

Application Number: DM/2019/01300

Proposal: Erection of 1 no. replacement detached dwelling. Provision of new access road. Amended domestic curtilage to existing dwelling house and all associated external works.

Address: Woodmancote and site of former 8a Highfield Close, off Highfield Road and Highfield Close, Osbaston, Monmouth

Applicant: Mr F Bucknall, Ms J Bucknall & Mrs R Jarman

Plans: Elevations - Proposed 5201 P 001 - Rev C, Ecology Report Bat Survey A BAT SURVEY OF WOODMANCOTE, Eric Palmer MCIEEM, Link Ecology Ltd. Dated March 2019 - , Ecology Report Bat Survey Update Bat Survey By: Eric Palmer MCIEEM Link Ecology Ltd. September 2020 - , Tree Survey Tree Survey Tree Survey and Arboricultural Constraints Report - , Drainage GRAYS 10165 TN01 R0 Technical Note Drainage Surface Water - , Planting Plan 17-74-PL-204 - Rev 0, Drainage 10165-GRY-XX-XX-DR-C-003 Rev P1 - , Tree Protection Plan NP253HR/JBUC/AIPP - , Tree Survey Tree survey and arboricultural constraints report Notes to exp Section 3 Arb constraint - , Tree Protection Plan NP253HR/BUC/AIPP 1 - Arb impact - , Ecology Report Confirmation Statement regarding Reptiles 8a Highfield Close - , Floor Plans - Proposed 5201P 101 - , Elevations - Proposed 5201P 102 - South and East Elevation, Elevations - Proposed 5201P 103 - North and West elevation

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Ms Jo Draper
Date Valid: 03.08.2022

This application is presented to Planning Committee as there are five or more neighbour objections

1.0 APPLICATION DETAILS

1.1 Site Description

This is a full planning application for a replacement dwelling, (8a Highfield Close), new access road and amendment to the domestic curtilage of Woodmancote, Highfield Road, Monmouth. The bungalow 8a Highfield Close has since been demolished and is proposed to provide a new shared access through this plot into the site to serve the replacement dwelling which is to be situated at the northern part of the site, and the immediately adjacent site to the north, Woodmancote. This application previously comprised of five new detached dwellings, a replacement dwelling, all to be accessed off this new shared access from Highfield Close. During the application process the phosphate pollution issue emerged, and the five dwellings have been removed from the scheme. This application is for a replacement dwelling only. The agent has stated that the proposed scheme is future proofed to allow further dwellings to come forward at a time when a nutrient neutrality solution is in place.

The adjacent property to the north Woodmancote (also in the applicant's ownership) is also subject to a planning application for a replacement dwelling (DM/2021/00182) and is being presented alongside this planning application.

The application site is located within the development boundary of Monmouth, located on rising ground to the north of the town centre and east of the Monnow Valley. The site comprises 8a

Highfield Close, situated near the end of Highfield Close (previously subject to Planning Permission DC/2018/00217 for a replacement dwelling.

There are two fields to the south and east of the application site, the land falls away from the high point adjacent to Woodmancote, this application site slopes down north to south and east to west. The existing site is accessed by a field gate access onto Highfield Road along the northern boundary - this is in the land outside of the application site but in the ownership of the applicants. The remainder of this boundary is formed by an overgrown hedge. The two fields are given over to rough grassland and are divided by hedgerow.

The western boundary of the fields is formed by a post and wire fence, providing no visual separation between the fields and the houses immediately below it. The eastern and southern boundaries are formed by a hedgerows with trees. The garden of Woodmancote itself supports a number of large mature trees that sit on the boundary with Highfield Road.

Osbaston is characterised by traditional Victorian villas dotted around the area and more modern development. There is a great variation of architectural styles and materials used, the majority of the properties are detached and sit within well-maintained gardens, many of which support mature tree that contribute to the area's sense of place.

The application site is surrounded on the north and east by residential properties. There are views to the west, although the site is not in the immediate public domain. The character of the site is currently of rough grassland. This application proposes to develop the north-eastern part of it for the one dwelling. A large area of grassland is retained to the west between the new dwelling and those on Prospect Road immediately to the west.

