

REPORT SUMMARY

REFERENCE NO: - 22/502738/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL: Erection of a two storey side and rear extension with detached garage (Resubmission-21/504328/FULL).		
ADDRESS: Upper Little Boy Court Boy Court Lane Headcorn Ashford Kent TN27 9LA		
RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the planning conditions set out in Section 8.0 of the report		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons set out below it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable and would not cause significant visual harm or harm to neighbouring amenity, nor be unacceptable in terms of any other material planning considerations such that the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with current Development Plan Policy and planning guidance.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE: The application has been called in by Ulcombe Parish Council by reason of the recommendation being contrary to their comments (see report below for reasons).		
WARD: Headcorn	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL: Ulcombe	APPLICANT: Ms Felicity Nichols AGENT: Kent Design Studio Ltd
CASE OFFICER: Angela Welsford	VALIDATION DATE: 09/06/22	DECISION DUE DATE: 23/12/22
ADVERTISED AS A DEPARTURE: NO		

Relevant Planning History

21/500772/FULL

Erection of a detached garage with holiday let accommodation above.
Withdrawn 27.04.2021

21/500773/FULL

Erection of a replacement five bedroom detached dwelling.
Withdrawn 05.05.2021

21/504328/FULL

Erection of a two-storey side and rear extension and a new double garage with garden equipment area.
Withdrawn 24.09.2021

MAIN REPORT

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 The application site is located in the open countryside, designated as part of The Low Weald Landscape of Local Value. Public footpath KH328 runs through fields to the north/north-east of the property and KH333 opposite the site.
- 1.02 Upper Little Boy Court is an unlisted, vernacular, two-storey dwelling with elevations of brick on the ground floor and white weatherboard to the first, beneath a fully-hipped, slate roof. To the rear is a brick, single-storey element which, in

planning terms, forms part of the "original" building. This was once two-storey also, but as the upper floor has been completely removed prior to submission of this application, that can no longer be taken into account as part of the original building.

- 1.03 The plot is large with a number of trees along the south-western boundary and a natural pond in the southern corner, close to Boy Court Lane. Residential premises adjoin the south-west and north-east boundaries and there is open countryside to the rear (north-west).

2. PROPOSAL

- 2.01 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension to the dwelling and erection of a detached garage.
- 2.02 The extension would have an L-shaped footprint, wrapping around the north-east side and the rear elevations of the two-storey host dwelling, but would be stepped back approximately 1m from the ends of each of those elevations. It would protrude approximately 3.4m from the existing side wall and 4.9m from the existing two-storey rear wall. The existing single-storey element at the rear of the house (which protrudes further - approximately 6.4m from the two-storey rear wall) would be demolished to make way for the extension.
- 2.03 The extension would be constructed from matching materials – brick to the ground floor, white weatherboarding to the first floor, a slate roof and timber joinery. Its roof would be formed of three fully-hipped sections with valleys between, each with a ridge height of approximately 6.2m, which is approximately 0.8m lower than the ridge height of the host dwelling.
- 2.04 The garage would provide two open-fronted parking bays and a log store beneath the cat-slide on the north-east side. It would be positioned in the northern corner of the site and would have oak boarded elevations beneath a fully-hipped, slate roof. The eaves height would be approximately 2.3m and the ridge height 4.2m.
- 2.05 The scheme has been amended since the original submission to reduce the mass/bulk of the proposed extensions and the garage.

3. POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Maidstone Borough Local Plan (2011-2031): Policies SP17, DM1, DM3, DM23, DM30, DM32

Emerging Policies: Maidstone Borough Council – Local Plan Review Regulation 22 Submission. The Regulation 22 Submission comprises the draft plan for submission (Regulation 19) dated October 2021, the representations and the proposed main modifications. It is a material consideration and some weight must be attached to the document because of the stage it has reached. This weight is limited, as it has yet to be the subject of an examination in public.

