

Wateringbury **569573 153437** **9 December 2008** **TM/08/03668/FL**
Wateringbury

Proposal: Removal of two garages. New extensions and alterations to existing residential care home
Location: 16 The Orpines Wateringbury Maidstone Kent ME18 5BP
Applicant: Abbeyfield Kent Society

1. Description:

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for extensions to Abbeyfield Care Home at 16 The Orpines, Wateringbury. The proposal involves removal of 2 existing garages and a mix of first floor, two storey and single storey extensions. The overall internal floor space of the building would increase from 1356sqm to 2709sqm, an increase of 1353sqm which equates to a 100% increase.
- 1.2 The existing building was originally constructed to serve 45 residents and additional live in staff. This included accommodating residents in double rooms in some cases.
- 1.3 The CSCI (Commission for Social Care Inspection) standards has increased minimum standards and the existing care home no longer conforms to these standards. In addition, double rooms have been phased out through changes in legislation.
- 1.4 The proposal would provide 51 single occupancy bedrooms which fully comply with CSCI standards and no live-in staff are proposed. The standard of accommodation to be provided would meet the Council's "enhanced care" provision.
- 1.5 The proposed extensions would be phased in their construction to ensure that the existing residents would not have to be re-located during the works.
- 1.6 The scheme has been amended to relocate some of the bulk and mass from the north-east and north-west wings to the south east corner of the site, above the main dining area. Additional car parking spaces have also been provided to serve over-flow parking on site as necessary, taking the number of spaces from 18 to 24.
- 1.7 In addition to the above amendments, the applicant has stated that the existing training centre within the building (which is an ancillary use to the main care home use), would cease operation upon commencement of the proposed extension. The applicant is also happy to accept a planning condition to restrict such a use being created on an ancillary basis again in the future. This aspect of the proposal is aimed at addressing the parking problems this site contributes to locally when the training centre is in use.

1.8 The home at Watringbury is also one of the country's few specialist homes for the care of people with Parkinson's disease. The applicant, Abbeyfield Kent Society, is a "not-for-profit" organisation.

2. Reason for reporting to Committee:

2.1 The application is a departure from the development plan in that it is a significant extension to a care home in the Metropolitan Green Belt.

3. The Site:

3.1 The site lies on the north of the A26 Tonbridge Road and to the north-east of Watringbury Village. The Orpines roadway runs along the west and north of the site, along with a cluster of residential dwellings and associated gardens. There is a drop in land level across the site from north to south.

3.2 To the east of the site and on the south side of the A26 lies agricultural farming land.

3.3 The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Borough boundary lies further to the east.

4. Planning History:

TM/45/10018/OLD Grant with conditions 5 December 1945

Conversion into flats.

TM/64/10964/OLD Grant with conditions 27 May 1964

Outline application for the demolition of existing house and cottage and the erection of 10 terraced houses, 4 detached houses and a three storey block of six flats and maisonettes on land outlined on the revised plan accompanying the letter

TM/65/10801/OLD Grant with conditions 21 May 1965

12 single storey, 3 two storey dwellings, and conversion of house into 5 units, as amended by plans and layout enclosed with letters dated 2nd and 5th April, 1965, for Messrs. Orpines (Teston) Ltd.

TM/66/10665/OLD Refuse 29 April 1966

Demolition of residence and erection of three storey dwellings with garages, for Messrs, Orpines (Teston) Ltd.

TM/84/10890/FUL Grant with conditions 2 March 1984

Erection of an extension to existing toilets.

TM/86/11261/OLD Application Withdrawn 26 June 1986

Application under Regulation 4 for the provision of a glazed conservatory.

TM/88/10384/OUT Refuse 29 June 1988

Outline application for 30 bed total care Nursing Centre, 12 close coupled bungalows, 27 retirement homes, access road and all associated hard and soft landscaping.

TM/91/10159/OLD No Objection 8 May 1991

Detailed submission under Reg. 4: additional staff and visitors parking.

