

DELEGATED REPORT

REFERENCE:	SE/14/03641/FUL	DATE:	30.1.15
SUBJECT:		NAME:	Jim Sperry
ADDRESS:	Boons Park, Toys Hill Road, Toys Hill, Edenbridge		

Description of site & location: The application site is located approximately 1.6km to the south of Toys Hill (junction with Puddledock Lane) and the same distance north of Four Elms, on the west side of the main road.

The site presently accommodates an extensive Victorian mansion house, originating from 1896, with extensive outbuilding to the north, arranged around a courtyard. The building has been vacant for several years and has become dilapidated. The main house is constructed in red brick and tile hanging under a tiled roof. Main access is to the south of the house, directly from Toys Hill Road. There are extensive grounds surrounding the house and extending considerably to the south.

The buildings were previously used as a drug rehabilitation centre (residential institution which comprises a Class C2 use).

Since submission of the application, the majority of the outbuildings have been seriously damaged, and in part totally destroyed, by fire.

Proposal:

The proposals seeks the demolition of the existing buildings and associated outbuildings and the erection of a large, single, Georgian style villa, with attached outbuildings with 2 symmetrical coach houses; that to the east consisting of a garage, poolhouse and spa, with small basement, and that to the west consisting of a staff flat and estate office/function room with basement kitchen and Colonnade walkways. It is to be used as a single house. The buildings would occupy a very similar siting to that existing, but would move the main house and eastern coach house slightly to the north of the existing building, though there would still be a significant overlap to the footprint of the main house.

The house itself would be 2 storey, but with accommodation within the roof. The outbuildings would be linked to the house by stone colonnades (open to the side) and would be single storey with some accommodation within the hipped roof. The main house would have a significant basement area with the coach houses also having small basements. Main materials for the house are described as Ashlar Stone Façade with lime render under a natural slate roof, with timber fenestration. The columns to the colonnades would be stone, with rolled lead roofs to the conservatories.

It is proposed to close the existing southern access into the site and re-open the access from Toys Hill Road to the north. This would run from east to west and then turn 90° south into the site. This would lead to a parking area flanked by the 2 coach houses with the entrance to the main house directly in front.



Planning History

SW5/64/450: Convert stables to dwelling. Refused
SW5/64/451: Erect bungalow. Refused
SW5/64/490: change of use of dwelling to nursing home. Approved
SW5/66/424: New Access. Approved
SW5/69/214: Erect dwelling for matron. Refused
SW5/70/92: Erect dwelling for Matron. Approved
SE/84/764: Erection of staff bungalow PCO
SE/85/1584: Convert bungalow to staff accommodation. Granted
SE/87/383: Extension. Granted
SE/87/1922/LDC: Swimming pool. Granted
SE/89/1065: Separate dwelling. Granted

13/00955/FUL: Proposed demolition of existing buildings (C2 use) and replacement buildings for nursing home (C2 use).

Refused on 30th October 2013 on the grounds, in summary, that the proposals would result in the loss of a non-designated heritage asset which contributes to the character of the area without a satisfactory replacement scheme.

Constraints:

- Green Belt, house & surrounding buildings within Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, garden outside AONB, bottom part of site designated Site of Nature Conservation Interest (approx. 180m south of house), Public Right of Way dissects end part of site (approx. 180m south of the house)

Policies

Core Strategy:

L01 Distribution of development
L08 The Countryside and the Rural Economy
SP1 Design of New Development and Conservation
SP2 Sustainable development and Low Carbon Energy Generation
SP11 Biodiversity

Allocations and Development Management Plan:

EN1 Design Principles
EN2 Amenity Protection
EN4 Heritage Assets
GB9 Replacement buildings in the Green Belt

Consultations

Brasted Parish Council:

Support:

BPC supports this application providing that the total floor area does not exceed 50% of the existing footprint and it used as a single dwelling with utilisation of the surrounding land.

Arboricultural Officer:

There is a tree survey with this application but it does not cover all mature trees on site. The proposed plans do show the important trees to be retained and included as part of the finished project. I offer no objection to this application based upon the aforementioned. Should consent be provided, I would like to see tree protection details, details of new planting as well as details of frontage boundary treatment, which can be conditioned.

Highway Authority:

Thank you for consulting with us. We have no objection to the proposals, however we would recommend the following conditions for reasons of highway safety:

1. Provision of a 2.4m x 55m visibility splay to the south at the exit of the driveway onto Toys Hill Road, to be maintained with no obstruction higher than 0.9m above the height of the road;
2. Standard condition that any gate across the driveway should be at least 5.5 metres from the carriageway of Toys Hill Road;
3. Standard condition that the driveway should be formed of a bound material within 5.5 metres of the carriageway of Toys Hill Road.

