

<b>REFERENCE NO:</b> 21/505458/REM		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL:</b> Approval of Reserved Matters for erection of 3 detached dwellings with associated parking (Appearance, Landscaping, Layout, Scale being sought) pursuant of 20/504370/OUT (Outline application for erection of 3 detached dwellings with matters of access and layout being sought, appearance, landscaping and scale are reserved matters for future consideration).		
<b>ADDRESS:</b> Land rear of Redic House Warmlake Road Sutton Valence Kent ME17 3LP		
<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to planning conditions		
<b>SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:</b> The proposal is acceptable with regard to the relevant provisions of the Development Plan, the NPPF and all other material considerations such as are relevant.		
<b>REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE:</b> Sutton Valence Parish Council has requested application is considered by Planning Committee if officers are minded to approve application. This request is made for reasons outlined in consultation section below.		
<b>WARD:</b> Sutton Valence & Langley	<b>PARISH COUNCIL:</b> Sutton Valence	<b>APPLICANT:</b> Mr Lazaro-Silver <b>AGENT</b> MJB Architecture Ltd
<b>TARGET DECISION DATE:</b> 24/01/22		<b>PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE:</b> 27/12/21

## RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

### *Proposal site*

- 21/505459 - Details for conditions: 3 (materials); 4 (landscaping); 6 (biodiversity); 7 (foul/surface water disposal); 8 (charging points) of 20/504370 - Split decision:

*Details for conditions 3, 6, 7, 8 approved. Details for condition 4 refused as submission failed to fully comply with details as required by condition and would not ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and would not be in the interests of residential amenity.*

- 20/504370 - Outline: 3 dwellings with access & layout being sought. Appearance, landscaping & scale reserved for future consideration - Approved (**APPENDIX A**)
- 20/502082 - Details for conditions: 1 (materials) & 2 (landscape) of 19/500724 - Approved
- 20/501800 - Outline for 3 dwellings (access & layout sought) - Refused
- 20/500004 - Details for conditions: 1 (materials); 2 (landscape) for 19/500724 - Refused
- 19/501103 - Erection of 2 houses with garages - Refused
- 19/500724 - Reserved matters following approval of 16/500489 - Approved
- 17/503541 - Outline: 3 dwellings (access sought) - Refused (appeal dismissed)
- 16/500489 - Outline: 1 dwelling (access sought) - Refused (appeal allowed)

### *Land to north of proposal site*

- 21/505631 - S73: Remove condition 11 (landscape buffer) pursuant to 16/508382 - Pending consideration (C11 of 16/508382 states landscaping details [pursuant to condition 1] shall provide at least 10m native landscape buffer along north and west boundaries of site [excluding gardens]. This does not relate to the northern boundary of this current application that is for consideration).
- 20/501089 - CLD to confirm development permitted under 16/508382 and 18/503784 can be lawfully implemented at any time - Approved
- 19/506309 - NMA to 18/503784 - amend layout of parking (plot 5) - Approved
- 18/503784 - Reserved matters application pursuant to 16/508382 - Approved
- 16/508382 - Outline: demolition of buildings and erection of 8 dwellings to ensure retention of 5 B1 commercial units - Approved

## MAIN REPORT

### 1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

1.01 The proposal site relates to a parcel of undeveloped land located to the north of Redic House. To the east of the site is the rear garden of 'Marwood House', with the main house to the south-east of the site; to the north, work has commenced on an approved residential development (see above planning history); and to the west is agricultural land. The Oast, that is in Warmlake Business Estate and some 60m to the north-east of the northern boundary of the proposal site (with a large modern commercial building in between), is Grade II listed. For the purposes of the Maidstone Local Plan the proposal site is within the designated countryside. The site also falls within an area of archaeological potential.

### 2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.01 On 26<sup>th</sup> November 2020, Members of the Planning Committee resolved to grant outline planning permission (under 20/504370) for the erection of three new dwellings on the application site (with matters of access and layout being sought and matters of appearance, landscaping and scale being reserved for future consideration). The decision for 20/504370 was issued on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2020. The Approved layout is as follows:



### 3.0 PROPOSAL

3.01 The description of the development is as follows: *Approval of Reserved Matters for the erection of 3 detached dwellings with associated parking (Appearance, Landscaping, Layout, Scale being sought) pursuant of 20/504370/OUT.*

3.02 The layout has been amended and the plan below shows what is now proposed:



*Matters of access and layout*

3.03 The matter of access has already been approved under 20/504370 and remains unaltered by this application. To reiterate, the proposed layout shows the continuation of the access road serving the housing development to the north (accessed from Maidstone Road), leading into the proposal site; and no vehicular or pedestrian access is shown into the site from the existing track in between Redic House and Marwood House.

