

REPORT SUMMARY

REFERENCE NO - 21/504391/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Proposed conversion of Mill into a habitable space ancillary to main dwelling. Works to include the renovation of the single storey rear extension, alterations to roof, windows and doors. Erection of a new double garage.			
ADDRESS Mill House Upper Street Hollingbourne Maidstone Kent ME17 1UL			
RECOMMENDATION - APPROVE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS set out in 8.0			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The proposal would result in only a low level of harm to the significance of the listed building. The harm is considered to have been minimised and the proposal is considered to provide the optimum viable use for the listed building. The public benefits, relating to providing a viable use for the building, are considered to outweigh the harm and to warrant the granting of planning permission.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE The recommendation is contrary to the views of the Parish Council and they have requested consideration at Planning Committee.			
WARD North Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Hollingbourne	APPLICANT Mr And Mrs Stephen Whorlow And Kathryn Seeger AGENT D.C.Husdon And Partner LLP	
DECISION DUE DATE 11/10/21 (EOT until 28/4/22)	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 23/09/21	OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE 01/09/21	
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
06/2164	Boundary fence	Approved	02/01/2007
14/500888	Listed Building Consent for wooden pillars on ground floor to support floor and additional purlins	Approved	08/08/2014
20/502392 & 20/502404	Conversion of mill building to additional accommodation to Mill House, together with extensions and alterations to both buildings – Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent	Refused	24/07/2020

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 This application relates to a grade II listed water mill building, and an attached dwelling, also grade II listed. The list description advises that the Watermill building dates from the late 19th century, upon earlier foundations, with the house being added later in the century or early 20th century.

- 1.02 The water mill is constructed of red brick in Flemish bond to the ground floor, with grey bricks introduced towards the top, with the first floor being blended red and grey bricks in English bond. It also includes some elements of rag stone. The mill building is of approximately 2 storey height with attic, with the house being one and a half stories. The heritage statement submitted with the application indicates that the origins of the Watermill date from as early as the Domesday survey, and it retains a well preserved setting, with the building having a strong visual relationship with the mill pond and Millstream. The waterwheel still exists, but is currently in poor condition.
- 1.03 The site also lies within Upper Street Hollingbourne conservation area, to which it makes a strong and important contribution. It also falls within the open countryside and is located in the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, again to which it makes a strong and positive contribution to the character and appearance of the landscape.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 Planning Permission is sought for the conversion of the water mill building to additional accommodation ancillary to the dwelling, Mill House, together with alterations. These include the renovation of the existing single-storey rear extension to the house, alterations to its roof and alterations to fenestration. A detached double garage is also proposed.
- 2.02 This application is a resubmission of the refused scheme references 20/502392 & 20/502404. Both the Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent were previously refused for a number of reasons which are set out in more detail below.

3.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
Development Plan: Maidstone Local Plan 2017: SP17, SP18, DM1, DM3, DM4, DM30, DM31, DM32, DM23
Supplementary Planning Documents: Residential Extensions
Maidstone Local Plan review (regulation 19), October 2021: LPRSP15, LPRSP14, LPREnv1, LPRQ&D3, LPRTRA4, LPRHou11, LPRQ&D4, LPRQ&D5
Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan

4.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

Site notice posted on 01/09/21, expired on 22/09/21.
No representations received from local residents.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 5.01 Hollingbourne Parish Council: wish to see the application refused and requests that it is considered at Planning Committee. Initial comments were that they had concerns over the change of use of the mill, as it is a listed building and very important to the history of the village. Subsequent comment that the changes would make the mill a separate dwelling in its own right due to the facilities provided.
- 5.02 Historic England: Do not wish to comment.

- 5.03 Conservation officer (summary of comments): suggested amendments. In relation to the cottage, suggested a reduction in the extent of internal demolition of walls, and a reduction in the extent of glazing to the walls and roof of the extension. (Officer comment: amended plans have been submitted in response to these issues).

In relation to the mill, suggested that the residential conversion of the mill be confined to just 2 floors with the other floor not being converted. Considered the spiral stairs to be out of keeping, had some concerns over the doors to the end elevation and considered the conversion should be more sensitive. (Officer comments: it was not considered justified or reasonable to insist upon the suggested changes in relation to the mill. Further commentary upon these issues is given particularly in paragraph 6.16 below).