The first condition stems from the intensification of use of the proposed access, and the limited visibility to the south which is restricted by vegetation growing on the verge or overhanging from the application site, in particular a tree which has grown so close to the road that it appears to have been damaged by passing vehicles.

Natural England:

Natural England's comments in relation to this application are provided in the following sections. Statutory nature conservation sites - no objection.

Based upon the information provided, Natural England advises the Council that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites.

Protected landscapes

Having reviewed the application Natural England does not wish to comment on this development proposal.

The development however, relates to the Kent Downs AONB. We therefore advise you to seek the advice of the AONB Unit Their knowledge of the location and wider landscape setting of the development should help to confirm whether or not it would impact significantly on the purposes of the designation. They will also be able to advise whether the development accords with the aims and policies set out in the AONB management plan.

Protected species

We have not assessed this application and associated documents for impacts on protected species.

Natural England has published Standing Advice on protected species. The Standing Advice includes a habitat decision tree which provides advice to planners on deciding if there is a 'reasonable likelihood' of protected species being present. It also provides detailed advice on the protected species most often affected by development, including flow charts for individual species to enable an assessment to be made of a protected species survey and mitigation strategy.

You should apply our Standing Advice to this application as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications in the same way as any individual response received from Natural England following consultation.

Local sites

If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local site, e.g. Local Wildlife Site, Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Site (RIGS) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local site before it determines the application.

Biodiversity enhancements

This application may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes. The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant, if it is minded to grant permission for this application. This is in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Additionally, we would draw your attention to Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which states that 'Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity'. Section 40(3) of the same Act also states that 'conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat'.

Landscape enhancements

This application may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider new development and ensure that it makes a positive contribution in terms of design, form and location, to the character and functions of the landscape and avoids any unacceptable impacts.

Impact Risk Zones for Sites of Special Scientific Interest.

Natural England has recently published a set of mapped Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) for Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). This helpful GIS tool can be used by LPAs and developers to consider whether a proposed development is likely to affect a SSSI and determine whether they will need to consult Natural England to seek advice on the nature of any potential SSSI impacts and how they might be avoided or mitigated. Further information and guidance on how to access and use the IRZs is available on the Natural England website.

K.C.C. Ecology:

We have reviewed the ecological information which has been submitted with the planning application and we are satisfied with the results of the ecological surveys. We advise that we require no additional information to be submitted prior to determination of the planning application.

Bats

Bat emergence surveys were carried out for planning application: SE/13/00955/FUL which identified that Serotine, Brown Long Eared and Common and soprano pipistrelle bats were roosting within the building.

Updated emergence surveys were carried out for this planning application and confirmed that Brown long eared and common pipistrelle bats are present and highlighted that it is possible that

soprano pipistrelle and serotine bats are present.

The results of the 2012 and 2014 emergence surveys have informed the mitigation strategy which has detailed that 3 bat lofts, at least 10 lifted tiles installed on various aspects, and at least 20 bat bricks will be incorporated in to the proposed development if planning permission is granted.

When we commented on the 5th January we had some concerns that two separate mitigation strategies were submitted with the planning application. However the applicant has submitted updated information confirming that the mitigation detailed within the Ecological Assessment Report (Ash Partnership) is correct and will be implemented if planning permission is granted. As such we are satisfied with the proposed mitigation and advise that if planning permission is granted a detailed mitigation strategy is submitted as a condition of planning permission, if granted.

Reptiles

A reptile survey has been carried out and no reptiles were recorded during the survey – we are satisfied that it is unlikely that reptiles are present within the site and we require no additional information to be submitted for comment.

Great Crested Newts

The survey has recommended that there is a need for a Great Crested Newt (GCN) Survey to be carried out to establish if there is potential for GCN to be injured or killed as a result of the works. Unfortunately access to survey the pond has been denied – however the report has detailed that as the pond is known to have goldfish and waterfowl it does reduce the potential for GCN to be present.

As such we are satisfied with the proposal to use a precautionary approach to clear the area of grassland within the proposed development site.

Breeding Birds

There are buildings and vegetation present for breeding birds within the site. All breeding birds and their young are legally protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). We recommend that the buildings and vegetation are removed outside of the breeding bird season (March – August) and if that is not possible the site must be examined by an ecologist prior to the works being carried out.

If any breeding birds are recorded all works must cease in that area until all the young have fledged.

Enhancements

One of the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework is that *“opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged”*.