Relevant Policies:

Policy LPRSP9 – Development in the countryside

Policy LPRSP15 – Principles of Good Design

Policy LPRQ&D4 – Design principle in the countryside

LPRHou11 – Rebuilding, Extending and Subdivision of Dwellings in the countryside

Policy LPRTRA4 - Parking Matters

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Supplementary Planning Documents: Residential Extensions SPD (adopted May 2009)

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

Local Residents: 13 representations received in total across the various consultations/re-consultations, these are from 4 properties of local residents. 11 are objections to the application and 2 are in support of it. The following (summarised) issues are raised:

Objections

- Excessive scale/not subservient;
- Loss of privacy;
- Overbearing impact;
- Overshadowing;
- Out of character;
- Flooding from water run-off;
- Impact on ecology/wildlife;
- Trees have been felled (prior to the application).

Support

- Visual improvement;
- In keeping;
- Lane has not flooded since the site was tidied.

5. 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)

Ulcombe Parish Council

5.01 *Response to original proposal:*

Recommends refusal and wishes application to be referred to Planning Committee if approval is recommended. Objects on the following (summarised) grounds:

- Fundamental issues are the mass of both the house extension and the garage, their scale and the loss of amenity and privacy for the immediate neighbours and for the rural countryside, in a Landscape of Local Value;
- Conflict with Local Plan Policies DM1 (scale and mass, amenity of neighbours, topography), DM30 (character of the landscape), DM32 (visually unacceptable in the countryside, garage not subservient and of a scale capable of being a separate dwelling) and SP17 (Landscape of Local Value should be protected);
- Garage conflicts with advice in the SPD that it should not need to be more than single-storey;
- Most of the significant mature trees on site have already been felled.

5.02 *Response to amendment to garage design/scale:*

Recommends refusal and wishes application to be referred to Planning Committee if approval is recommended. Objects on the following (summarised) grounds:

- Objections to house extension (as above) still stand;
- In addition, overlooking/loss of privacy to Upper Boy Court Oast, contrary to DM30 and DM32.

5.03 *Response to amendment to house extension design/scale:*

The Parish Council objects to the amended application and requests referral to Planning Committee if approval is recommended. Objects on the following (summarised) grounds:

- Main issues are still loss of amenity/privacy and impact on the countryside/lack of respect for the LLV topography (as above);
- Do not appear to be any significant design changes apart from the roof line on the N.E. elevation, and the position of the garage which seems to have moved closer to the boundary with Upper Boy Court Oast;
- Parish Council supports objections of neighbours.

6. APPRAISAL

The key issues are:

- Visual impact to the host building and the countryside;
- Impact on residential amenities of neighbours;
- Impact on ecology/protected species.

Policy Context/Principle of Development

- 6.01 Policy DM1 (Principles of good design) outlines the importance of high-quality design for any proposal. Amongst other things, well-designed proposals respond positively to their context in visual terms by respecting landscape character and the character and form of the host building, as well as preserving the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
- 6.02 The countryside is a valuable and finite resource which should be protected for its own sake and for the benefit of future generations. Consequently, development there should be limited and Local Plan Policy SP17 requires that *"Development proposals in the countryside will not be permitted unless they accord with other policies in this plan and they will not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area."*
- 6.03 Extensions to existing rural dwellings are one of the exception types of development which, in principle, are permissible in the countryside. Consequently, Policy DM30 requires, *inter-alia*, that such extensions are of a scale which relates sympathetically to the existing building and the rural area and that they have no significant adverse impact upon the form, appearance or setting of the host building, whilst Policy DM32 echoes similar sentiments, requiring that extensions to rural dwellings are well-designed and sympathetically related to the existing dwelling without overwhelming or destroying the original form of the dwelling; and that householder development is individually and cumulatively visually acceptable in the countryside.
- 6.04 Further design guidance is provided in the Council's adopted Residential Extensions SPD. This states on page 47 that *"an extension should be modest in size,*

subservient to the original dwelling and should not overwhelm or destroy its original form” and that “an extension should cause no adverse impact on the character or openness of the countryside”. Since the term “modest” is open to interpretation, the SPD explains that judgement in that respect will be made on the basis of the impact of the extension on the character of the countryside, its impact on the form and appearance of the original building, and the scale of the extension. In relation to scale, paragraph 5.18 states, “in considering an extension to a residential dwelling in the countryside, the Local Planning Authority would normally judge an application as modest or limited in size if, in itself and cumulatively with previous extensions, it would result in an increase of no more than 50% in the volume of the dwelling”. Examples of well-designed extensions to rural dwellings given in the SPD show them to be subservient to the host property in terms of scale and positioning, stepped back from its building lines, and including design elements from the original building.