3.04 The three detached houses are still shown to be located around the access road, with garden land predominantly abutting the eastern, southern, and western boundaries of the site. This said, the layout has been amended so that the development is moved southwards (away from the northern boundary of the site). Furthermore, the parking area for Plot 1 has been increased; and the parking area for Plot 2 has been moved to the east of the associated dwelling. Except for the three houses, it remains that no other buildings are proposed.

*Matters of scale, appearance and landscaping*

3.05 In terms of heights, Plot 1 would stand some 9.4m in height with an eaves height of some 5m; and both Plots 2 and 3 would have ridge heights of some 9m and eaves heights of around 5m. In general terms, the three (4-bed) properties would have hipped roofs; gable-end features to the front elevations; and open porches over the front doors. In terms of appearance, an external materials schedule has been submitted and already approved under 21/505459 (condition 3 pursuant to 20/504370). The approved materials are as follows:

	<b>PLOT 1</b>	<b>PLOT 2</b>	<b>PLOT 3</b>
<b>ROOF TILES</b>	<i>Marley Acme Double Camber Plain Clay in Antique</i>	<i>Marley Acme Double Camber Plain Clay in Antique</i>	<i>Marley Acme Double Camber Plain Clay in Antique</i>
<b>TILE HANGING</b>	<i>Sandtoft Plain Tile Mottled Red</i>	N/A	N/A
<b>WEATHERBOARD CLADDING</b>	N/A	<i>Marley Eternit Cedral Feather-Edge (white)</i>	<i>Marley Eternit Cedral Feather-Edge (white)</i>
<b>BRICKWORK</b>	<i>Freshfield Lane First Quality Stocks</i>	<i>Freshfield Lane First Quality Stocks</i>	<i>Freshfield Lane First Quality Stocks</i>
<b>HARD SURFACE FINISHES</b>	<i>PRIVATE DRIVEWAYS: Brett Alpha Flow in Brindle Colour</i> <i>SHARED ACCESS ROAD: Permeable Tarmac</i> <i>PRIVATE FOOTPATHS/PATIOS: Indian Sandstone in Fossil Mint Colour</i>		

3.06 The submitted plans show each new dwelling as having photovoltaic panels installed on the roof and the provision of electric vehicle charging points.

3.07 In terms of landscaping, the submission confirms that the existing Cypress trees along the northern boundary of the site will be retained (except for the new access); and that new native hedge planting will be undertaken along the eastern, southern and western boundaries of the site. An existing Willow tree that was part of the northern boundary planting has been removed; and the submission confirms that new plants will be protected by bio-earth biodegradable plastic free shelter guards. This detail is compliant with this part of the condition.

**4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Local Plan (2017): SS1, SP17, SP18, DM1, DM2, DM4, DM6, DM8, DM23, DM30
- Landscape Character Assessment (2012 amended July 2013)
- Maidstone Landscape Capacity Study: Sensitivity Assessment (Jan 2015)
- Maidstone Landscape Character Assessment Supplement (21012)
- National Planning Policy Framework (2021) & National Planning Practice Guidance
- Regulation 19 Maidstone Local Plan

*Local Plan*

- 4.01 The submission is subject to the normal policy constraints to development in the countryside, as set out in the adopted Local Plan. Indeed, new development should not be permitted unless it accords with other policies in the Local Plan and it (inter alia): does not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area; it respects the amenity local residents; it is acceptable in highway safety, heritage, and flood risk terms; and it protects and enhances any on-site biodiversity features where appropriate or provides sufficient mitigation measures.

*Council's Landscape Character Assessment and Capacity Study*

- 4.02 The Maidstone Landscape Character Assessment (2012 amended 2013) identifies the application site as falling within the Boughton Monchelsea to Chart Sutton Plateau (Area 29). The landscape guideline for this area is to 'IMPROVE'. The Council's Landscape Capacity Study: Sensitivity Assessment (Jan 2015) states that the Boughton Monchelsea to Chart Sutton Plateau has the overall landscape sensitivity as 'LOW'.

*NPPF (July 2021)*

- 4.03 The NPPF is clear that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that permission should be refused for development that is not well designed, with section 12 of the NPPF referring to 'achieving well-designed places'. Section 16 of the NPPF sets out what should be considered in terms of conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

*5yr housing land supply*

- 4.04 The Council is in a position where it can demonstrate a 5.6yrs worth of housing land supply (1st April 2021).

