is not harmful to the existing settlement pattern, compliant with local design Policies GP01, H13 and H15. Neighbouring residential amenity is unaffected, and the supporting noise assessment concludes that an acceptable amenity interface between the dwelling and public house will be achieved, compliant with Policy H16. Whilst strictly not compliant with required visibility splays, the site specific access-related circumstances (low speed environment, absence of collision incidents) and the very low level of intensification are such

that the development will not unacceptably endanger other road users or pedestrians. On-site parking provision is standard compliant.

- 9.4 None of the scheme elements weigh heavily against the proposal. Where there are adverse impacts, they are not of a magnitude that significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits, albeit acknowledging that the benefits are only modest.
- 9.5 Accordingly, the proposal delivers sustainable development. Planning permission is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION

That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions.

(1) That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:

- Standard time limit
- Approved Plans (Plans submitted that form this application)
- Tree protection – arboricultural report
- Landscaping timeframe
- Manufacturer’s literature of facing and roofing materials
- Manufacturer’s literature and/or large scale drawings of windows and doors
- Manufacturer’s literature of rooflights
- Notwithstanding the submitted details, details and large scale drawings of boundary treatments including materials specification and finishes
- Sample panel of brickwork for the boundary wall, no less than 1 metre square, to be constructed, opportunity given to inspect and following agreement of an acceptable panel, agreed panel to be retained on site for the duration of the build.
- Manufacturer’s literature of external hard surfacing materials/specification
- Large scale drawings of eaves and verges
- Construction Management Plan
- On-site carparking
- Environmental protection mitigation
- Noise assessment
- No burning on site
- Construction/delivery hours time limit
- Removal of permitted development rights for new openings (windows and doors), alterations to the dwelling and outbuildings and enclosures