6.0 APPRAISAL

- 6.01 The key issues for consideration relate to:
- Site Background/Principle of development/Policy context
 - Impact upon the Listed Building and that the Conservation Area
 - Impact upon the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
 - Residential amenity
 - Biodiversity
 - Other matters

Site Background/Principle of development/Policy context

- 6.02 The previous applications of specific relevance are planning application 20/502404 and listed building consent application 20/502932. These were refused for the following reasons:

20/502404:

(1) The proposed extensions, external staircase and alterations to fenestration, including rooflights, would harm the significance, simple and industrial form, character and appearance of the grade II listed mill building and the character and appearance of the Mill House building. The public benefits are not considered to outweigh this harm and the proposal is therefore contrary to policies DM4 and SP18 of the Maidstone Local Plan 2017 and paragraphs 184, 190, 192, 193, 194 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(2) The proposed rear extension and bridge would harm the significance and setting of the grade II listed Mill and Mill House, by destroying the rustic appearance of the setting, obscuring historic masonry, dominating and harmfully altering key views of the waterwheel and diminishing the appreciation of the water management works and earthworks which are considered fundamental to the significance of the heritage asset. The public benefits are not considered to outweigh this harm and the proposal is therefore contrary to policies DM4 and SP18 of the Maidstone Local Plan 2017 and paragraphs 184, 190, 192, 193, 194 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(3) The proposed extensions and external alterations to the mill building and Mill House would harm the character, appearance and significance of the buildings and unacceptably diminish the positive contribution which they currently make to the significance, character and appearance of the Upper Street Hollingbourne conservation area. The public benefits are not considered to outweigh this harm and the proposal is therefore contrary to policies DM4 and SP18 of the Maidstone Local

Plan 2017 and paragraphs 184, 190, 192, 193, 196 and 200 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(4) The proposed extensions, external staircase and alterations to fenestration including rooflights would be out of character with the existing mill building and would destroy the positive contribution which it currently makes to the scenic quality and historic character of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, contrary to policies SP17, DM30, DM31 and DM1 of the Maidstone Local Plan 2017, paragraphs 170 and 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies SD1, SD2, SD3, SD8, SD9 and HCH1 of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan.

(5) Insufficient information has been provided to fully assess the impact of the proposed development upon protected species. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM3 of the Maidstone Local Plan 2017 and paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

20/502392/LBC:

(1) The proposed extensions, external staircase and alterations to fenestration, including rooflights, would harm the significance, simple and industrial form, character and appearance of the grade II listed mill building and the character and appearance of the Mill House building. The public benefits are not considered to outweigh this harm and the proposal is therefore contrary to policies DM4 and SP18 of the Maidstone Local Plan 2017 and paragraphs 184, 190, 192, 193, 194 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(2) The proposed rear extension and bridge would harm the significance and setting of the grade II listed Mill and Mill House, by destroying the rustic appearance of the setting, obscuring historic masonry, dominating and harmfully altering key views of the waterwheel and diminishing the appreciation of the water management works and earthworks which are considered fundamental to the significance of the heritage asset. The public benefits are not considered to outweigh this harm and the proposal is therefore contrary to policies DM4 and SP18 of the Maidstone Local Plan 2017 and paragraphs 184, 190, 192, 193, 194 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(3) There is insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed internal works, including removal of the fireplace and cupboards within the Mill House and fabric within the mill building and tanking works would not harm the significance, character, appearance and longevity of the listed building. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies DM4 and SP18 of the Maidstone Local Plan 2017 and paragraphs 184, 190, 192, 193, 194 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 6.03 Policy DM31 of the local plan relates to the conversion of redundant rural buildings to other uses, including residential, subject to a number of criteria. It requires that firstly, a business reuse is considered before a residential use and secondly, amongst other things, that the building is of sufficient character and quality to warrant its retention. It further advises that the building must be capable of being converted without major or complete reconstruction. In this case, firstly it is considered that a business use would not be appropriate. This is because the mill building is physically attached to the dwelling and one aspect of high significance is its setting. The use of the building for a business use would be likely to necessitate subdivision and boundary treatments, as well as potentially additional parking.