5. Consultees:

- 5.1 PC: No objection to amended plans and additional information. (The PC originally raised objection on parking and highway grounds.)
- 5.2 KCC Highways: The proposals result in the care home having a total number of bedrooms of 51 an increase of 13. Staffing levels will be a total of 42, an increase of 3 with the maximum on site at any one time rising from 12 to 14. It is unclear how many staff are residential. KVPS (2006) would look for maximum off street parking of 1 car per 6 bedrooms plus 1 space per resident staff plus 1 per 2 other staff. The bedrooms would therefore attract 8 spaces and the staff 7 spaces i.e. a total of 15. The applicant is providing a total of 18 spaces which would provide some allowance for residential staff.

Further comments: The applicant has increased the number of off street parking spaces from 18 to 24 and this is beneficial. Previous comments and conditions apply.

- 5.3 DHH: Pollution: Suggested condition relating to noise levels. Housing: The applicant references "local need" in paragraph 3.2 of their Planning Statement when discussing "very special circumstances for development". The need for extra care units is evidenced in the Council's (draft) Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). This is described in paragraph 1.11 where the SHMA discusses future demographic changes within West Kent, and more thoroughly in paragraphs 10.9 onwards. Consequently DHH is happy that local need does indeed exist for this type of provision.

5.3.1 The applicant compares their “enhanced provision” to the definition of “extra care” contained within the adopted Affordable Housing SPD, paragraph 3.5.2, and concludes that they are identical. DHH would concur with this.

5.3.2 The applicant has argued that the existing units are too small and below modern standards, and thus the desperate need for the revisions to the existing buildings to make each room bigger. DHH would welcome the improved quality of life for the residents brought about by enlarging the rooms and modernising the facilities.

5.4 Private Reps: 24/1S/8X/6R + 28 signatory petition in support. The Council originally received objection letters from 15 neighbouring properties. Following the amended plans 9 people have withdrawn their original objections (8 now raise no objection and 1 now supports the application). 6 neighbours remain concerned, on the following grounds:

- North East Wing – additional bulk and footprint breaks existing building line, loss of privacy, over-shadowing and outlook to neighbours.
- Boundary Treatments – the new close boarded fencing causes a loss of sight lines to vehicle users.
- The application represents urban sprawl in terms of Green Belt policy, harm to infrastructure for residents of The Orpines (parking and vehicle movements).
- The size and appearance of the building is not compatible with its neighbours and the character of the surrounding area. Increase in overall size is excessive.
- Construction vehicles would cause disturbance, noise and hazards.
- Over intensification of the site.
- Training facility causes poor parking conditions.
- Parking- inadequate off-street parking resulting additional parking on the highway and potential hazards, increase in the number of rooms available but a decrease in the amount of on-site parking.
- Effect of shared sewer facilities.
- Phased project would cause long term disruption to both care home residents and neighbours.

5.5 Maidstone Borough Council: No objection.

5.6 Article 8 Site Notice: No response.

5.7 Press Notice: No response.

6. Determining Issues:

- 6.1 The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt where development must be assessed against PPG2, policy SS2 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006 and policy CP3 of the Tonbridge and Malling Core Strategy 2007. In addition to the Green Belt policies, development in the countryside must be assessed against policy CP14 of the Tonbridge and Malling Core Strategy 2007.
- 6.2 Care homes are not listed as one of the acceptable development types within paragraph 3.4 of PPG2 and extensions to such facilities are not specifically mentioned. Accordingly, I have researched recent appeal cases for similar types of developments within the green belt and the following conclusions have been made by Inspectors:
- Minor or small scale extensions to care homes within the green belt can be considered appropriate development provided they are modest.
 - New care homes or large extensions are considered to be inappropriate development in the green belt.
 - Where a proposed care home or extension to a care home is considered inappropriate development, a sufficient case of “very special circumstances” can override the policy objections to the development.
- 6.3 As the proposed extension represents a 100% increase in internal floor area and the increase in volume is in excess of 100%, the application is in my opinion a significant extension and cannot be considered modest. The proposal is therefore inappropriate development and contrary to the policies set out above.
- 6.4 The applicant is fully aware of the policies and restrictions on development affecting the site and has put forward supporting documents and statements which aim to present a case of “very special circumstances” (VSC). I shall set out each of the main areas of justification below:

Improvements in Care:

- 6.5 The proposal aims to bring the number of bedrooms up to 51 to serve 51 residents. The original home was designed for 45 residents in much smaller and in some cases double rooms. The proposed 51 bedrooms meet the minimum standards of room sizes and each provides en-suite facilities suitable for wheelchair access. Accordingly, although the maximum occupancy of the proposal will only increase from 45 residents (original not existing) to 51, the floor area is proposed to increase by 100%.

