

LOCATION: CHOBHAM CLUB, 50 WINDSOR ROAD, CHOBHAM, WOKING, GU24 8LD

PROPOSAL: Erection of a part single storey, part two storey building to form social club on ground floor and 1 x 1 bed and 1 x 2 bed units above, with associated parking and landscaping, following partial demolition of existing club premises and flat. (Additional information recv'd 28/7/17) (Additional plan recv'd 1/8/17) (Amended plan recv'd 2/8/17).

TYPE: Full Planning Application

APPLICANT: The President
Chobham Club Ltd

OFFICER: Emma Pearman

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however it has been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Tedder.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This application is for the demolition and redevelopment of part of the site occupied by Chobham Club. The applicant states that the membership numbers of the club have fallen considerably over the last few years (from 1200 to 350 approx) and that the existing building is no longer fit for purpose. The proposal is to replace the existing club (and flat above) with a smaller, more energy efficient building on part of the site, with two flats above. The existing building does not contribute positively to the street scene, and it is considered that the new building will be an improvement in character terms, with the existing attractive hedge retained. The building is also likely to be an improvement in amenity terms for local residents, with better sound proofing within the fabric of the building and a sound proof barrier installed around the perimeter, inside the hedge.
- 1.2 The club currently has a private car park and concern has been raised about the loss of parking, from around 50 spaces to 16. This part of the road can be very busy with the close proximity of Chobham Rugby Club and the scouts, and although parking is unrestricted the carriageway is narrow. However, the applicant is prepared to accept a condition restricting outside hire of the club, which at present seems to be the times when the car park is busiest, and has provided information which indicates that only a small proportion of current members drive to the club. The County Highway Authority has specifically been asked to consider parking provision and has not objected on highway safety grounds. It is not considered therefore that the future use of the Club is likely to cause any significant parking problems in the road.

- 1.3 Further comments are awaited from the Environmental Health Officer, and the SAMM payment is also awaited but it is anticipated that these will be received prior to Committee and updates can be provided at the meeting. Concern has also been raised about the fact that this application deals with only part of the site, however the Council has to determine the application before us and it would be unreasonable to delay determination on this basis. While two applications were originally submitted together, the other application, for housing on the remainder of the site, remains invalid and as such there is no other application for the remainder of the site currently under consideration.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is the southern part of the site currently occupied by Chobham Club and its adjacent car park. The site is located in the settlement area of Chobham, on the eastern side of Windsor Road, and is opposite the entrance to Chobham Rugby Club. This part of the site is around 750m² in size and includes the car park to the south and part of the end of the club building. The club itself is a predominantly single-storey pre-fabricated concrete panelled building, with a brown pebble-dash exterior, which was built in the 1960s and subsequently extended to include a flat and office at first floor level. The site has a high hedge along the western boundary, around the southern end and part of the eastern boundary. It is surrounded by dwellings on both sides of Windsor Road, which are generally detached dwellings of varying architecture, with two Grade II listed dwellings, and some semi-detached houses.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 The site has been used as a clubhouse since the 1920s. The existing clubhouse was granted permission in 1963 (reference BR 4418) and then there have been various permissions for extensions throughout the 1960s and one in 1986 (reference SU86/1270).

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The proposal is for the erection of a part single-storey, part two-storey building to form a social club on the ground floor and 1 x 1-bed and 1 x 2-bed units above, with associated parking and landscaping, following partial demolition of the existing club and flat. The ground floor would comprise a club room, function room, office, kitchen, bar and WCs with the main entrance on the northern side. The two flats would be accessed via a door on the eastern side of the club, and would comprise a living/kitchen area, bathroom and one or two bedrooms.
- The new building would be built on an area currently used for parking towards the southern end of the site, with a maximum depth of 17.7m and maximum width of 16.2m

- The maximum height of the building is 6.4m and would have a hipped roof
- The single storey element would have a maximum height of 3.8m and a mono-pitched roof.