- 6.04 Both the water mill and Mill House have a strong visual relationship with the mill pond and Millstream. There is a Historic England document entitled “Mills” and this indicates that whilst Mills sometimes changed function and had internal refits over time, the water management works probably needed little alteration over the years/centuries. Indeed, it is considered that the water management works, the earthworks, the mill race, the wheel race and the tailrace, are likely to have remained predominantly unchanged for almost 1000 years, since the heritage statement indicates the existence of a water mill in this location in the Domesday survey. Therefore, the earthworks and Millstream are considered of very high significance to the listed buildings and their setting.
- 6.05 Therefore, the addition of a boundary treatments, such as fences, to subdivide the buildings into 2 separate uses is likely to result in clear harm to an aspect of high significance and therefore is likely to be strongly resisted. I am therefore satisfied that in this particular case, no further information is required to demonstrate that a business use would not be viable, since a business use would be very likely to be harmful to the significance and special interest of the listed building.
- 6.06 With regards to the other points within the policy, the building is clearly of sufficient character and quality to warrant its retention – it is a listed building which makes a very strong positive contribution both to the conservation area and the area of outstanding natural beauty. It appears to be in a reasonable state of repair and seems clearly capable of being converted without major or complete reconstruction. I therefore conclude that in principle, the use of the mill building as ancillary accommodation to Mill House is acceptable.
- 6.07 It is further emphasised that the previous application was *not* refused in terms of the principle of the development.

Impact upon the Listed Building and the Conservation Area

- 6.08 Section 66(1) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 states:
- “In considering whether to grant planning permission...for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority...shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”.
- 6.09 Section 72.1 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires that special regard is given to the question of whether or not the proposed development would either preserve or enhance the special character of the conservation area. There is a presumption that development which would not do so should be refused.
- 6.10 Policies SP18 and DM4 of the local plan seeks to preserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. The NPPF similarly seeks this end. Importantly, it is clear that the NPPF does seek to put heritage assets to “viable uses consistent with their conservation”.
- 6.11 The previous refusal included 3 reasons relating to the heritage assets. The areas of the proposed development which were considered to result in harm were the proposed extensions, external staircase, alterations to fenestration, including rooflights, and the proposed bridge.
- 6.12 Firstly, importantly, a number of the previously identified harmful aspects of the development have simply been removed and are no longer proposed. These include

the two-storey front extension to the water mill building, the single storey rear extension to the water mill building, the proposed external staircase, the rooflights and the bridge over the mill stream. All of these proposals, which were considered to be unacceptable in principle and very harmful, have been deleted and no longer forms part of the proposals.

- 6.13 In terms of the remaining aspects, the rear extension to the house is still proposed to be altered, as is fenestration, but changes have also been made to the scheme in relation to these elements to result in a more sympathetic appearance.
- 6.14 It is now considered that this revised scheme, which is *very* significantly different to the refused scheme, would preserve the special interest and significance of the listed buildings. The simple and industrial form and character of the mill building would be preserved – there are no extensions proposed to the mill building and the rooflights, which were considered resolutely residential in character, are again no longer proposed. The external staircase was also considered of residential character and harmful and this has been omitted. A change to the scale in the window opening to the end elevation is proposed, but this would generally retain the simple, functional character of the building it is considered. Although the conservation officer comments refer to this opening as doors, as the external staircase has been removed it would no longer be externally accessible and large-scale details can be sought to ensure a satisfactory appearance which is not inappropriately domestic.
- 6.15 An extension to the Watermill was previously proposed to obscure historic masonry, possibly being the earliest surviving section of the building, but again this is no longer proposed, so the masonry would remain visible. Views of the waterwheel would also be retained through the omission of this extension. Furthermore, in terms of the setting, the formerly proposed bridge was considered to have a heavily engineered and harmful appearance and would have dominated the water management works which, as stated above, are considered fundamental to the significance of the heritage asset. This part of the development is also no longer proposed, so that the mill stream and water management works would remain as existing, with the existing low-level bridge over the millstream being of very low key and retaining the high significance of this area of the site. The changes to the rear extension to the house would not be of a scale or position to significantly harm the appreciation of management works and earthworks and therefore these elements of high significance would be preserved. The garage would be of a sympathetic design to the host building and situated somewhat to one side, so as not to harm key views of the building.
- 6.16 With regard to other issues raised by the conservation officer, the use of only 2 floors and the omission of the internal staircase is considered unreasonable – this would prevent the viable use of the building as a whole and it is not considered reasonable to seek to secure such a scheme. Although the internal changes are considered to result in a low level of harm, it must also be borne in mind that internally significance is considered to be lower - as stated, the Historic England guidance on Mills indicates that they often had internal refits over time, whereas the water management works were generally more historic and therefore are considered of much higher significance. Changes to the cottage has been amended following the conservation officer's comments to retain more of the internal walls and to reduce the amount of glazing. The changes which have been made are considered to have a satisfactory visual appearance and have significantly reduced the extent of glazing to the roof and walls such that it is no longer considered to dominate the cottage. I note that the conservation officer comments did not recommend refusal, but only sought amendments.