- 6.6 The increase in floor space is not just to provide additional and larger rooms. The proposals provide additional circulation space, living and dining areas and associated corridors, lifts, staff, store and treatment rooms. All of the additional facilities contribute to the CSCI standards which are the current best practice standards for new or refurbished care homes.
- 6.7 The improvements in care which would be provided by meeting the CSCI standards are, in my opinion, a material consideration. The existing rooms are substandard in their size and lack en-suite facilities. It is my view that the increase in room sizes and the provision of wheelchair accessible en-suites are essential to the improvement of quality of life and care at Abbeyfield Wateringbury. The Director of Health and Housing supports the application on this basis and I therefore consider that the need to improve care at Abbeyfield to meet current CSCI Standards, is a determining factor which should be awarded weight.

Local Need:

- 6.8 The applicant states that nationally and within the County there are two trends in the purchasing of care for the elderly: (a) a decrease in the purchasing of traditional care placements for the elderly, and (b) an increase in the purchasing of specialist care provision for Dementia Care (EMI), Palliative Care, Intermediate Care and High Dependency.
- 6.9 The applicant indicates that there is a need for “enhanced care” within the Borough as set out in the Tonbridge and Malling Affordable Housing SPD, and considers that it meets the criteria set out within paragraph 3.5 of the SPD.
- 6.10 The Director of Health and Housing agrees that there is a local need identified within the draft SHMA and supports the application on this basis. Local need is, in my opinion a material consideration in this application and I consider weight should be allocated to this VSC.

Alternative Sites/Options:

- 6.11 The applicant has carried out an alternative land availability assessment, which concludes that there are no sites of a suitable size in the Wateringbury area allocated within the Tonbridge and Malling Land Allocations DPD 2008. They have carried out a desk top study of other potential sites in the area on a variety of websites, none of which showed up any sites of suitable size.
- 6.12 The applicants point out that over three quarters of the Borough is within green belt which further restricts the likelihood of available sites. The applicant considers that even if an alternative scheme were found, the likelihood is that a suitable use for the existing facility (16 The Orpines) would not fit in with the Core Policies of the Local Development Framework. This would limit the ability of Abbeyfield to sell the existing site, which would be necessary to provide funds for development of an alternative site.

- 6.13 It is my opinion that the applicant has sufficiently investigated land and sites for sale in the area and a site of a suitable size cannot be found regardless of the land use designations. Moreover, it is unlikely that a site of the size required could be found within a defined urban or rural settlement.
- 6.14 The existing site has a substantial building already and large grounds and the use on this site is well established. Accordingly, I do not consider that Abbeyfield has an option other than to extend here on site or close the premises and try to find a purchaser. It is also worth noting that an alternative site exercise is usually a requirement for a new use being proposed in the countryside or green belt; such an investigation is not normally a requirement when there is an existing use and building. However, I do consider that the lack of available sites should be allotted weight in the determination of this application.

Feasibility/Phased Development/Disruption to Residents:

- 6.15 The applicant originally submitted a phasing plan showing the construction of the proposal taking 5 phases. This has been amended to three phases following the amendments to the layout of the extensions. The changes in phasing have been proposed to reduce the construction time and overall cost, though there would be funding implications for the project, in that larger amounts of funding would need to be sourced prior to each phase. The reduction in the number of phases is aimed at reducing disruption to residents of the private properties within The Orpines.
- 6.16 The ability to ensure that no existing residents have to be relocated at any time has not been affected by reducing construction to three phases. Although further works are proposed above the kitchen area, which will result in significant disruption to catering services, the kitchens would have been refurbished in any event as part of the original proposal and therefore no additional disruption would occur.
- 6.17 The ability to phase the construction works and keep the care home in operation will also ensure that the existing staff base will be kept in employment in the Wateringbury home.
- 6.18 The applicant has, in my view, sufficiently demonstrated that the existing building is capable of the proposed extensions within their Feasibility Statement. In addition, the phasing of the development has been planned to ensure that the existing residents will be able to remain on site at all times which, in my opinion is a benefit. The recent reduction in the number of phases from 5 to 3 will also reduce the build time on site and as a result reduce the impact on neighbours caused by general construction disturbance. The reduction in phasing will, in my opinion, reduce the disruption to the neighbouring occupants.

6.19 In light of the above, I do consider that the ability of the existing building to be adapted, the phasing of the build and the benefit to neighbours by reducing the number of phases, should be allocated weight in this application, although the ability to phase the development is not in my view a VSC in its own right.

Planning and Design:

6.20 The applicant accepts that the scheme is not a type of development specifically set out as “appropriate” in PPG2, and considers that the proposal should be assessed against the objectives of Green Belt policy.

6.21 The applicant accepts that the extensions to the building will add to the building’s visual bulk within the green belt, however, they consider that the design of the extensions has used the existing site contours to minimise the impact of the additional bulk. In addition, the site is well screened by existing landscaping to assist in screening the proposal, and its effectiveness is increased by the existing bunding to the site.

6.22 The planning merits of the scheme, irrespective of green belt policy, are apparent in my view, in that the extensions have been designed to sit above or close to the original built form and the land levels in the site have been taken advantage of to limit the impact of the additional bulk within the wider landscape. The alterations to the building include a re-design of the external appearance to update the aesthetic of the structure; this has been achieved through the window design and external cladding in place of the existing dark brown hanging tiles.

6.23 The recent amendments to the scheme have relocated some of the bulk originally proposed for the northern wings of the building, to the south east corner of the site, over an existing single storey area of the building. In my opinion, this amendment to the scheme reduces the impact of the proposals on the privacy of the neighbouring dwellings in The Orpines and reduces the bulk and mass from the neighbours’ perspective.

6.24 I have taken a detailed look at the distance between the proposal and the neighbouring dwellings at both ground and first floor levels and taken account of the relationship with each dwelling (i.e. which is the most affected elevation, front rear or side). The distances and affected elevations are set out below:

House number and affected elevation	Ground floor distance (metres)	First floor distances
4 (back, oblique)	30m	31m
5 (flank)	24m	31m
8 (back)	22m	29m
14 (flank)	27m (nw wing) & 19m (ne wing)	36m and 19m
15 (front, oblique)	25m	25m
15a (front, oblique)	24m	24m

6.25 The ground floor and first floor distances are quite appropriate and represent a building which is designed to respect the privacy of the neighbouring properties. Where some of the ground floor figures are lower, this does not, in my opinion, result in harm through over looking due to the existing close-boarded fencing and high hedging surrounding the adjacent properties, and the existing tree cover. Where first floor distances are low, these affect flank or oblique front elevations and whilst the proposal will increase over looking in areas of the site, it would not be to an undue level in my opinion due to the particular elevations being affected and the distances involved. I do not therefore consider that an undue level of overlooking or loss of privacy would occur.

6.26 In light of the above considerations, I am satisfied that the proposal, due to its form, bulk, mass and appearance, would not have an undue impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring property or the visual amenities of the locality. I therefore consider that the proposal would accord with policies CP1 and CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Core Strategy 2007, and policy QL1 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006.

6.27 The parking proposed for the site was originally 18 spaces. This has recently been amended to 24 to add a further 6 spaces in an informal over flow manner. These spaces will be treated in a grasscrete or gravel surface to show that they are for over-flow parking and to avoid increasing the hardstanding on site. KCC Highways raised no objection to the original 18 spaces which meet the KCC Vehicle Parking

Standards which are adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG4) of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006.