The ecology report has recommended a number of ecological enhancements which can be incorporated in to the site. We recommend that if planning permission is granted these enhancements are incorporated in to the landscape plan.

Representations: Have been received from 3 neighbouring residents raising the following points:

- Loss of existing building of immense character and charm.
- Proposed replacement poor design and out of character.
- Boundaries are incorrectly shown and the proposed entrance driveway is owned by the neighbouring property.

One letter raises no objection to the erection of a private house and long as it remains a dwelling (no commercial use).

APPRAISAL

Principle issues

Green Belt Implications:

Current Government advice, in the form of the **National Planning Policy Framework**, supports the protection of the Green Belts and seeks to restrict development.

Paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that “The fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.”

The advice states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Such development should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.

Paragraph 89 states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. There are exceptions to this, including the replacement of a dwelling. However, whilst Boons Park may have originally been built as a single dwelling, I do not consider the last use of the buildings to fall within this use. Therefore I do not consider the proposals to represent the replacement of an existing dwelling.

For this reason, I do not consider policy GB9 of the emerging Allocations and Development Management Plan to be relevant to the present proposals as whilst it allows for the replacement of existing non-residential buildings, it requires the replacement building to be within the same use as the building to be demolished. This is clearly not the case here.

However, there is a further exception set out in the NPPF which I consider highly relevant to the present proposals. This allows for the “limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use, which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.” Such development may be considered appropriate.

In my view, this is the key test against which to judge the proposals.

According to the agents submission, the floorspace of the main house and existing outbuildings totals 1,981m². The proposals would reduce the total floor space by 50m² (total proposed = 1,931m²). In terms of volume, the reduction has been calculated as -331m³.

Whilst I would accept the figures above, I would add that from my own calculation of the drawings, which appear to scale accurately, there would actually be a greater reduction in total floorspace (my calculations include all basement areas, area under balcony and covered colonnades).

Turning to the individual elements, the proposed outbuildings would represent a significant reduction in total floor area compared to existing (if the colonnade links to the main house were omitted from the calculation, the reduction of the footprint of the proposed outbuildings themselves is greater still, at almost half that existing) with a considerable reduction at first floor level. The reduction in the height and scale of the proposed outbuildings compared to existing is therefore fairly considerable, in my view, and this is self-evident from the drawings.

In terms of the house itself, that proposed would have a very considerably smaller footprint than that existing (393m² compared to 522m² existing), a slightly greater 1st floor area and a clear reduction in floorspace provided within the roof. Where the proposed house increases floor space considerably is within the extensive basement. However, the basement is designed in such a way as to have no external light-wells, entrances/exits etc. and it would not artificially raise the height of the building (rather the outbuildings and north elevation of the house are indicated as set at a slightly reduced ground level compared to existing) and therefore this floor area has no implications for the scale, bulk or appearance of the house. Furthermore, the height of the house has been kept the same as the existing building. In summary, the proposals would result in a reduced footprint and reduced total floorspace overall, with the height of the house matching existing and that of the outbuilding representing a reduction in height and scale.

In view of the above, it is my view in Green Belt terms that the proposals would replace a rather sprawling main house and outbuildings and represent a far more compact form of development overall in terms of footprint, floorspace and overall scale, bulk and massing on the site. It is my conclusion, therefore, that the proposals actually represent an enhancement in terms of the impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

In the circumstances, in terms of the NPPF policy test, I consider the proposals would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Bearing in mind the original property was clearly built for residential purposes and the site has maintained a form of residential use, I am satisfied that the reinstatement of a single dwelling would not represent encroachment into the Green Belt contrary to the purposes of the Green Belt.

I therefore consider that the proposals represent appropriate development within the Green Belt.

Impact on Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty:

The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 states that the Local Planning Authority should conserve and enhance Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Designating an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty protects its distinctive character and natural beauty and can include human settlement and development.

Section 85 of that Act requires decision-makers in public bodies, in performing any function affecting land in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of that area.

Core strategy **L08** refers to the extent of the Green Belt will be maintained. The countryside will be conserved and the distinctive features that contribute to the special character of its landscape and its biodiversity will be protected and enhanced where possible. The distinctive character of the Kent Downs and High Weald Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be conserved and enhanced

The site lies within the Kent Downs AONB and sits at the top of a gently sloping parkland site and the buildings are surrounded by landscaping, including numerous mature trees. This considerably softens the appearance of the site. As the siting of the proposed buildings closely follows that of the existing buildings and thus does not necessitate the removal of any significant planting, the landscaped setting of the site will be preserved.

Though there would be views from the public highway directly to the east of the house, the impact could be considerably softened by modest planting along this boundary. There would also be public views directly from the south, but these are at a distance, are outside the AONB boundary and would again be screened and softened by tree planting.