1.2 Proposal Description

The proposed new dwelling is contemporary in design and comprises of two parallel staggered elements oriented east - west, the main part is a flat-roofed two-storey element accommodating the main habitable rooms, with a slightly smaller pitched roof element on the south accommodating the sitting room and ancillary elements including a garage, and guest suite. There is a small single-storey, flat-roofed link connecting both elements. Overall, the combined length of the two elements running east to west is 26.9m. The pitched roof element measures 6.5m in width with a depth of 14m, forming a long narrow unit, there is an overlap with the main flat-roofed element that is staggered back to the west of the plot; this projects a further 12.9m to the west, the same narrow form is replicated and there is a single-storey connecting hall element.

The layout and design of the proposed dwelling seeks to emulate the principles of low energy, passive designed houses. These are "ideally orientated with larger windows on the south facing elevations to maximise solar gain into primary living spaces, whilst mitigating the risk of overheating from the summer sun. The general design approach is for the plan layout to provide a long elevation facing south into private gardens with a narrow floorplan to limit the need for glazing on the north elevation. This approach ensures privacy and avoids issues of overlooking. Pergolas, balconies and overhanging canopy roofs will mitigate overheating".

These features are proposed in this scheme, large glazing panels on the south and west elevation, covered areas including a pergola on the south elevation and covered balconies on the west elevation. The form of the dwelling encompasses two long parallel buildings with narrow footprints.

External materials comprise a standing seam (metal) roof to the main two-storey element, the second wing has a sedum green roof, walls comprise a mix of render and timber boarding, with aluminium coping and coated aluminium fenestration, rainwater goods are galvanised steel with natural stone and render proposed to the wall.

The site slopes down from east to west and north to west; the proposed dwelling has been cut into the site.

The height of the roof to ridge on the main wing on the east elevation is 5.8m, although the new ground level is taken below the existing ground level as the proposal would be cut into this sloping

site; a retaining wall is proposed along the eastern boundary. Windows on the east elevation at first floor level serve a bedroom, stairway and bathroom. The bedroom is in the main two-storey flat roofed part which is staggered further away from the common boundary. There is a recessed enclosed balcony proposed on the west elevation of the flat roof element, this mirrors the enclosed arrangement proposed at ground floor level. There is a pergola to run adjacent to the main ground floor window on the south elevation.

There is a new mixed hedgerow to be planted along the eastern boundary with hedgerow and stockproof fence proposed to the west. It is proposed to alter the residential curtilage boundary of the property Woodmancote, shifting it to the south to square off the site, providing the northern boundary to this application site. Within the boundary of Woodmancote, there is a new mixed native-species hedgerow proposed on the southern boundary; this forms the northern boundary for this site. There is no indication of boundary material on the southern elevation of this development.

8a Highfield Close was purchased by the applicants to facilitate access to this site. It is proposed that this new single access serves both this replacement dwelling and the replacement dwelling proposed on the adjacent site under DM/2021/00182. This single shared access is proposed to run parallel to the rear boundary of numbers 4, 6 and 8 Highfield Close (it is proposed to close the vehicle access serving the adjacent site Woodmancote onto Highfield Road, making it pedestrian only).

The application site boundary shows the red line running centrally down the middle of the hedgerow that forms the common boundary to the rear of 4, 6 and 8 Highway Close, the distance from the boundary (centre of hedge) and the new access varies between 3m and 3.1m width. It is proposed to retain the existing hedge; the plans state that the 'existing overgrown boundary vegetation cut back and retained as boundary hedge, weak/gappy areas to be infilled with mixed native hedge species' with further 'incidental 'light tracery' species trees to strengthen boundary landscape buffer'. It is proposed that this buffer accommodates the swale, a filter drain is proposed along the edge of this shared access drive.

The required access would be provided through Highfield Close which would necessitate the removal of a length of hedgerow currently forming the boundary to 8a Highfield Close. The proposed new shared access also runs adjacent to the southern boundary of 8 Highfield Close. The red line boundary along this section runs midway in the hedgerow, there is a separating distance from the middle of this hedge to the edge of the shared driveway of 1.75m. The proposed shared drive measures 5.8m in width as it crosses through what was 8a Highfield Close, once within the site and running north, this reduces to 4.8m and then 4.1m once to the rear of 6 Highfield Close and adjacent to this replacement dwelling. The access continues to provide access into the adjacent site, Woodmancote. The access also forks off to the south (this is remaining from the original submission for the six dwellings that included residential units to the south; this has been retained within this application boundary). Within the site that was 8a Highfield Close it is proposed that in addition to delivering a shared access to this site it will accommodate the proposed attenuation area, with proposed planting and drainage accommodating a rain garden and cellular storage.

