

**LOCATION:** BY PASS NURSERY, BLACKSTROUD LANE EAST,  
LIGHTWATER, GU18 5XR

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of a detached two storey dwelling with further  
basement accommodation, following demolition of all  
existing buildings and caravan.

**TYPE:** Full Planning Application

**APPLICANT:** Mr Bell

**OFFICER:** Mr N Praine

**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 White.**

**RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions**

## **1.0 SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This application seeks redevelopment of an existing site comprising a former poultry farm and disused buildings which include chicken coops, dove coops, poultry stores and a caravan. The site is located on the eastern side of the A322 Bracknell Road in Lightwater, with access from the Blackstroud Lane East. The site falls outside the settlement area of Bagshot and lies wholly within the Green Belt.
- 1.2 The proposal would provide a detached two storey dwelling with further basement accommodation following demolition of all existing buildings and removal of the existing caravan. The new building represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt but given the reduction in the quantum of built form, that would significantly improve the openness of the Green Belt, in the officer's opinion this would outweigh the limited harm to constitute very special circumstances. The development would also not result in adverse harm to agricultural provision, trees, character, ecology, residential amenity or the highway and is acceptable in all other regards. It is therefore considered that planning permission should be granted.

## **2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION**

- 2.1 The application site is a 0.45ha area of land located on the eastern side of the A322 Lightwater bypass within the designated Green Belt. The site is accessed from Blackstroud Lane East outside the settlement area of Bagshot and within the Green Belt. The application site a former poultry farm comprises a number of disused buildings which include chicken coops, dove coops, poultry stores and a caravan. The site has been disused since 2015.

The site has a significant amount of hardstanding and there is space to the front for several vehicles.

### **3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1 SU/15/0746 - Certificate of Lawful Development for the existing use of a caravan on blocks and part use of a concrete building as a residence – agreed 04/11/15.
- 3.2 Prior to this the site has been used as a poultry farm and dating further back other horticultural and agricultural uses have continued on the site.

### **4.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 This proposal is for the erection of a detached two storey dwelling with further basement accommodation, following demolition of all existing buildings and removal of the existing caravan. The proposed dwelling would have 4 bedrooms with an integral garage, the dwelling as proposed would be spit over 3 floors the lowest floor being basement accommodation which opens to a rear courtyard area which is cut into the existing ground levels. The proposed dwelling would have a pitched roof with maximum height of 7.2m, maximum width of 22m and maximum depth of 7m.
- 4.2 The access will remain as existing and the proposed driveway will utilise or replace existing hardstanding areas with additional landscaping proposed across the site. It is also proposed to engineer a 1.5m planted bund to the A322 boundary and re-profile the land levels around the basement of the dwelling. The application is supported by both existing and proposed land level, and cross section drawings.

### **5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

- 5.1 Surrey County Highway Authority No objections.
- 5.2 Environmental Health Officer No objection, subject to conditions.
- 5.3 Council's Arboricultural Officer No objection, subject to conditions.
- 5.4 Surrey Wildlife Trust At the time of writing this report no comments have been received.
- 5.5 Windlesham Parish Council Objection – Green Belt location, there is a need to demonstrate Very Special Circumstances [*Officer comment: These Green Belt considerations are set out at paragraph 7.4.1 below*].
- 5.6 Drainage Officer No objections.

## **6.0 REPRESENTATION**

- 6.1 At the time of preparation of this report no representations of objection and no representations of support have been received.

## **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 (CSDMP), and in this case the relevant policies are Policy CPA, CP2, CP8, CP12, CP14, DM9, DM11 and DM13. It will also be considered against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Lightwater Village Design Statement Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG).

7.2 The main issues to be considered are:

- Principle of the loss of the agricultural use;
- Principle of the development in the Green Belt;
- Character;
- Residential amenity;
- Highways, parking and access;
- Trees;
- Impact on Infrastructure and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA; and,
- Other matters – ecology, contaminated land and noise.