4.2 A total of 16 car parking spaces would be provided, mostly on the northern side of the site with two to the rear. There would be a small garden seating area behind the building to the south with a sound proof barrier of 2m in height installed behind the existing hedge, which would remain along the boundary. The building is to be a 'Modula' building constructed off-site and is to include sound proofing, and be more energy efficient. It will be finished with brick and render, aluminium windows and doors and natural slate roofing. The levels of the site are to be slightly lowered by 400mm approx.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|---|
| 5.1 | Surrey County Highway Authority | No objection, subject to conditions. |
| 5.2 | Head of Environmental Services | No objection, but awaiting comments on sound proof barrier. |
| 5.3 | Council's Heritage Officer | No objection to the impact of the proposal on the setting of the nearby listed building (Fowlers Wells Farm House). |
| 5.4 | Chobham Parish Council | Objection – overdevelopment of the site, redevelopment of Chobham Club should be considered in full and not two parts, site has high community activity and the loss of parking spaces will result in highway safety issues, land to the east will become more 'closed in', no footway on either side of Windsor Road and would be out of keeping with existing semi-open appearance and hazardous on the narrow lane |

[Officer comment: the Council has to consider the application in front of them and that is for this club building only on part of the site, and not for the redevelopment of the whole site. Other issues raised are addressed in the relevant sections of the report.]

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 The applicant held a public meeting for local residents in October 2016, prior to the application being submitted. At the time of preparation of this report one letter of representation has been received which raises the following issues:

- Concern at loss of parking – membership numbers remain the same despite smaller building and there are also two flats proposed, plus parking for staff etc [*see section 7.6*]
- Concern that this application is only for part of the site so we cannot assess impact of redevelopment overall [*Officer comment: Officers cannot insist on the whole application coming forward at one time and we can only consider the application in front of us.*]
- Proposed loss of green hedging around the northern end of the site [*Officer comment: the hedge referred to along the northern boundary is not part of this application and will be considered when an application comes forward for the remainder of the site. No loss of hedging on this application site, around the southern end, is currently proposed.*].

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

7.1 The application proposed is considered against the policies within the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012, and in this case the relevant policies are CP1, CP2, CP6, CP11, CP12, CP14B, DM2, DM7, DM9, DM11 and DM14. It will also be considered against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

7.2 The main issues to be considered are:

- Principle of the development
- Impact on character;
- Residential amenity;
- Highways, parking and access;
- Impact on infrastructure;
- Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA; and
- Other matters – housing mix.

7.3 Principle of the development

7.3.1 Policy CP1 states that new development will largely come forward in the western part of the Borough, but does direct development towards previously developed land. It states that Chobham has limited capacity to accommodate any new development.

7.3.2 Policy DM2 states that development within the settlement of Chobham will be limited to appropriate uses, including extensions, alterations and adaptations of community uses. New opportunities for community uses are also appropriate, giving priority to re-use of existing non-residential buildings, but where re-use is not

feasible, the replacement of such buildings when replacement would improve and enhance environmental performance. Policy DM14 states that the Borough Council will seek opportunities to enhance and improve community facilities, and the loss of existing facilities will be resisted unless there is no demand for such facilities.

- 7.3.3 This application proposes the demolition of the existing Chobham Club (in part) and replacement with a much smaller club building with two residential flats above. As such, there is no loss of the club facility, however the applicant states that the membership of the club has reduced to 350 from over 1200 at one time and as such, the size of the building is not necessary to accommodate the current membership.
- 7.3.4 The applicant also stresses that the existing building is very energy inefficient, and the new building will be considerably more energy efficient and have better sound proofing than the existing building. The provision of two flats in this location on a previously developed site and within Chobham settlement area is not considered to be inappropriate, given also that the use of the existing flat above the club would be lost due to demolition (or part demolition) of the building and would provide housing which is in need in the Borough.
- 7.3.5 It is therefore considered that in principle, the replacement of the club building with a smaller, more energy efficient building, and provision of two flats in this location, is in line with the above policies and no objection is raised to the principle of the development.

7.4 Impact on character

- 7.4.1 Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Paragraph 58 goes on to say that planning decisions should aim to ensure that developments respond to local character and history, reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture.
- 7.4.2 Policy DM9 states that development should respect and enhance the local, natural and historic character of the environment, paying particular regard to scale, materials, massing, bulk and density, and that high quality hard and soft landscaping should be provided. Policy CP2 requires development to respect and enhance the character and quality of the area. Policies CP2 and DM7 encourage energy efficient buildings.
- 7.4.3 The existing pre-fabricated concrete building is fairly well hidden behind the existing hedge from the main part of Windsor Road, however is very visible from the inlet part of the road, and does not contribute positively to the street scene. It is a sprawling, unattractive building taking up much of the space on the site, with the remainder of the site being laid to hardstanding for car parking. The design of the proposed building appears more modern and attractive than the existing building, and it is noted that the architecture in the vicinity of the club is very varied, but dwellings are generally two-storey, as is proposed (with part single-storey). The existing building is 5.5m in height, and the proposed building would be 6.4m, with the ground levels slightly lowered also, so would not represent a large height increase from existing and would be mostly hidden behind the existing hedge along the southern part of the site on the eastern and western sides. It would be a