- 6.28 Although KCC has raised no objection, the local residents have raised objections to the scheme on the grounds of parking, both on site and on an ad-hoc basis along The Orpines. While KCC has no objection to the number of spaces provided on site, and therefore this aspect of the proposal is acceptable, I would like to address the other parking concerns of the residents.
- 6.29 The use of The Orpines public highway for parking by staff or visitors is said to cause access problems for the private residents and the ability for emergency vehicles to gain access. I note that this issue is heightened by the use of the training school within the care home. As Members will be aware, the planning system directly control parking problems on a public road. To limit such ad-hoc parking would require traffic restrictions and these are the responsibility of KCC Highways.
- 6.30 However, the additional spaces being provided in the revised scheme, along with the cessation of the training centre and restriction on the creation of a similar ancillary use in the future would, in my opinion, help to alleviate the existing parking problems within The Orpines.
- 6.31 Further objections were received regarding the use of The Orpines roadway by construction traffic and potential damage to the road surface and sewers beneath. The Planning Acts can, in appropriate circumstances, be used to limit the hours that construction traffic travels to and from a site, however, this type of restriction is usually only applied to developments close to schools or play areas or where other, very specific problems are likely to arise. I do not consider there is any reasonable or enforceable condition which could be applied to this proposal in respect of construction vehicles. Moreover, if damage did occur to the road or sewers it would be a matter for the road owner to take up with the contractors as a civil matter. In addition, the hours of construction work on site cannot be controlled through the planning system as separate environmental protection legislation exists.
- 6.32 The applicant has submitted a tree survey and proposed planting schedule which has been met with approval by the Council's Landscape Officer. Their proposals would result in the loss of a category B Oak which is a good specimen but is not particularly old. There are other trees in this area of the site and accordingly, the loss of this Oak is not considered to cause undue harm to amenity. The amount, height and location of trees within the site would continue to provide a good level of screening especially along the south and east of the site, which provide the major public views along the A26.
- 6.33 The proposed additional planting has been shown but full details of new species, number of shrubs etc and heights of new tree planting would be required by condition to ensure a suitable scheme is achieved. Proposed boundary treatments

would also be required by condition to ensure issues such as visibility and openness are controlled by the Council at a later date.

6.34 In addition to other sustainable build claims, the applicant states within the Design and Access Statement that building materials would be sourced locally and timber would be from sustainable woodlands. Also various water efficiency and drainage improvements are proposed which reduce water use and conserve water on site.

Conclusions:

6.35 It is established that the proposal is inappropriate development in the green belt for which a compelling case of “very special circumstances” is required to override the harm to the green belt (by definition – by virtue of it being “inappropriate”) and the actual harm by virtue of the bulk and mass of the proposed extensions, which result in the proposals being contrary to local, strategic and national policy.

6.36 The various grounds set out by the applicant within their supporting documents have been thoroughly examined above. It is my opinion that the ability of the existing building to be extended and the phased system to reduce build time and keep the care home residents in situ are material considerations which weigh in favour of the application. The improvements in care and quality of life to meet CSCI standards, the local need for additional care facilities, the lack of alternative site options, and the planning and design benefits to the scheme (improvements in aesthetic, relocation of bulk to the south of the site, use of the existing land levels); cumulatively, and when added to other material considerations, provide a sufficient case of very special circumstances to override the objections to an extension of this size in the Metropolitan Green Belt and the caused harm to the openness of the Green Belt by virtue of the increased bulk and mass.

6.37 Whilst many original objectors have withdrawn their concerns, I note the objections to the proposal raised by the remaining 6 neighbours. However, I am satisfied that the proposal would not give rise to undue harm to residential amenity, visual amenity or highway safety.

6.38 In light of the above considerations, I recommend the application be approved, subject to conditions, and subject to the application being notified to the Secretary of State as a Departure from the Development Plan.