- 6.17 In conclusion, with regards to the impact upon the heritage assets, being the listed building and the conservation area, it is concluded that there would be a very low level of harm, particularly resulting from some internal changes to the mill building. However, it is concluded that the harm has been minimised and would be of a very low level, much less than substantial.

Impact upon the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

- 6.18 As with the impact upon the heritage assets described above, there are equally considered to be very significant changes to the proposal in terms of its impact upon the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Again, the key harmful elements have all been removed – the extensions, the bridge and the rooflights – areas which all would have harmed the character of this important building which makes a very high contribution to the scenic quality of the AONB. As described above, the external appearance of the changes is now considered sympathetic and to preserve the simple, functional character of the mill building and I am satisfied that this proposal would thereby preserve the scenic quality of the area of outstanding natural beauty. This reason for refusal has therefore been addressed.

Residential amenity

- 6.19 The proposal does not raise any significant residential amenity issues. The Watermill would be used in connection with the existing dwelling, and would not form a separate unit and fenestration would not be in a position to significantly overlook any neighbouring properties. The scale and nature of the proposals are such that there are no significant light or outlook issues for any neighbouring properties. Also, as no additional use or commercial use is proposed, but simply one single residential unit, being comprised of the existing dwelling and the Watermill, there are no significant noise and disturbance issues.

Biodiversity

- 6.20 Previously the application was refused upon the grounds of insufficient information being provided to fully assess the impact of the proposed development upon protected species.
- 6.22 This application is now accompanied by a preliminary ecological appraisal, which has been carried out by qualified professionals. This indicated that further survey work, in the form of bat emergence and re-entry surveys were carried out. It also suggested mitigation measures and ecological enhancements. The further bat surveys suggested in the preliminary appraisal were also carried out and have been submitted.
- 6.23 The bat surveys concluded that although a small number of bats were seen, these must have been simply roosting behind the bargeboard, as there was no access to any other roosting features. The said bargeboard is understood to be retained and the survey concludes that there would be no impact expected upon bats, nor is any mitigation licence expected to be necessary.
- 6.24 With regards to other species, the report suggests mitigation for badgers and hedgehogs during construction works and also for great crested newts. Although there are ponds – the mill pond – in close proximity, the report advises that no further survey work is recommended for them, due to “the unsuitable water bodies present

within the site and the proposals not impacting any suitable great crested Newt terrestrial habitat.

- 6.25 Mitigation is also suggested for nesting birds. The ecological appraisal suggests enhancements, including planting, bat boxes and bird boxes.
- 6.26 In conclusion, sufficient information is considered to have been submitted to conclude that the proposals would not result in any significant loss of important habitat for protected species or significant harm in terms of biodiversity. Mitigation measures and ecological enhancements can be secured by condition and this is considered appropriate and necessary.