Updated tree information has been submitted in line with the new access and drainage proposals and there are eight trees of lesser importance proposed for removal as a result of the new vehicle access proposed. Note that all of these proposed removals involve trees of moderate to low quality (retention category C).

The supporting information states the following:

"The willow, tree 11, is visible from one or two adjacent properties, but any loss of amenity would be mitigated by the proposed planting of four replacement trees in its immediate area, specified in the planting plan as three silver birches (*Betula pendula*) and one cut-leaved alder (*Alnus glutinosa* Laciniata). Note also that the suspected decay in the existing willow is likely to mean that even if it were to be retained it is likely that it would have to be pollarded or even felled within the next few years."

A planting scheme has been provided as part of this application. There are in total 29 new trees indicated on the planting plan. All category A and B trees are being retained and only eight category C trees are being removed.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (if any)

Reference Number	Description	Decision	Decision Date
DM/2019/01300	Erection of 1 no. Replacement Detached Dwelling. Provision of new access road. Amended domestic curtilage to existing dwelling house and all associated external works.	Pending Determination	
DM/2021/00182	Demolition of existing 2 storey dwelling. Construction of a 2 storey replacement dwelling including integral garage and amended access.	Pending Determination	

3.0 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Strategic Policies

S1 LDP The Spatial Distribution of New Housing Provision
 S13 LDP Landscape, Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment
 S17 LDP Place Making and Design
 S1 LDP The Spatial Distribution of New Housing Provision
 S2 LDP Housing Provision

Development Management Policies

DES1 LDP General Design Considerations
 EP1 LDP Amenity and Environmental Protection
 EP3 LDP Lighting
 NE1 LDP Nature Conservation and Development
 GI1 LDP Green Infrastructure
 LC5 LDP Protection and Enhancement of Landscape Character
 MV1 LDP Proposed Developments and Highway Considerations
 SD4 LDP Sustainable Drainage
 SD2 LDP Sustainable Construction and Energy Efficiency
 LC1 LDP New Built Development in the Open Countryside

4.0 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

Future Wales - the national plan 2040

Future Wales is the national development framework, setting the direction for development in Wales to 2040. It is a development plan with a strategy for addressing key national priorities through the planning system, including sustaining and developing a vibrant economy, achieving decarbonisation and climate-resilience, developing strong ecosystems and improving the health and well-being of our communities. Future Wales - the national plan 2040 is the national development framework and it is the highest tier plan, setting the direction for development in Wales to 2040. It is a framework which will be built on by Strategic Development Plans at a regional level and Local Development Plans. Planning decisions at every level of the planning system in Wales must be taken in accordance with the development plan as a whole.

Planning Policy Wales (PPW) Edition 11

The primary objective of PPW is to ensure that the planning system contributes towards the delivery of sustainable development and improves the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales, as required by the Planning (Wales) Act 2015, the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 and other key legislation and resultant duties such as the Socio-economic Duty.

A well-functioning planning system is fundamental for sustainable development and achieving sustainable places. PPW promotes action at all levels of the planning process which is conducive to maximising its contribution to the well-being of Wales and its communities.

5.0 REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 Consultation Replies

Monmouth Town Council 15.11.2022 Recommendation: REFUSAL

Grounds of Refusal:

1. Access concerns;
2. Impact and disturbance to neighbours;
3. Impact on biodiversity and trees in the area;
4. Potential impact on flood risk to the area;

Councillors noted that the committee had considered the associated application in October for the neighbouring development and were confused as to why the applications are not being considered as one especially as access is linked. Concerns were also raised regarding the objections from the Tree Officer and the potential impact this development could have on the area's biodiversity. It was noted that there are a large number of objections made by neighbours due to the access concerns from Highfield Close. Councillors accepted the concerns raised regarding the potential impact that this development would have on the traffic in the area, the neighbours' quality of amenity and the safety concerns of those using the road. It was questioned whether access could remain from Highfield Road which would reduce the impact on the area. Councillors also questioned the need to build on green spaces. It was noted that the area already has flooding issues due to the amount of development in the area and it was suggested that this development could worsen this issue. It would also see a further reduction of green spaces in an area that is highly developed which would see a further impact on the biodiversity.