### **7.3 Principle of the loss of the agricultural use**

7.3.1 The applicant has commissioned an independent agricultural appraisal of the site and this has been submitted with the application (Nb. The applicant has relied upon the same agricultural advisors that the Council would normally rely upon). It is noted from this appraisal that the site has enjoyed agricultural uses until 2015 with the most recent use focusing on the breeding and selling of live poultry, eggs and associated poultry rearing equipment over the 10 years from 2005 to 2015. The report states that, over the 10 year period there has been significant capital investment with the enterprise investing in the region of £200,000 on facilities which include, automatic feeding systems, incubators, cages, hoppers and packing facilities. However, since 2009 the enterprise has become less profitable as demand for pure breed poultry has been fallen away since 2009. By 2015 the commercial venture became unviable and ceased trading.

- 7.3.2 In considering if the site would be viable to continue as an agricultural use, it is appropriate to consider if future agricultural uses could be sustained on this site given the site layout, condition, current market conditions and location of the site.
- 7.3.3 It was noted during the site visit that the buildings are currently in a poor state of repair with the timber structures suffering from rot. The applicant's agricultural advisor states that replacement and repair of the existing infrastructure would require significant investment as well as further expenditure to re-establish breeding lines if livestock was reintroduced. Likewise, given the restrictive size of the site at 0.45ha with no scope to expand, any livestock introduced onto the site would be low scale with limited room for modern agriculture machinery. The agricultural appraisal considers the site would only generate a low income. The associated noise, odour and dust from any livestock farming to the adjoining dwellings would also, in the officer's opinion be unneighbourly.
- 7.3.4 Turning to horticulture, it was also noted from the site visit that buildings on site have been heavily modified to accommodate poultry. The agricultural advisor considers the size of the buildings on site are too small in both footprint and height for modern horticulture and as such would not achieve the economies of scale to ensure viability. Likewise, the size of the site is limited at 0.45ha and does not offer any opportunities for expansion. Well established competition from surrounding retail and wholesale nurseries which include Wyevale Garden Centre, Longacres Garden Centre, Hillers Garden Centre, North Hill Nurseries, Plants Ltd and Dingley Dell Nurseries also weigh against the viable use of this site for horticulture.
- 7.3.5 The applicant has demonstrated that the use of the site is not viable because of the size of the site being too small for a modern agriculture and horticulture. The size, layout and condition of the buildings make the site currently unviable and also very unlikely to be viable for any subsequent owners. Although it is also noted that the site has not been marketed as a going concern, in terms of the constraints identified above and the limited contribution it would make to the economy, if it traded, there is no objection to the loss of the use.
- 7.3.6 It is therefore considered that the loss of the existing use is justified as the current site constraints and market conditions make an agricultural use on this site unviable. No objections are raised on these grounds.

#### **7.4 Impact on the Green Belt**

- 7.4.1 Paragraph 89 of the NPPF regards the construction of new buildings as inappropriate development in the Green Belt but lists exceptions to this. This

includes buildings for agriculture. Thus the existing buildings historically used for agriculture are not inappropriate development. Another exception under paragraph 89 is the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites, whether redundant or in continuing use. However, agricultural sites are not included in the definition of previously developed land (Annex 2 of the NPPF), and there are no other exceptions that would allow this development. As such the development is inappropriate in the Green Belt.

7.4.2 Paragraph 87 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

7.4.3 The most important attribute of the Green Belt is its openness and therefore it is necessary to ascertain whether the quantum of proposed development would cause additional harm to the Green Belt. In this case the site is covered with a number of low scale agricultural buildings of up to 4.4m in height. The following table indicates the differences in floor space, footprint and volume in comparison with the existing situation:

	Existing	Proposed	Difference
Floor space	744m <sup>2</sup>	344m <sup>2</sup>	-54%
Volume	2372m <sup>3</sup>	1004m <sup>3</sup>	-28%

7.4.4 While the proposed dwelling would be taller than existing structures at 7.2m it is noted that the volume and floor space and the spread of built development across the site would be reduced significantly from existing as well as removal of the existing hardstanding. As such the significant net gain to the openness of the Green Belt is considered to outweigh the in principle inappropriateness to constitute very special circumstances. To safeguard the openness of the site it is, however, considered necessary and reasonable to remove permitted development rights.