7. Recommendation:

7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Letter dated 09.12.2008, Other FINANCIAL INFORMATION dated 09.12.2008, Planning Statement dated 09.12.2008, Design and Access Statement dated 09.12.2008, Arboricultural Assessment dated 09.12.2008, Plan TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN dated 09.12.2008, Plan PROPOSED PLANTING PLAN dated 09.12.2008, Plan ABORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT dated 09.12.2008, Site Plan 19592 E10 dated 09.12.2008, Location Plan 19592 E9

dated 09.12.2008, Existing Plans 19592/E/11 dated 09.12.2008, Existing Plans 19592/E/12 dated 09.12.2008, Elevations 19592/E/13 dated 09.12.2008, Section 19592/E/14 dated 09.12.2008, Section 19592/P/13 dated 09.12.2008, Site Survey BHP/LS/786 dated 09.12.2008, Letter dated 03.02.2009, Proposed Plans 19592 P10 A dated 03.02.2009, Proposed Plans 19592 P11 A dated 03.02.2009, Proposed Plans 19592 P12 A dated 03.02.2009, subject to:

- Reference of the application to the Secretary of State as a Departure from the Development Plan

- The following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. (Z013)

Reason: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. No development shall take place until details and samples of all materials to be used externally have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (D001)

Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or the visual amenity of the locality.

3. No development shall be commenced until full details of a scheme of acoustic protection of habitable rooms having windows that will be exposed to a level of road traffic noise in Noise Exposure Category B or C as set out in Policy P3/17 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme of acoustic protection shall be sufficient to secure internal noise levels no greater than 30 LAeq dB in bedrooms and 40 LAeq dB in living rooms with windows closed. Additionally, where the internal noise level will exceed 40 LAeq dB in bedrooms or 48 LAeq dB in living rooms with windows open the scheme for acoustic protection should incorporate appropriate acoustically screened mechanical ventilation. Mechanical ventilation should also be provided to bedrooms having openings onto facades that will be exposed to a level of road traffic noise in excess of 78 L_{Amax} (slow) time weighting.

The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the room to which it relates.

Reason: To safeguard the aural amenity of the occupiers of the development hereby approved.

4. Prior to the commencement of development, details of a scheme to demonstrate that the development hereby approved will incorporate appropriate measures to contribute to a sustainable environment shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The scheme shall include measures to minimise waste

generation, and to minimise water and energy consumption, having regard to the need for 10% of energy consumption requirements to be generated on-site from alternative energy sources (where possible) and the potential for recycling water. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of any of the units hereby approved.

Reason: In accordance with Core Strategy policy CP1 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council Local Development Framework.

5. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping and boundary treatment. All planting, seeding and turfing comprised in the approved scheme of landscaping shall be implemented during the first planting season following occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the earlier. Any trees or shrubs removed, dying, being seriously damaged or diseased within 10 years of planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees or shrubs of similar size and species, unless the Authority gives written consent to any variation. Any boundary fences or walls or similar structures as may be approved shall be erected before first occupation of the building to which they relate. (L003)

Reason: Pursuant to Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality.

6. The existing Training Centre ancillary use within the building shall cease on site upon commencement of this permission and no such training facility or similar ancillary use shall thereafter be provided on site unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of preserving the level of care accommodation on the site and in the interests of highway safety.

7. The use shall not be commenced, nor the premises occupied, until the area shown on the submitted layout as vehicle parking space has been provided, surfaced and drained. Thereafter it shall be kept available for such use and no permanent development, whether or not permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order) shall be carried out on the land so shown or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to this reserved parking space. (P004)

Reason: Development without provision of adequate accommodation for the parking or garaging of vehicles is likely to lead to hazardous on-street parking.

8. No building shall be occupied until the area shown on the submitted plan as a turning area has been provided, surfaced and drained. Thereafter it shall be kept available for such use and no permanent development, whether or not permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995

(or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order), shall be carried out on the land so shown or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to this reserved turning area.

Reason: Development without provision of adequate turning facilities is likely to give rise to hazardous conditions in the public highway.

9. Prior to commencement of works, details of slab, finished floor and ridge levels shall be submitted for approval to the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be carried out in strict accordance with those details.

Reason: In the interests of limiting the visual impact of the proposal on the locality.

Informatives

- 1 The applicant is advised that details of hard surfacing for the main car parking areas and the over flow parking should be submitted alongside details pursuant to condition 5 for landscaping and boundary treatment.

Contact: Lucy Stainton