*Regulation 19 Local Plan*

- 4.05 Following recent approval by members, the Council's Reg 19 Local Plan is out to public consultation. This document is a material planning consideration, however at this time individual policies are not apportioned much weight. At the end of the consultation period, the weight to be attached to individual policies will be adjusted upwards or downwards depending on whether objections have been received. The current programme involves submission to the Planning Inspectorate in Spring 2022.

## **5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

- 5.01 Six representations received raising concerns over: Biodiversity enhancements are not adequate; impact upon trees/loss of existing landscaping; change to layout will cause additional harm to residential amenity of local residents in terms of overshadowing, privacy and general noise and disturbance; potential alteration to use of south access to site; houses are larger than approved in outline permission; and scale of proposal would be unacceptable in residential amenity terms.

## **6.0 CONSULTATIONS**

(Please note that summaries of consultation responses are set out below with the response discussed in more detail in the main report where considered necessary)

- 6.01 **Sutton Valence Parish Council:** Wish to see application refused and reported to Planning Committee if officers are minded to recommend approval. Their comments are summarised below:

*Application does not respect amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties - Loss of hedge will cause excessive noise, homes will be overlooked and there is unacceptable loss of privacy enjoyed by occupiers of neighbouring properties.*

*20/504370/OUT requires "retention of northern boundary 'hedge' (except for new access)". Large leylandii hedge, although not considered important in planning terms, provided*

*screening for both light and noise for neighbouring properties. These have been pollarded to extent they will have to be removed, exposing residents to noise and disturbance.*

*Applicant has not considered mature oak tree in Marwood House. Branches of this tree overhang into land rear of Redic House which means roots do as well. Concerned Plot 1's foundations may damage roots of this tree. Parish Council cannot see a tree survey has been carried in respect of this tree, which is not on site but could be damaged due to building work.*

6.02 **Landscape Officer:** Raises no objection to proposal (see main report).

6.03 **KCC Biodiversity Officer:** Raise no objection to proposal.

6.04 **Environmental Protection Team:** Raise no objection to proposal.

6.05 **KCC Highways:** Development does not meet criteria to warrant their involvement.

6.06 **KCC Minerals Safeguarding Team:** Confirm they have no minerals or waste safeguarding objections or further comments to make regarding these matters.

6.07 **KCC Archaeological Officer:** No representations received.

6.08 **Kent Wildlife Trust:** No representations received.

## **7.0 APPRAISAL**

### *Main issues*

7.01 In terms of sustainability, the principle of three new dwellings in this location has already been accepted when outline planning permission was granted under 20/504370. Moving forward, the key issues for consideration relate to:

- Visual impact (layout, scale and appearance);
- Landscape/arboreal considerations;
- Residential amenity;
- Biodiversity considerations; and
- Other planning considerations.

7.02 The details of the submission will now be considered.

### *Visual impact (layout, scale and appearance)*

7.03 The development of this backland site for three detached dwellings has already been accepted under 20/504370 and it remains that the shown plot sizes would be similar to those under construction adjacent to site and that adequate parking would be provided. The proposal would also continue the road through from the north, creating a clear relationship with the application site and how the houses to the north are laid out, whilst helping to provide a natural end to the Warmlake Business Estate development. Furthermore, the proposed dwellings would be of a similar scale to surrounding existing properties (including the new development to the north of the site); their design is considered to be interesting, appropriate and in keeping with the site's context that is varied in terms of property styles; and as set out in paragraph 3.05 of this report, the external finishes of the development have already been considered acceptable under 21/505459.

7.04 On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would not appear cramped and out of place with the pattern and grain of development in the area; and it would not adversely harm the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with relevant Local Plan policy.

*Landscape/arboricultural considerations*

7.05 Condition 4 imposed under 20/504370 states:

*Pursuant to condition 1 of this permission and as shown on drawing ref: P.16.001.2437\_01A, the scheme of hard and soft landscaping shall use indigenous species (excluding Sycamore), and shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with a programme for the approved scheme's implementation. The landscaping shall be designed using the principles established in the Council's adopted Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Guidelines and shall include the following:*

- (a) native hedgerow planting along the eastern, southern, and western boundaries;*
- (b) retention of the northern boundary hedge (except for the new access);*
- (b) details of new planting (including location, planting species and size);*
- (c) details of all fencing, walling and other boundary treatments; and*
- (d) written confirmation that non-plastic guards shall be used for the trees and hedgerows.*

*The landscaping of the site thereafter shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and maintained as such thereafter.*

*Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, and in the interests of residential amenity and biodiversity enhancement.*

7.06 Pursuant to condition 4 of 20/504370, landscaping details were submitted for consideration under 21/505459 and subsequently refused because the submission showed the removal of the northern boundary planting and this was not compliant with part (b) of the condition.