Other Matters

- 6.27 The parish council have raised the issue of the accommodation being used as a separate dwelling. Initially, the convoluted and separate layout of the previously refused scheme was referred to within the previous officer report, since the previous refused proposal included a convoluted layout where there was only an access through a proposed extension to link the 2 buildings. This scheme includes internal access, both at ground and first floor level and has been submitted on the basis of providing additional accommodation to the main dwelling. Therefore, the application must be assessed upon that the basis upon which permission has been applied for, which is for ancillary accommodation. A condition can be attached to ensure that the buildings remain in use as a single dwelling and, should the building be used as a separate dwelling at any point in the future, then this would be a matter for enforcement.
- 6.28 With regards to highways, no additional units are being proposed, as the mill would simply be used as additional accommodation to the mill house and therefore there are not considered to be any significant highways issues.
- 6.29 No important trees would be lost it is considered.
- 6.30 With regard to conditions, in the event of a favourable recommendation, conditions regarding the removal of permitted development rights and installation of renewables have been considered. With regards to the removal of permitted development rights, it is considered necessary to attach this, because, besides from the impact upon the listed building, the mill building also has a very important impact upon the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and visually is considered a key building which contributes towards its scenic quality. Therefore, the removal of permitted development rights would give control over the impact upon the AONB of any future development.
- 6.31 With regards to renewables, I have considered this but do not, in this case, conclude that a condition is justified or necessary. Firstly, the development is in essence to create ancillary accommodation to an existing dwelling – no additional units would be provided. Moreover, I do not consider it reasonable to require something which would be difficult to install without resulting in harm to the listed building and its setting. For example, the installation of solar panels upon the building is likely to have a high, adverse impact, and even within the setting, freestanding renewables are likely to result in harm. The garage would be prominently located so the addition of solar panels upon this building would also not be considered desirable visually. The issue of appropriate insulation would to some extent be controlled by the impact which it has upon the listed building and this issue can therefore be considered under the concurrent listed building consent. Therefore, considering the great weight which

must be given to the conservation of the heritage asset, I do not consider that to attach a condition requiring renewables would be reasonable or necessary and therefore it would fail to accord with the NPPG.

Balancing exercise

- 6.32 Paragraph 197 of the NPPF advises under point a) that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of “the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation”.
- 6.33 Paragraph 199 requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. This is irrespective of the amount of harm, whether this be substantial or less than substantial.
- 6.34 Where harm is identified and the level of harm is considered to be less than substantial, paragraph 202 advises that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
- 6.35 In this case, it is considered that the previous reasons for refusal relating to the AONB and biodiversity have been addressed. The level of harm to the heritage assets, being the listed buildings and conservation area are considered to be low.
- 6.36 It is clear from the NPPF that securing viable uses for heritage assets is a very important consideration, providing that such uses consistent with their conservation.
- 6.37 In this case, as explained, the residential use of the mill building as part of one dwelling unit comprising the mill and mill house, is considered likely to be the least harmful use to significance and the most appropriate use. Any use of the building is likely to require some changes clearly in order to make it fit for purpose. It is considered in this case, under this revised scheme, but harm has been minimised and is of a low level. Key elements of the significance of the buildings would be preserved. These include the simple, functional form of the mill building, its setting and water management works, and the simple character of the mill.
- 6.38 Great weight must be given to the conservation of the heritage asset. However, as stated, the key aspects of its significance would be preserved and the level of harm is considered to be low. This proposal is considered likely to secure the optimum viable use of the building. This is a public benefit in terms of providing long-term preservation for the building. In essence, if no use is found, ultimately the building could fall into disrepair and become at risk. This scheme is a generally sympathetic scheme, with harm being minimised and of a low level and is considered to secure the optimum viable use.
- 6.39 Therefore, having regard to give great weight to the asset’s conservation and considering policy and the guidance within the NPPF it is concluded that in this case, the public benefits outweigh the harm and therefore a recommendation of approval is appropriate.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.01 This revised scheme is very significantly different to the previously refused proposal. The key elements resulting in harm has been removed – the extensions to the mill, the bridge, the rooflights and the external staircase. The revised scheme is now

considered to result in only a low level of harm to the listed building and the conservation area. There are not considered to be significant grounds to refuse the application in terms of the impact upon the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

- 7.02 The NPPF requires harm to be balanced against public benefits, including securing the optimum viable use of the building. The proposal is considered to secure the optimum viable use of the building, with harm being of a low level and minimised. It is therefore concluded that in this case, the public benefits to designated heritage assets outweigh the harm and approval is therefore recommended.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to the following conditions:

- (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission;

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- (2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

2214/01 Rev E and Seegar_OFD23111 received on 09/08/21 and 2214/05 Rev E and 2214/04 Rev H received on 14/10/21;

Reason: To clarify which plans have been approved and to ensure the quality of the development.