Whilst the proposed house takes a different design approach to that existing, it would represent an overall reduction in built form on the site. It is a fact that the existing significantly sized buildings have remained in situ for a very considerable time, indeed well before designation of the AONB, and they form part of the landscape in this location. In the circumstances, subject to retention of existing trees and a landscape scheme to help enhance the setting of the site and soften the impact of the new buildings, I do not consider the proposals would erode or significantly harm the otherwise open and rural character of the landscape.

Size and design of proposals and implications for existing buildings:

During the consideration of the previous application, it was considered that the building, due to its history, architecture and landmark status, was considered to be a locally important building and therefore a non-designated heritage asset.

Paragraph 135 of the **NPPF** states that “the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”

Section 7 of the **NPPF** addresses the issue of good design and it is implicit that high quality and inclusive design should be sought.

Policy **EN1** of the **ADMP** seeks high quality design and lists a number of criteria with which development must comply. Of particular relevance is that proposed development should respond to the scale, height, materials and site coverage of the area and the layout should respect the topography and character of the site and incorporate features such as trees, hedges and ponds within the site and should not result in loss of buildings, open spaces or green infrastructure that would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area.

Policy **SP1** of the Core Strategy states that all new development should be designed to a high quality and should respond to the distinctive local character of the area in which it is situated.

A Heritage Appraisal has been submitted in support of the application. This concludes that Boons Park is an example of an altered loose courtyard farmstead that has evolved in a piecemeal fashion if the 19th century. The house is not considered to be of particular merit and are not considered historically important. The stables and coach house is described as an “unremarkable Victorian outbuilding”.

As the site is relatively isolated and is not readily seen in the context of neighbouring buildings, I consider it reasonable to compare the impact of the proposed buildings to those presently existing on site. In this regard, in terms of footprint, scale, height, bulk and massing, as discussed in more detail in the section above, I am satisfied that the proposed buildings would not be larger than the existing buildings on site. Indeed, I consider the proposals would result in a slightly more compact form of development.

The Councils Conservation and Design Officer has examined the proposals, which have been submitted following pre-application discussions, and provides the following comments:

“The existing building sits harmoniously in the surrounding landscape and reflects the style of Victorian vernacular surrounding development of the area. However, in itself it is a pedestrian

example of Victorian architecture and is not of sufficient quality to be retained if there is a proposal for a high quality replacement.

I accept the thorough assessment of the quality of the architectural as submitted in the Heritage Statement and I agree that this is not a good quality example of the type or a locally distinctive style. Any replacement must therefore make a positive contribution to the surrounding landscape but the NPPF clearly states that the LPA can not dictate the architectural style (para 60) but to seek high quality design (para 17). During the Pre-Application process the applicant was required to demonstrate that they were capable of achieving a high quality Georgian style by paying detailed attention to the rules of the Georgian style. The architects were keen to demonstrate this and have assured Officers that the quality of materials and detailing will be carried through to the details applications. The application should be conditioned accordingly.”

In conclusion, whilst I would note that the NPPF requires that the significance of non-designated heritage assets to be considered as part of an overall balancing judgement, there is no requirement to retain such buildings. In judging the impact of the proposals, the quality of the replacement buildings must also be taken into consideration. In this instance, the proposed building has been subject to negotiation to ensure that the submitted design is of a high enough quality to justify the loss of the existing buildings. In my view this has now been achieved and I consider the demolition of the existing buildings to be justified. Together with the reduction in the apparent scale of built form on site, I consider the proposals to represent an acceptable form of development .

Highway implications:

The proposed use of the site as a single dwelling, even a large one with ancillary staff accommodation, would be likely to be significantly less intensive than the previous use as a care home. In light of the above, I consider the impact on the local highway network would be no greater than the authorised use of the site.

There would be plenty of parking on site to accommodate the proposals.

Impact on residential amenity:

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF identifies a set of core land use planning principles that should underpin decision making. One of these principles is that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The closest neighbour to the site is Boonswood, the dwelling to the north of the site. This property is located away from the siting of the main house, beyond the spread of the outbuildings and beyond the proposed access road into the site. Furthermore, there is dense tree planting along the southern edge of the intervening access with a dense hedge along the northern boundary. This provides a fairly comprehensive screen to the site. There is no intention to remove this planting and in the event that permission were to be recommended a condition could be attached to ensure its retention or replacement as necessary. Furthermore, use of the site in connection with a single dwelling would be likely to have far less of an impact than the former use of the site as a care home. In the circumstances, I do not consider either the buildings as proposed, or the use of the site for residential purposes, would have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

Impact on ecology:

Under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006), *“Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those*

functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity". In order to comply with this 'Biodiversity Duty', planning decisions must ensure that they adequately consider the potential ecological impacts of a proposed development.