- 6.05 In relation to garages and outbuilding at rural properties, Policy DM30 states that any new buildings should, where practicable, be located adjacent to existing buildings or be unobtrusively sited, whilst DM32 requires new outbuildings to be subservient in scale, location and design to the host dwelling and cumulatively with the existing dwelling to remain visually acceptable in the countryside. Relevant design guidance in the adopted SPD includes:

Garages and other outbuildings should not impact detrimentally on the space surrounding buildings. They must be smaller in scale and clearly ancillary to the property. (Paragraph 5.28)

Their scale should not exceed what might reasonably be expected for the function of the building. Garages and outbuildings for domestic purposes do not normally need to exceed a single storey in height or have excessive volume. (Paragraph 5.29)

There should be no adverse impact on the character or openness of the countryside. (Paragraph 5.30)

The impact of a garage or other outbuilding would be greater if located in a prominent location where it would be highly visible (Paragraph 5.30)

Garages and outbuildings should not compete with the main house and consequently should be sympathetically positioned away from the front of the house and should be simpler buildings. (Paragraph 5.32)

- 6.06 Turning to residential amenity, criterion iv of Local Plan Policy DM1 requires new development to respect the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties and states that it should not result in, *inter alia*, unacceptable overlooking or visual intrusion, or an unacceptable loss of privacy or light for the occupiers of nearby properties. The adopted SPD describes a method for carrying out a loss of light test and offers the following relevant design guidance in relation to privacy:

In order to safeguard the privacy of neighbours, the introduction of windows in extensions which would overlook windows of habitable rooms in any adjoining property at a close distance and would result in an unreasonable loss of privacy will not be permitted. For similar reasons, a window overlooking the private area immediately adjacent to the rear of an adjoining dwelling may also be inappropriate. If a window which overlooks a habitable room or amenity space is included, it should protect against overlooking and maintain privacy by, for example, containing obscure glazing or being non-opening. The Borough Council will normally calculate the private amenity area as a depth of 5 metres from the back of the property which, if it has been extended, will be measured from the back edge of the extension. (Paragraph 5.52)

- 6.07 Consequently, there is general Development Plan policy support for extensions to existing rural dwellings and the construction of outbuildings within their curtilages, subject to proposals being of appropriate scale and design and having an acceptable impact on the surroundings and neighbours etc. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development is acceptable in principle. The finer detail of the proposals will now be considered.

Visual Impact

Extension

- 6.08 The existing house is a modest, vernacular building of attractive period character, typical of its time. A traditional way of extending dwellings of this period was to create a "double-pile" house – to essentially replicate the original building behind, but including a separate roof – and, in line with pre-application advice, that technique has been employed in the design of the rear part of the proposed extension, in conjunction with design guidance in the Council's adopted Residential Extensions SPD. Consequently, the south-west side wall of the extension would be stepped in from the side building line of the host dwelling by 1m. This would subordinate the extension in views from the south, creating a visual break between it and the older part of the house. The depth of the extension has been reduced to just over half the depth of the host building, to ensure that its proportions are visually modest. This would also result in a significantly lower roof ridge height than the host building, increasing its subservience. The "double-pile" design ethos would also result in the minimum increase in bulk at roof level whilst still allowing provision of a sympathetic pitched roof of matching materials, since the overall roof would be formed of two separate pitched sections with a central valley.
- 6.09 The side element of the proposed extension has also been designed in accordance with the guidance in the adopted SPD. Its width (3.4m) would be significantly less than half the width of the 8.5m wide host building, resulting in a visually modest addition of appropriate proportions. The 1m set-back from the front building line of the host dwelling and the significantly lowered ridge line would again create a visual break and ensure that the extension would appear clearly subordinate, respecting and preserving the attractive form and character of the original building.
- 6.10 Concern has been raised regarding the scale and mass of the extension. However, for the reasons explained in paragraphs 6.08 and 6.09, it is considered that the extension would appear visually modest in relation to the host building such that it would not overwhelm or destroy the original form of the house and would respect its character and proportions. In terms of additional volume created, after making allowance for the single-storey element to be removed (which constitutes part of the original building, in line with the definition given in paragraph 5.8 of the Residential Extensions SPD), the extension would result in an increase of approximately 65%. This does exceed the 50% guideline referred to in the SPD, but that same document makes it clear that judgement as to the acceptability of a rural extension will be made on the basis of the impact of the extension on the form and appearance of the original building and its impact on the character of the countryside, as well as its scale purely in terms of volume/dimensions.
- 6.11 Turning, therefore, to the impact on the countryside, as explained in paragraphs 6.08 and 6.09, when seen in public views from Boy Court Lane and the footpath opposite, the extension would appear as a modestly proportioned, subservient addition constructed from sympathetic matching materials, which would respect and preserve the character and form of the host building. It would not project excessively from either the existing side or rear building lines, so would not have any significantly detrimental impact on the openness of the rural surroundings. It would be visible in medium-long range views from the public footpath to the