- (3) No development above slab course level relating to the garage hereby permitted shall take place until written details and photographs of samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the garage building hereby permitted, including rainwater goods and details of the finish of the weatherboarding, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be completed using the approved materials with the approved finish and subsequently maintained;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance and that the historic significance of the listed building is maintained.

- (4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (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-H and Part 2 Class A to that Order shall be carried out without the permission of the local planning authority;

Reason: To safeguard the character, appearance and functioning of the surrounding area and the character, appearance and setting of the listed building

- (5) No external lighting shall be installed unless full details of any such lighting have first been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved details shall be in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations for Environmental Zone E1. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

Reason: In order to protect dark skies and prevent undue light pollution, in accordance with the maintenance of the character and quality of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and to protect the setting of the listed building.

- (6) The additional accommodation hereby permitted shall only be used as accommodation ancillary to the use of the dwelling known as Mill House, outlined in red on the site location plan and it shall not be used as a separate, independent unit;

Reason: In order to preserve the setting of the listed building and the scenic quality of the Kent Downs AONB, in the interests of sustainability, and in order to provide a satisfactory relationship with the main house.

- (7) The development hereby approved shall not commence above slab level until a landscape scheme designed in accordance with the principles of the Council's landscape character guidance has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall show all existing trees, hedges and blocks of landscaping on, and immediately adjacent to, the site and indicate whether they are to be retained or removed, provide details of on site replacement planting to mitigate any loss of amenity, and include a planting Spec, a programme of implementation and a 5 year management plan. The scheme shall also show details of all hard surfaced areas and hard surfacing materials. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details;

Reason: In the interests of landscape, visual impact and amenity of the area, in the interests of ecology and to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and setting to the listed building.

- (8) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the first use of the development hereby permitted or the completion of the development, whichever is sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of five 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, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory setting and external appearance to the development and to preserve the setting of the listed building and in the interests of ecology.

- (9) The development hereby approved shall not commence above slab level until details for a scheme for the enhancement of biodiversity on the site shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall consist of the enhancement of biodiversity through either integrated methods into the design and appearance of the extension by means such as swift bricks, bee bricks, bat tube or bricks, or through provision within the site curtilage such as bird boxes, bat boxes, bee hotels, bug hotels, log piles, hedgerow corridors and native planting. The development shall be implemented prior to occupation in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason: To protect and enhance the ecology and biodiversity on the site in the future.

- (10) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with all of the mitigation measures in section 11 of the preliminary ecological

appraisal by Native Ecology ref 0673_R01_REV A_PEA unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority;

Reason: To protect ecology and biodiversity on the site.

INFORMATIVES

The weatherboarding for the proposed garage should be finished in either black or dark brown stain. Rainwater goods should be cast metal.

Ecological enhancement measures should be in accordance with the suggestions in section 12 of the preliminary ecological appraisal.

Details pursuant to the biodiversity condition should show, on a scaled drawing, the positions of the proposed ecological enhancements including, where appropriate, the height above ground level to demonstrate that this would be appropriate for the species for which it is intended. Any bird boxes should face north and bat boxes should face south. Some helpful advice may be found at:

<https://www.rhs.org.uk/science/conservation-biodiversity/wildlife/plants-for-pollinators>

<https://www.rspb.org.uk/birds-and-wildlife/advice/how-you-can-help-birds/>

<https://www.bats.org.uk/our-work/buildings-planning-and-development/bat-boxes>

<https://www.wildlifetrusts.org/actions/how-build-hedgehog-home>

<https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/blog/2019/09/how-to-build-a-bug-hotel/>

Case Officer: Louise Welsford

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.