minimum of 2.5m approx. from the eastern boundary of the site, and further from other boundaries, and as such it is not considered to be overdevelopment of this part of the site in character terms (although concerns about car parking are considered later in the report).

- 7.4.4 The retention of the existing hedge, which contributes positively to the street scene, is welcomed and can be conditioned, and there would be an acoustic fence of 2m in height installed on the inside of the hedge. The hedge would be trimmed to around 2.7m in height so would mostly obscure the fence from view. There is a Grade II listed building, Fowlers Wells Farm House, opposite the site however the Council's Heritage Officer has said there would be a neutral impact on the setting of the listed building resulting from the proposal. However, given the aforementioned comments on the proposed building being an improvement to the existing, in the officer's opinion, there is unlikely to be any harm to this heritage asset.
- 7.4.5 It is therefore considered that the proposed development would respect and enhance the character of the area and is in line with Policies CP2, DM9 and the NPPF.

7.5 Residential amenity

- 7.5.1 Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Policy DM9 states that development will be acceptable where it respects the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and uses. It is necessary to take into account matters such as overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light and an overbearing or unneighbourly built form.
- 7.5.2 The proposed building would be at least 18m from the front elevations of the nearest dwellings at 48 and 46 Windsor Road, with the first floor element of the building set back further still. Given this separation distance, and the fact that the building would face the front of these dwellings, it is not considered that there would be any material loss of privacy, nor any overbearing or overshadowing effects.
- 7.5.3 In terms of noise impacts, the existing building is currently hired out to various groups, including a brass band and for events and functions. The applicant states that the redevelopment of the club would not require the building to be hired out for financial purposes, nor could the club continue to accommodate the brass band given the smaller size of the new building. The applicant states that the proposed building would have sound proofing built into its structure, and the number of windows are limited by design. The Environmental Health Officer has not objected in terms of noise, but has requested further details of the proposed sound proof acoustic fencing, which is to be provided around most of the perimeter of the site, behind the hedge. This has been provided by the applicant and further comments from the EHO are awaited.

Given the additional sound proofing and more modern construction of the building, acoustic fencing, and the fact it would not be let to outside parties, it is considered that the redevelopment of the club is likely to result in an improvement in terms of noise, for existing residents. These elements can be secured by conditions.

- 7.5.4 In terms of amenities for the future occupiers of the flats on the first floor of the building, all the primary living areas of both dwellings would have a good amount of daylight and sunlight given the amount and size of the windows proposed. There would also be a shared outdoor amenity area for use by the occupiers of the flats, and its size is considered to be sufficient for this purpose, as it exceeds the minimum size recommended by the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide (Consultation Draft). Sound proofing between the flats and the club internally would be a matter for Building Control and the EHO has not objected on this basis.
- 7.5.5 It is therefore considered that the proposal is, at this stage, acceptable in terms of its impact on residential amenity, and in line with Policy DM9 and the NPPF in this regard.

7.6 Highways, Parking and Access

- 7.6.1 Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should take account of whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people. Policy DM11 states that development which would adversely impact the safe and efficient flow of traffic movement on the highway network will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that measures to reduce such impacts to acceptable levels can be implemented. Policy CP11 requires all new development to be appropriately located in relation to public transport and comply with the Council's car parking standards.
- 7.6.2 The access to the site would be from the inlet part of Windsor Road, slightly further south than the existing access on this side, and the County Highway Authority have not objected to the proposed access. It is noted that while Windsor Road does not have restricted parking, it is narrow and at certain times is very heavily used, for example by the adjacent Chobham Rugby Club. While the application site has no obligation to provide parking for any adjacent uses, and indeed the current site has large signs displayed stating parking is for the club visitors only, the parking must be sufficient for the club itself so as not to cause any significant amenity impacts.
- 7.6.3 In terms of parking provision, the SCC Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance 2012 recommends a maximum of 1 car space per 5 members or an individual assessment and justification. The car park would have 16 spaces, and two of these would be required to be allocated to the two flats, which is in line with the parking guidance. This would leave 13 plus 1 disabled space for the club itself. The applicant has stated that there are 350 club members, however they estimate only 30-40 of these people are active users of the club, and that all members are likely to be asked to re-join once it is rebuilt with a fee involved (resulting in lower membership).