north/north-east, but again, due to its design and materials, would not appear over-scaled, obtrusive or visually harmful.

- 6.12 Overall it is considered that this would be a well-designed and visually modestly proportioned, subservient addition that would respect and preserve the character and form of the host building and would not result in any harm to the character, appearance or openness of the countryside in the Low Weald Landscape of Local Value.

Garage

- 6.13 The scale and design of the proposed garage have been amended from the original submission to be more modestly-scaled and rural in character. The open-fronted design, fully-hipped roof with a cat-slide at one end, and the proposed materials would all be in keeping with the rural surroundings. Moreover, its significantly set-back position (approximately 46m from Boy Court Lane) in the rear north corner of the site would minimise its visual impact and accentuate its subordination to the dwelling. In public views from the footpaths, it would likewise appear as a subservient ancillary outbuilding of appropriate rural character.
- 6.14 It is considered that the proposed garage accords with the design guidance set out in the adopted SPD and that it would not cause harm to the character, appearance or openness of the countryside in the Low Weald Landscape of Local Value.

Residential Amenity

- 6.15 Concern has been raised in representations and by the Parish Council regarding overlooking of / loss of privacy to Upper Boy Court Oast from the proposed windows in the first floor side elevation facing that property. It is acknowledged that those windows would face onto and overlook land forming part of the large plot of the Upper Boy Court Oast property, however, it is not considered that the impact would be so significantly detrimental as to justify a refusal of planning permission that could be sustained at appeal. Material considerations in reaching that conclusion are:
- There would be no direct inter-looking, window to window – the flank windows at Upper Boy Court Oast face at an angle of almost 90° to the direction the proposed windows would face.
 - The angled distance between the proposed window closest to Upper Boy Court Oast and the nearest corner of that building itself (not its windows) would be approximately 24m, which exceeds the 21m separation distance normally applied in a planning assessment of impact on privacy. (The distance from the other proposed windows would be greater; more than 30m from the rearmost.)
 - Although Upper Boy Court Oast stands on a large plot and reference is made to overlooking of a designated seating area, the guidance on assessment of impact on privacy set out in the adopted Residential Extensions SPD clearly states that “*The Borough Council will normally calculate the private amenity area as a depth of 5 metres from the back of the property*” (paragraph 5.52) and that area, as indicated on the latest revision of the proposed block plan, lies more than 21m from the proposed windows. Furthermore, notwithstanding the degree of separation, the angle of view from the windows would be oblique and much of that protected area would consequently be shielded by its own dwelling in relation to them.
 - An objector has stated that the considerations set out in the preceding bullet point are more applicable to assessment of privacy impacts in urban locations, however Development Plan policy makes no distinction in terms

of how the impact should be assessed and the guidance quoted above is taken from Chapter 5 of the adopted SPD, which is titled "Extensions within the Countryside". It is therefore considered to be equally relevant.