The National Planning Policy Framework states that *"the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by...minimising impacts on biodiversity and delivering net gains in biodiversity where possible."*

Paragraph 99 of Government Circular (ODPM 06/2005) Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations & Their Impact Within the Planning System states that *'It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision.'*

Core strategy policy **SP11** seeks to ensure that the bio diversity of the district will be conserved and opportunities sought for enhancement.

The submitted Ecological Assessment Report identifies that there are bats roosting in the buildings. However, there are not considered to be implications for reptiles or Great Crested Newts.

In light of the above, KCC Ecology have recommended that in the event that permission were to be granted, a detailed mitigation strategy would be required explaining how the bats on site are to be dealt with. This would presumably be based upon the mitigation described in the letter from The Ash Partnership (dated 21st January 2015). In summary this includes bat boxes to be erected on trees around the site, bats voids within the building, "lifted" roof tiles to provide access and at least 20 bat bricks.

KCC suggest that the above mitigation could be incorporated into a landscaping plan (the elements relating to the bat boxes) and I consider the other elements be undertaken in accordance with the details submitted.

Affordable Housing:

Policy SP3 of the Core Strategy, relates to the provision of affordable housing. In residential developments of less than 5 units that involve a net gain in the number of units a financial contribution equivalent of 10% affordable housing will be required towards improving affordable housing provision off site.

However, on 28 November 2014 the Government amended the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) to restrict the circumstances where contributions for affordable housing should be sought. Under the new guidance, contributions should not be sought from developments of 10 units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm

Thus, the erection of a single dwelling would not normally attract an affordable housing contribution. However, where proposals for a new dwelling would result in a net increase in floorspace over 1000m², it will potentially become liable for a contribution towards the off-site provision of affordable housing. The proposed dwelling would have a total floor area well in excess of 1000m². In the circumstances, as a single new dwelling, policy SP3 would require a contribution equivalent to 10% affordable housing. The proposed market value for the house is accepted and this would result in a contribution of some £245, 410.00.

However, in schemes where vacant buildings are redeveloped or brought back into use a vacant building credit can be applied. The National Planning Policy Framework states that:

“Where a vacant building is brought back into any lawful use, or is demolished to be replaced by a new building, the developer should be offered a financial credit equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of relevant vacant buildings...”

In this instance, whilst some of the outbuildings have been destroyed by fire, the main building remains in situ. In this instance the existing buildings, including outbuildings still standing, have a total floor area of 1,313.44m². The proposed dwelling would have a total floor area of 1,683m². This equates to a net increase in floor area of 369.52m². This in turn, has been calculated as requiring a financial contribution of £53,892.04.

A signed Unilateral Undertaking confirming this amount has been received.

Community Infrastructure Levy:

As the application would comprise a new dwelling, it would be CIL liable. No exemption has been sought.

Other issues:

Whilst I note that the proposals include the provision of a “staff flat” within the western coach house, this appears to be an integral part of the building as a whole, in that the ground floor below the bedroom and “living quarters” is to be used in conjunction with the main house, as is the kitchen within the basement. Bearing in mind the scale of the site and the layout of the accommodation, I am satisfied that this accommodation would be ancillary to the main use of the site. In any event, it is my conclusion that the proposals are acceptable in terms of size and impact in Green Belt and AONB and even if used independently from the main house, this accommodation would be highly unlikely, in my view to intensify the use of the site in such a manner to adversely affect the character of the site, the impact on neighbouring occupiers or highway conditions.

Conclusion

In light of the above, I consider the scale, height and bulk of the proposed buildings to be acceptable. In view of this and the high quality design proposed I consider the proposals outweigh any harm from the loss of the existing buildings of historic interest. I do not consider the proposed buildings would have a materially greater impact on the openness of the Green belt and therefore consider they represent appropriate development within the Green Belt. The proposed buildings would site comfortably within an extensive plot and as they would retain the sylvan setting and character of the site, I consider the impact on the street scene in general and the open and rural character of this part of the AONB would be preserved. The Unilateral Undertaking would ensure the necessary affordable housing contribution.

The impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and highway conditions is considered acceptable. Subject to conditions regarding ecology, landscaping details and submission of materials and details, I consider the proposals to be acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant

Case Officer: Jim Sperryn
Date: 31.3.15

Manager / Principal: Alan Dyer
Date: 31.03.15