7.07 The landscaping details submitted as part of this current application have now been amended to show the retention of the Cypress trees along the northern boundary of the site, except for where the new access will go. Furthermore, new native hedging (that is generally in accordance with the Maidstone Landscape Character Assessment Supplement for the site's landscape character area) will be planted along the eastern, southern and western boundaries of the site; the shown hard boundary treatment details are considered acceptable; and the submission confirms that new plants will be protected by bio-earth biodegradable plastic free shelter guards, in accordance with condition 4 as set out above. With this considered, the submitted landscaping scheme is considered to be acceptable and it would safeguard the character and appearance of the countryside hereabouts. The Landscape Officer also considers the landscaping details to be acceptable.

7.08 It is noted that Sutton Valence Parish Council refer to the Cypress trees being '*pollarded to extent they will have to be removed*'. The site was visited after the receipt of these comments and it was evident at the time that the Cypress trees along the northern boundary of the application site had not been pollarded. It may be that Sutton Valence Parish Council are referring to different trees on the adjacent site. To reiterate, the Cypress trees along the northern boundary of the site are to be retained (except for the access); and as an aside, it is considered that pollarding represents good management of this fast growing species.

7.09 There is an Oak tree in the garden of Marwood House, to the east of the application site; and in this respect no arboricultural information has been submitted with this application. The Landscape Officer has reviewed the submission, including the representations made by local residents, and has made the following comments regarding this tree (summarised):

*Based on info available, Oak tree has circular root protection area (RPA) radius of approx. 9.6m and is 7.6m from boundary. Proposed plans show development requires excavation of just under 1m from boundary, therefore (in worst case scenario), RPA may be compromised by approximately 1m at one point on its western edge. It is difficult to comment with any certainty without the tree being accurately plotted on plans and without measured dimensions of the tree's stem diameter, but based on info available, it appears the development might conflict*

*with the edge of the RPA of the tree, but if it does, it is only likely to be a small percentage of total RPA, on its outer edge. Default position in BS5837:2012 is that RPA should not be disturbed unless there is overriding justification, but where there is, the 'lost' RPA can be compensated for elsewhere if suitable rooting environment exists in other directions. It would be preferable to have accurate information on which to be able to properly assess potential impact on tree. However, given that the encroachment, if any, is likely to be minor and at least 8.5m from the tree stem (with suitable protection measures in place), the long-term health of the tree is unlikely to be compromised by the proposals.*

- 7.10 Based on this specialist advice and subject to tree protection details, it is accepted that the proposal would not compromise the long-term health of the adjacent Oak tree. Turning to the proposed tree protection measures in more detail, the Landscape Officer goes on to comment (as summarised):

*Proposed tree protection measures do not appear to be based on principles of BS5837 and it is therefore not possible to assess whether they will be adequate; and they also omit consideration of adjacent Oak tree. In order to ensure construction of proposed layout minimises the impact on retained trees and hedges and thereby increases their chance of successful retention within the scheme, I consider it necessary to impose pre-commencement conditions requiring revised tree protection details to be submitted, which should be based on accurate plotting of existing trees and hedges, with RPAs plotted in accordance with BS5837 methodology. This must form basis of a Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement, which should be required to be submitted and approved before any site clearance or excavation takes place and before any materials, vehicles or machinery are brought on site.*

- 7.11 On the basis that the Landscape Officer is satisfied that accurate tree protection details can be dealt with by way of pre-commencement condition, the recommended condition shall be duly imposed in the interests of safeguarding the longevity of existing trees and safeguarding the character and appearance of the area. The agent has agreed to this pre-commencement condition.