7.4.5 The above table's figures are inclusive of the proposed basement, part of which would be exposed. However, to ensure that the land is graded as shown on the proposed plans it is deemed necessary to secure this by conditions. The bund would constitute an engineering operation and this form of development is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt provided that it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt (para 90 of the NPPF refers). In the officer's opinion this bund does not harm

openness. Again it is, however, considered necessary to secure the correct grading of this bund by condition.

## **7.5 Impacts on the character and quality of the area**

7.5.1 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. 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. Policy CP2 requires development to ensure that all land is used efficiently within the context of its surroundings and to respect and enhance the quality of the urban, rural, natural and historic environments.

7.5.2 It is also acknowledged that paragraph 60 of the NPPF is clear that planning decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes, and that they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles, though it is proper to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. In this case, the proposal would not be visible from public vantage points and its design nods to the agricultural past through its materials and style. The materials to be used can be required by condition to ensure that they are high quality and result in an attractive dwelling.

7.5.3 It is therefore considered that, subject to the proposed conditions, that the development is acceptable in character terms and in line with Policy DM9 and the NPPF in this regard.

## **7.6 Impact on residential amenity**

7.6.1 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.

7.6.2 The nearest neighbours are sited in excess of 20m away and on this basis it is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on residential amenity and in line with Policy DM9 in this regard.

## **7.7 Highways, parking and access**

7.7.1 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.

7.7.2 The County Highway Authority has been consulted and have assessed the application on safety, capacity and policy grounds and have not objected. It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of highway safety and capacity and in line with Policies CP11, DM11 and the NPPF in this regard.

## **7.8 Trees**

7.8.1 Policy DM9 states that development will be acceptable where it protects trees and other vegetation worthy of retention and provides high quality hard and soft landscaping where appropriate. The site currently has mature vegetation along the boundaries and the submitted tree report confirms that no trees will be removed as part of the proposal. The report also recommends suitable tree protection during the demolition and construction phases. The Council's Arboricultural Officer has been consulted and has not objected, subject to a condition requiring tree and ground protection measures having been implemented and a comprehensive landscaping plan being submitted via condition.

7.8.2 The proposed site plan shows some hardstanding proposed to the front in the form of the driveways and access, and to the rear for patios, however the rest of the site would be open land. There are no details of boundary treatments or size of the residential curtilage, however, these details can be agreed within the landscaping plan. It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable subject to the above condition and in line with Policy DM9 in this regard.

## **7.9 Impact on Infrastructure and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA**

7.9.1 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.

7.9.2 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. This development would not CIL liable as the proposal results in a reduction in floor space. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be in accordance with Policy CP12, the Infrastructure Delivery SPD and the NPPF in this regard.

7.9.3 All of Surrey Heath lies within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and this site is within 5k of 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, given a residential unit has already been established on the site via SU/15/0746, see paragraph 3.1 above, it is considered that there is no net increase in residential units as part of this proposal.

## **7.10 Other matters**

7.10.1 Policy CP14A supports the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity within Surrey Heath. The applicant has submitted an Ecological Appraisal, which assessed the site as having negligible benefit for protected species and makes recommendations (under paragraph 6) for the ecological improvements across the site. In the event Surrey Wildlife Trust raises no objections before the committee date and subject to conditions requiring the undertaking of these mitigation measures as outlined in the Ecological Assessment, it is considered the development is acceptable in this regard.

7.10.2 Paragraph 120 of the NPPF states that to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution, planning decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location. The applicant has submitted a Contamination Report. The Environmental Health Officer has not objected but has recommended conditions to ensure further work is carried out to establish the extent of the contamination and remediation measures implemented, all to be agreed with the LPA. It is therefore considered the proposal is acceptable in this respect, subject to the proposed conditions.

7.10.3 In respect of noise the Environmental Health Officer comments that the proposed dwelling is adjacent to the A322 and traffic noise levels at the façade of the proposed building through a normal double glazed window when partially open for ventilation purposes would result in a noise level within the dwelling of 57 to 65dB. British Standard 8233:14 recommends an internal level within bedrooms of no more than 30dB. The Environmental Health Officer therefore considers that higher specification windows in the bedrooms nearest the A322 are therefore required. Subject to the imposition of a condition to control this, the Environmental Health Officer raises no objection.