- 6.16 In view of the degree of separation from neighbouring dwellings of both the proposed extension and the proposed garage, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a significantly detrimental impact on the levels of daylight and sunlight enjoyed by neighbours, nor would it be significantly overbearing in terms of outlook.

Impact on Ecology/Protected Species

- 6.17 Policy DM1 of the Local Plan sets out, at point viii, that proposals should '*protect and enhance any on-site biodiversity and geodiversity features where appropriate, or provide mitigation.*'
- 6.18 The application is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA). This states that no bats nor signs of bats were found during the internal inspection of the house and that the building is judged as offering low suitability for roosting bats. The single-storey rear element "*offered negligible suitability for roosting bats*" and "*None of the trees present on site offered suitability for roosting bats*", although it was noted that "*the surrounding area is likely to be used by foraging and commuting bats*". In the recommendations section of the report, however, it is then stated that should bats be roosting on the site, animals could be injured and habitat lost during development, so a night time bat survey is recommended. Clearly it would be unacceptable for these protected species to be injured or their habitat lost. However, in this particular instance, given the findings in the same report that the building and its site offer little to no suitability for roosting bats, together with the facts that (i) the building is already in residential use as a family dwelling, (ii) renovation works not requiring planning permission were underway at the time of the survey and have since been completed, including installation of vaulted ceilings leaving, as acknowledged in the survey, very shallow roof spaces, and (iii) there would only be a small degree of interconnection between the extension roof and the existing roof because of its design, it is considered that it would be unduly onerous to require a further bat survey, and that the matter can be adequately dealt with by way of a condition requiring all work to cease and ecological advice to be sought in the unlikely event that any bats or evidence of bats are discovered during the development. This is considered to be a proportionate response given the nature and scale of the development, the scope of the works and the findings of the PEA.
- 6.19 No other protected species are likely to be adversely impacted. The amount of new-build footprint is below the recommended threshold for potential impact on great crested newts, and the recommended mitigation measures to be implemented during the development phase can be secured by condition.
- 6.20 The report also recommends inclusion of some biodiversity enhancement measures, which is in line with Policy DM1 and advice in both The NPPF and the adopted Residential Extensions SPD. It is understood that some of the measures indicated on the submitted proposed block plan have already been implemented (the wildflower and other planting and the froglio). Additional enhancements now proposed are 5 timber bat boxes on the extended dwelling, 1 bat box, 2 bird boxes and 1 owl box on trees, and a log pile behind the proposed garage. These measures are to be welcomed and can be secured by planning condition.

Other Matters

- 6.21 Parking/Highway Safety: The development would not significantly impact parking provision or highway safety. Although additional bedrooms would be created, there is ample space for the parking of vehicles within the site. The proposed garage

would provide an appropriate degree of covered parking. Access to the property would remain unchanged.

- 6.22 Renewables: The NPPF, Local Plan and Residential Extensions SPD all seek to promote the use of renewables and energy efficient buildings. The proposal includes installation of an air source heat pump, which would be discretely sited beside the proposed extension, as well as a number of water butts for rainwater harvesting from the roofs of both the garage and the extended dwelling. These measures are welcomed and considered to be proportionate to the scale of the development. They can be secured by condition.
- 6.23 Flooding/Water Run-off: The site does not lie within an identified flood risk area. Concern has been raised regarding increased run-off from the development roofs and hard-standing, however, water butts are to be provided to harvest rainwater from the building roofs and the driveway (which already exists) has a permeable surface. Provision of the water butts can be secured by condition.
- 6.24 Removal of Trees: This is stated to have occurred before submission of the application and, whilst regrettable, is not a material consideration that can be taken into account in its determination.

PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITY DUTY

- 6.25 Due regard has been had to the Public Sector Equality Duty, as set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. It is considered that the application proposals would not undermine objectives of the Duty.

7. CONCLUSION

- 7.01 For the reasons set out above it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable and would not cause significant visual harm or harm to neighbouring amenity, nor be unacceptable in terms of any other material planning considerations such that the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with current Development Plan Policy and planning guidance. Subject to appropriate conditions, therefore, approval is recommended.

8. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT planning permission subject to the following conditions

with delegated powers to the Head of Planning and Development to be able to settle or amend any necessary planning conditions in line with the matters set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

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 and documents:

The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated 03/05/2022, referenced 2022/01/22 and received on 09/06/2022, drawing numbers 3906 01 Rev C, 3906 10 Rev D,

3906 11 Rev F, 3906 12 Rev I and 3906 13 Rev C and the email from Jack Coleman of Kent Design Studio timed at 13:54 on 14/09/2022, all received on 14/09/2022;

Reason: To clarify which plans and documents have been approved

- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as described on the application form;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

- 4) Should any bats or evidence of bats be discovered during development, all work must cease with immediate effect until a suitably qualified ecologist has attended the site and been consulted, and all of their resultant recommendations have been carried out;

Reason: To prevent harm or injury to bats, which are a European Protected Species.

- 5) The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the great crested newt mitigation during development measures set out on pages 20-21 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated 03/05/2022 and referenced 2022/01/22;

Reason: To prevent harm or injury to great crested newts, which are a European Protected Species.

- 6) The proposed ecological enhancements detailed on drawing number 3906 12 Rev I received on 14/09/2022, namely 5 timber bat boxes on the extended dwelling and 1 bat box, 2 bird boxes and 1 owl box on trees, shall be provided in accordance with the details on that drawing before the extension hereby permitted is first occupied. The proposed log pile behind the garage hereby permitted shall be provided before the first use of that garage. All ecological enhancements shall be maintained thereafter in perpetuity;

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

- 7) The proposed air source heat pump and one water butt attached to the dwelling shall be provided in accordance with the details on drawing number 3906 12 Rev I received on 14/09/2022 before the extension hereby permitted is first occupied, and the two water butts attached to the garage hereby permitted shall be provided before the first use of that garage. These measures shall be maintained thereafter in perpetuity;

Reason: To ensure an energy efficient form of development and minimise surface water run-off.

INFORMATIVES

- 1) All bat species and their roosts are legally protected. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that appropriate precautions are taken to ensure that an offence is not committed. Further advice can be sought from Natural England.
- 2) It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure, before the development hereby approved is commenced, that approval under the Building Regulations (where required) and any other necessary approvals have been obtained, and that the details shown on the plans hereby approved agree in every aspect with those approved under such legislation.
- 3) Your attention is drawn to the following working practices which should be met in carrying out the development:

- Your attention is drawn to Sections 60 & 61 of the COPA 1974 and to the Associated British Standard COP BS 5228: 2009 for noise control on construction sites. Statutory requirements are laid down for control of noise during works of construction and demolition: if necessary you should contact the Council's environmental health department regarding noise control requirements.
- Clearance and burning of existing woodland or rubbish must be carried without nuisance from smoke etc. to nearby residential properties. Advice on minimising any potential nuisance is available from the Council's environmental health department.
- Plant and machinery used for demolition and construction should only be operated within the application site between 0800 hours and 1900 hours on Mondays to Fridays and between 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sunday and Bank Holidays.
- Vehicles in connection with the construction of the development should only arrive, depart, be loaded or unloaded within the general site between the hours of 0800 hours and 1900 Mondays to Fridays and 0800 to 1300 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
- The importance of notifying local residents in advance of any unavoidably noisy operations, particularly when these are to take place outside the normal working hours is advisable. Where possible, the developer shall provide residents with a name of a person and maintain dedicated telephone number to deal with any noise complaints or queries about the work.
- Adequate and suitable provision in the form of water sprays should be used to reduce dust from the site.
- It is recommended that the developer produces a Site Waste Management Plan in order to reduce the volumes of waste produced, increase recycling potential and divert materials from landfill. This best practice has been demonstrated to both increase the sustainability of a project and maximise profits by reducing the cost of waste disposal.
- Adequate and suitable measures should be carried out for the minimisation of asbestos fibres during demolition, so as to prevent airborne fibres from affecting workers carrying out the work, and nearby properties. Only contractors licensed by the Health and Safety Executive should be employed.
- If relevant, the applicant must consult the Environmental Health Manager regarding an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Protection Act 1990

Case Officer: Angela 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.