#### *Residential amenity*

- 7.12 The principle for three dwellings here has already been accepted, and so the general use of the site for this purpose is not objectionable in residential amenity terms. It should also be reiterated here that the proposal will continue to have sole access (both pedestrian and vehicle) from Maidstone Road, through the already approved housing development to the north of the site. Notwithstanding this, the matter of layout has been amended from that approved under the original outline permission (20/504370) and the submission now provides details of scale, appearance and landscaping. These matters need to be assessed in residential amenity terms.
- 7.13 It remains that the access road is largely in the same location as approved under the previous outline permission, set an acceptable distance away from the boundaries with Redic House and Marwood House, with gardens and buildings acting as a suitable buffer; and although the parking area for plot 2 has been repositioned, it is still set away some 11m from the northern boundary of Redic House and this is not considered to be objectionable in terms of general noise and disturbance. With this considered, it remains the view that the vehicle movements associated with the new development would not have an unacceptable impact upon the occupants of Redic House or Marwood House (or any other dwelling), when trying to enjoy their properties both internally and externally.
- 7.14 Whilst the amended layout brings the dwellings further south into the plot, it remains that the two neighbouring properties to the south benefit from large gardens, separating these existing houses from the new dwellings; and it is considered that these separation distances (and the scale of the new dwellings) would not result in a development that would appear unacceptably overbearing in the outlook of the occupants of Redic House and Marwood House when trying to enjoy their own properties. The layout and scale of the proposal would also not result in an unacceptable loss of light for the adjacent neighbours.

- 7.15 In terms of privacy, it is considered that the separation distance between Redic House and proposed plot 2 is still sufficient to not result in harmful overlooking of Redic House; and the existing boundary fencing, the existing trees and outbuilding in the garden of Redic House, and the proposed landscaping for this application would also help to further safeguard against a significant loss of privacy. Given the separation distances involved and the layout and the orientation of the dwellings, it is considered that the development would also not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupants of Marwood House when trying to enjoy their property (both internally and externally).
- 7.16 It is also considered that future occupants of the proposal would benefit from acceptable living conditions, both internally and externally; and the development would not have an adverse impact upon the living conditions of any other local resident, including the occupants of the residential development to the immediate north of the application site. On this basis, the proposal would be in accordance with Local Plan Policy DM1, which includes a requirement for new development to respect the residential amenity of existing and future residents.

*Biodiversity considerations*

- 7.17 The KCC Biodiversity Officer has not requested any further ecological information in relation to this application and so it is assumed that they are satisfied that the application will not cause unacceptable harm to any protected species. Condition 6 imposed under the original outline permission (20/504370) seeks details of biodiversity enhancements to be incorporated into the design and appearance of each dwelling, through integrated methods such as swift bricks, bat tubes/bricks and bee bricks. Such details were submitted and approved under 21/505459, and this current submission replicates those details. Please note that the KCC Biodiversity Officer is satisfied with the submitted biodiversity enhancements; and that on their advice the submitted details were amended to place the swift bricks and bat bricks in more appropriate places (i.e. on north-facing elevations and east-facing elevations respectively).

*Other considerations*

- 7.18 To reiterate, the matter of access has already been approved under 20/504370 and remains unaltered by this application; and onsite parking provision is considered acceptable. Please also note that condition 9 of 20/504370 restricts vehicle access to and from the site, including at construction phase, via the track in between Redic House and Marwood House.
- 7.19 In the interests of residential amenity and to further safeguard the character and appearance of the countryside hereabouts, a condition will be imposed to remove permitted development rights for extending the houses and new hard boundary treatments.
- 7.20 The Environmental Protection Team has raised no objection to the application in terms of traffic noise impact on future occupants of the site; air quality; land contamination; and private water supplies. Notwithstanding this, they have recommended that details of foul drainage are sought by way of condition. This is not considered necessary, and nor is seeking further surface water disposal information, as these details have already been approved under 21/505459. The recommended condition relating to hours of construction working is also not considered reasonable or necessary in order to make this development acceptable in planning terms. There is sufficient room within the site for refuse storage and collection; and in the interests of amenity, a suitable condition will be imposed to restrict external lighting in accordance with Local Plan policy DM1.



- 7.21 As was accepted under 20/504370, the application site is noticeably separated from the Grade II listed 'Warmlake Oast', with recently approved residential development in between; and the proposal does not alter the existing access from Maidstone Road. With this considered, along with the assessment of the details of this reserved matters application, it remains the view that the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon the setting and significance of this listed building. The site is within an area of archaeological potential, but the KCC Archaeological Officer has made no representations on the submission and so it is assumed that they have no comments to make and do not require the submission of any further details in this respect.
- 7.22 The KCC Minerals Safeguarding Team confirm they have no minerals or waste safeguarding objections to make on the application and nor do they have any further comments to make.
- 7.23 The issues raised by Sutton Valence Parish Council and local residents have been considered in the assessment of this application. Due regard has been had to the Public Sector Equality Duty, as set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, and it is considered that the application would not undermine the objectives of this Duty. The proposed development is CIL liable. The Council has adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy and began charging on all CIL liable applications, approved on and from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2018. The actual amount of CIL can only be confirmed once all the relevant forms have been submitted and the relevant details have been assessed and approved. Any relief claimed will be assessed at the time planning permission is granted or shortly after.