## **8.0 CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 The dwelling represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt but no other harm arising from this proposal has been identified. Given the reduction in the quantum of built form, that would significantly improve the openness of the Green Belt, in the officer's opinion this would outweigh the limited harm to constitute very special circumstances. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

## **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 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. No development shall take place until details and samples of the external materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the development shall be carried out using only the agreed materials.

Reason: In the interests of 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: 025-P-015 B, 025-P-018 C, 025-P-020 C, 025-P-021 C, 025-P-022 C, 025-P-024 B, 025-P-025 B, 025-P-028 C, 025-P-031 B, 025-P-035 B, 025-P-036 A. 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. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order), no further extensions to the dwelling hereby approved or additions to the roof shall be erected under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A or Class B of that Order; and no buildings, enclosures, pools or containers incidental to the enjoyment of a dwelling house shall be erected under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of that order; without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the enlargement of the development, in order to preserve the openness of the Green Belt, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The development hereby permitted shall not be constructed until any additional outbuildings constructed after the date of this permission have been demolished and all resultant debris removed from the site, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the enlargement of the development, in order to preserve the openness of the Green Belt, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. Prior to commencement of development, full details of both hard and soft landscaping works, and boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details should include an indication of all hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features, the size of the residential curtilage and any existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out. All plant material shall conform to BS3936 Part 1: Nursery stock specification for trees and shrubs. Any trees or plants, which within a period of five years of commencement of any works in pursuance of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced as soon as practicable with others of similar size and species. The planting shall be carried out after completion of the building programme and prior to first occupation and shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.

7. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report prepared by Treetec Consultancy Limited dated August 2016. No development shall commence until photographs have been provided by the retained Consultant and forwarded to and approved by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. This should record all aspects of tree and ground protection measures having been implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Report. The tree protection measures shall be retained until completion of all works hereby permitted.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

8. The development, hereby approved, shall be implemented in accordance with the recommendations of the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey. Any deviation from the requirements of the report must be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the changes being undertaken.

Reason: To ensure the protection of protected species in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework

9. Prior to the commencement of development all existing buildings and hard standing on the site shall be demolished and removed unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the residential and visual amenities of the Green Belt in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation must not commence until conditions 1 to 4 below have been complied with. If unexpected contamination is found after development has begun, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority in writing until condition 4 has been complied with in relation to that contamination.

## **1. Site Characterisation**

An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

(i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;

(ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:

- human health,
- property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
- adjoining land,
- groundwaters and surface waters,
- ecological systems,
- archeological sites and ancient monuments;

(iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

## **2. Submission of Remediation Scheme**

A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

## **3. Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme**

The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report (referred to in PPS23 as a validation report) that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

#### **4. Reporting of Unexpected Contamination**

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of condition 1, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 2, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition 3.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors, in accordance with Policies CP2 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. The following shall be implemented, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority;

1. All the window openings on the ground and first floor bedrooms 1 and 2 must achieve a minimum of 33dB reduction when in the closed position.

2. An alternative means of ventilation must be provided to the bedrooms marked 1 and 2 such as to provide fresh air when the windows are shut. Such ventilation, which may be passive or active, must ensure that the level of 30dB<sub>A</sub>eq over 8 hours is not exceeded within the bedrooms.

3. The acoustic bund is completed in complete accordance with drawings 025P 031 Rev B and 025P 035 Rev B.

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

12. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the finished ground levels of the site including the planted bund and garden areas shall be in complete accordance with submitted drawings 025-P035 B and 025-P-015 B

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development, in order to preserve the openness of the Green Belt, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

13. No development shall take place on site until details of the proposed finished ground levels around the backfilled basement and basement courtyard, in relation to the proposed ground levels of the remainder of the site, are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the development shall be built in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over land levels in order to preserve the openness of the Green Belt, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative(s)

1. Building Regs consent req'd DF5
2. Decision Notice to be kept DS1