7.6.4 A short survey carried out by the applicant over a few days showed the following:

	Members at the club	Number who had used car
Sunday Evening	10	2
Monday Evening	7	1
Tuesday Evening	24	6
Wednesday Evening	9	2

On a Sunday lunchtime which is a popular time for the club to be used, the applicant undertook a small survey which indicated that 8% had driven to the club, 4% had received a lift, 4% arrived by motor scooter or cycle, 2% by mobility scooter, and 82% had walked. Given the nature of the club, where patrons are likely to drink alcohol, it does not seem unreasonable that many people would choose not to drive to the club.

7.6.5 The applicant has stated that once the club is rebuilt, and running costs are therefore lower, there will not be any need to hire out the premises to outside users, which causes sometimes higher numbers of cars than the above table indicates, for example a brass band with around 30 members uses the club at present once a week. The applicant is willing to accept a condition preventing any outside hire of the club. The applicant has also stated that there is unauthorised use of the car park with residents parking there without permission, and notes also that other surrounding facilities such as the popular E&O restaurant along the same road has limited car parking. The County Highway Authority has not objected, and has been asked specifically to consider parking given the Parish Council's concerns. They have re-iterated that in their opinion the lower membership, lack of outside hire and the members' means of transport to and from the Club will result in the parking being provided being sufficient. They have stated it is the Club's responsibility to implement their own parking management at busy times.

7.6.6 The County Highway Authority have requested conditions also for a Construction Transport Management Plan and parking of bicycles within the development site. It is also considered that a condition should be imposed for a Parking Management Plan, including details of how the Club will prevent overspill parking and unauthorised parking within the site. Given the above information and proposed conditions, it is considered that given the nature of the club and the likely method of transport used by its members, the parking provision is likely to be acceptable and not likely to cause any significant overspill or amenity issues. The proposal would therefore comply with policy DM11 of the CSDMP.

7.6 Impact on Infrastructure

7.6.1 Policy CP12 states that the Borough Council will ensure that sufficient physical, social and community infrastructure is provided to support development and that contributions in the longer term will be through the CIL Charging Schedule. Paragraph 153 of the NPPF states that supplementary planning documents should be used where they can aid infrastructure delivery.

The Council's Infrastructure Delivery SPD was adopted in 2014 and sets out the likely infrastructure required to deliver development and the Council's approach to Infrastructure Delivery.

7.6.2 The CIL Charging Schedule came into force on 1 December 2014 and details of infrastructure projects that are to be funded through CIL are outlined in the Regulation 123 list, which includes open space, transport projects, pedestrian safety improvements among others. These projects do not have to be related to the development itself. The new dwellings would be CIL liable at the rate of £220 per m² of additional floorspace, with the final figure being agreed upon completion of the relevant forms, if permission is granted.

7.7 Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA

7.7.1 The Thames Basin Heaths SPA was designated in March 2005 and is protected from adverse impact under UK and European Law. Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 states that new residential development which is likely to have a significant effect on the ecological integrity of the SPA will be required to demonstrate that adequate measures are put in place to avoid or mitigate any potential adverse effects. Policy CP14B of the CSDMP states that the Council will only permit development where it is satisfied that this will not give rise to likely significant adverse effect upon the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and/or the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

7.7.2 All of Surrey Heath lies within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and this site is approximately 750m from the SPA. The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD was adopted in 2012 to mitigate effects of new residential development on the SPA. It states that no new residential development is permitted within 400m of the SPA. All new development is required to either provide SANG on site (for larger proposals) or for smaller proposals such as this one, provided that sufficient SANG is available and can be allocated to the development, a financial contribution towards SANG provided, which is now collected as part of CIL. There is currently sufficient SANG available and this development would be CIL liable, so a contribution would be payable on commencement of development. Informatives relating to CIL will be imposed should the application be granted permission.