## **8.0 CONCLUSION**

- 8.01 For the reasons outlined above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable with regard to the relevant provisions of the Development Plan, the NPPF and all other material considerations such as are relevant. A recommendation of approval is therefore made on this basis.

## **9.0 RECOMMENDATION**

GRANT planning permission subject to the following conditions:

- (1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents: Amended materials schedule (received 22.11.21); Biodiversity Statement by The Ash Partnership (dated: 10.12.21); 2520/PH2/P5 Rev A; P6 Rev A; and P7 Rev A (received 21.10.21); and 2520/PH2/P3 Rev A; and P4 Rev B (received 10.12.21).

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

- (2) The development hereby approved shall not commence until details of protection for trees and new areas of structural planting in accordance with the current edition of BS 5837 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall comprise of a revised Tree Protection Plan (TPP) and an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) based on an accurate survey and plotting of tree positions, canopy spreads and Root Protection Areas calculated from stem diameters. The AMS should detail implementation of any aspect of the development that has the potential to result in the loss of, or damage to trees, including their roots and, for example, take account of site access, demolition and construction activities, foundations, service runs and level changes. All trees to be retained, including trees on adjacent sites with the potential to be affected by the development must be protected by barriers and/or ground protection and detailed in the TPP. No equipment, plant, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site prior to the erection of approved barriers and/or ground protection except to carry out pre commencement operations specifically approved in writing by the local planning authority. Nothing shall be stored or placed, nor fires lit, within any of the protected

areas. No alterations shall be made to the siting of barriers and/or ground protection, nor ground levels changed, nor excavations made within these areas without the written consent of the local planning authority. These measures shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the longevity of existing trees and safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

- (3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the landscaping scheme as shown on drawing ref: 2520/PH2/P4 Rev B and the Biodiversity Statement by The Ash Partnership (dated: 10.12.21) and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, and in the interests of residential amenity and biodiversity enhancement.

- (4) The approved landscaping associated with the individual dwellings shall be in place at the end of the first planting and seeding season following completion of the relevant individual dwelling. Any other communal, shared or street landscaping shall be in place at the end of the first planting and seeding season following completion of the final unit. Any trees or plants, which, within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, and in the interests of residential amenity and biodiversity enhancement.

- (5) Prior to the first occupation of a dwelling hereby approved, its first floor windows serving bathroom and ensuite facilities shall be obscure glazed and incapable of being opened except for a high level fanlight opening of at least 1.7m above inside floor level and shall be subsequently maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

- (6) Prior to the first occupation of the hereby approved dwelling on plot 3, the first floor window in the southern elevation of this dwelling shall be obscure glazed and incapable of being opened except for a high level fanlight opening of at least 1.7m above inside floor level and shall be subsequently maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

- (7) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the ground levels and finished floor levels, as shown on the submitted drawings.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in the interests of residential amenity.

- (8) The vehicle parking spaces and turning facilities, as shown on the submitted plans, shall be permanently retained for parking and turning and shall not be used for any other purposes.

Reason: In the interest of highways safety and parking provision.

- (9) Notwithstanding the external lighting details shown on the approved plans, no other external lighting, whether temporary or permanent, shall be placed or erected within the site unless details are submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any details to be submitted shall be in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Engineers Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Lighting, GN01, dated 2005 (and any subsequent revisions), and shall include a layout plan with

beam orientation and a schedule of light equipment proposed (luminaire type; mounting height; aiming angles and luminaire profiles) and an ISO lux plan showing light spill. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the subsequently approved details and maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity.

- (10) Notwithstanding what is shown on the approved plans and the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development (Amendment) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no development within Schedule 2, Part 1 Classes A, AA, B, C and D; and Schedule 2, Part 2, Classes A, shall be carried out.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and to safeguard the character and appearance of the countryside hereabouts.

#### Informative(s)

- (1) The proposed development is CIL liable. The Council adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy on 25th October 2017 and began charging on all CIL liable applications approved on and from 1st October 2018. The actual amount of CIL can only be confirmed once all the relevant forms have been submitted and relevant details have been assessed and approved. Any relief claimed will be assessed at the time planning permission is granted or shortly after.

Case Officer: Kathryn Altieri