7.7.3 The development would also be liable for a contribution towards SAMM (Strategic Access Monitoring and Maintenance) of the SANG, which is a payment separate from CIL and depends on the sizes of the units proposed. This proposal is liable for a SAMM payment of £818, which has not been received to date but the applicant is intending to pay shortly.

7.7.4 It is therefore considered that, subject to the payment of SAMM prior to the decision being issued, the proposal complies with Policy CP14B and Policy NRM6, and the Thames Basin Heaths SPD.

7.8 Other matters

7.8.1 Policy CP6 states that the Council will promote a range of housing types and tenures, and for market housing suggests that this should be approximately 10% 1-bed units, 40% 2-bed units, 40% 3-bed units and 10% 4+ bed units. This application proposes and 1 and 2 bed unit and as such no objection is raised on this basis.

8.0 CONCLUSION

8.1 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle and will provide a smaller but more energy efficient and attractive building than the existing building, while still retaining the existing hedge, so is considered to be an improvement in character terms. The sound proofing will also be improved from existing resulting in amenity benefits. While the amount of parking will be reduced, the applicant is prepared to accept a condition restricting the outside hire of the building, has provided evidence that the members generally do not drive to the club, and no objection has been raised in this regard by the County Highway Authority. It is therefore considered that, subject to receiving the SAMM payment prior to the decision being made, the proposal is acceptable and in line with the relevant policies, and permission should be granted.

9.0 ARTICLE 2(3) DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) ORDER 2012 WORKING IN A POSITIVE/PROACTIVE MANNER

In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 186-187 of the NPPF. This included 1 or more of the following:-

- a) Provided or made available pre application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.
- b) Provided feedback through the validation process including information on the website, to correct identified problems to ensure that the application was correct and could be registered.
- c) Have suggested/accepted/negotiated amendments to the scheme to resolve identified problems with the proposal and to seek to foster sustainable development.

d) Have proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescale or recommendation.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: To prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The building works, hereby approved, shall be constructed in external fascia materials; brick, tile, render, fenestration, doors, and hardstanding as stated on the application form.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

3. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Proposed Site Plan received 28.7.17
- Sections Drawing number 14/15/17 received 31.7.17 (with the exception of Plot 3 as shown on plan)
- Proposed Elevations and First Floor Layout plan Drawing number 14/15/9 received 18.4.17
- Proposed Ground Floor Layout plan Drawing number 14/15/7 received 18.4.17
- Block Plan received 18.4.17

unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning and as advised in ID.17a of the Planning Practice Guidance.

4. The club shall be used by its members only and there shall be no letting of the premises to external groups or organisations.

Reason: In order that the parking provision remains sufficient for the development proposed and does not cause any highway safety or amenity issues, in line with Policy DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The sound proof barrier shall be installed in the location as shown on the site plan and in accordance with the details submitted and received on 28.7.17, prior to the occupation and use of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of amenity, in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied unless and until the proposed vehicular access to Windsor Road has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, in line with Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the following facilities have been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for:

- a) The secure parking of bicycles within the development site

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained for the intended use.

Reason: In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, in line with Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of:

- a) parking of vehicles for site personnel, operatives and visitors
- b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
- c) storage of plant and materials

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of development.

Reason: In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, in line with Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted a Parking Management Plan shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The Parking Management Plan shall include details on parking control to prevent overspill, explore potential measures to restrict unauthorised vehicular access such as, for example, lockable bollards or, for example, a control access gate. The agreed details shall be fully implemented in accordance the Plan and be retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity; and, to ensure the development does not impede the safe flow of traffic to comply with Policies DM9, DM11 and CP11 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the NPPF.

Informative(s)

1. CIL Liable CIL1
2. Form 1 Needs Submitting CIL2
3. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway. The applicant is advised that prior approval must be obtained from the Highway Authority (0300 200 1003) before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway or verge to form a vehicle crossover or to install dropped kerbs. Please see www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/vehicle-crossovers-or-dropped-kerbs
4. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to obstruct the public highway by the erection of scaffolding, hoarding or any other device or apparatus for which a licence must be sought from the Highway Authority Local Highways Service.
5. The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or cause damage to the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131,148,149).
6. Building Regs consent req'd DF5
7. Decision Notice to be kept DS1