Natural Resources Wales: No objection subject to a condition

We continue to have concerns with the application as submitted. However, we are satisfied that these concerns can be overcome by attaching the following condition to any planning permission granted:

Lighting Plan

Please note, without the inclusion of this condition we would object to this planning application.

We note the application site is within the catchment of the River Wye Special Area of Conservation (SAC). As you are aware, on 21st January 2021, we published an evidence package outlining phosphorus levels for all river SACs across Wales. In line with our Planning Advice (July 2022), under the Habitats Regulations, Planning Authorities must consider the phosphorus impact of proposed developments on water quality within SAC river catchments. We therefore advise you to consider whether the proposals, as submitted, would increase the volume of foul discharge from the site in planning terms.

We note the application, as submitted, is now solely for a replacement dwelling of 8a Highfield Close, and plots 2-6 have been removed from the application and a new red line boundary submitted. We understand that the replacement dwelling will be of a similar size to the existing and will continue to use the existing connection to the mains sewer.

From the information available on your website, we note that Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has confirmed that there is no phosphorus permit at the Monmouth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW).

However, recognising the specific nature of the application submitted, a replacement dwelling, we are satisfied that it is unlikely to increase the amount of phosphorus entering the catchment. Therefore, we are satisfied that the proposal is not likely to have a significant effect on the River Wye SAC.

MCC Ecology: No objection subject to conditions

The proposals are linked to applications DC/2019/01300 and DC/2018/00217 for which previous ecological surveys have been completed. The reports entitled An Update Bat Survey (Link Ecology, September 2020) and A Bat Survey (Link Ecology, March 2019) have been submitted with the application. The reports also reference various reports submitted for DC/2019/01300, of which the Update Ecology Report (Link Ecology, February 2021) and Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (Link Ecology, March 2020) are the most relevant. Although ecological surveys are expected to remain up-to-date to within two years of planning or licensing consideration, it is appreciated that the building which will be demolished has been surveyed on a number of occasions and was not previously found to support roosting bats. In addition, the 2020 survey is only just out of date. The conclusions in relation to likely absence of roosting bats are therefore acceptable, providing the precautionary approach detailed in the 2019 bat survey report is secured by condition.

In relation to landscaping and enabling works including access and drainage, impacts on important habitats and protected and notable species have been considered in the PEA Report. The approach remains generally acceptable, although it is requested that a statement by an ecologist is provided confirming whether reptiles are now likely to have colonised habitats within the former garden of 8a Highfield Close. The previous justification for likely absence was based on the amount of time since the habitat had established in 2019. Ecological avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures detailed in the PEA report will need to be secured by condition if consent is granted.

Although the trees which will be impacted do not appear likely to be of particularly high ecological value in their own right, any issues raised by the Tree Officer in relation to protection of mature or important trees will need to be addressed.

It is also requested that ecological enhancement measures in relation to this specific scheme are clearly shown on a site plan before determination in accordance with PPW 11. This will need to include any native/beneficial planting including native hedgerow planting, at least one integrated bat roost feature and one bird nesting feature and hedgehog connectivity measures. The proposals for Emorsgate seed mixes and gapping up/planting of native hedgerows shown on the Planting Plan are welcomed. Drainage features should be designed to benefit wildlife wherever possible. A detailed specification and Habitat Management Plan could then be secured by condition if consent is granted.

In response to the clarification required by the ecologist regarding reptiles there were three outstanding issues from the ecology response from September 2022.

An update report has been submitted that suggests that habitat is still present that could support a small reptile population and that the recommendations of the 2021 update ecology report should still apply relating to mitigation.

Significant phosphate impacts need to be ruled out or an HRA will need to be completed - it is noted on NRW's latest response (18/11/2022) they note that they are satisfied that the development is unlikely to increase the amount of phosphorous entering the catchment.

All features for net biodiversity gain need to be clearly shown on a site plan - whilst preferable to get this prior to determination a suitably worded planning condition covers this.

MCC Landscape/GI: No objection subject to conditions

The previous comments related to a scheme consisting of the erection of 1 no. replacement detached dwelling and five new detached dwellings and additional works.

The current scheme is reduced to the 1 new dwelling. The current proposal application red line area as per site plan 5201 P 001 REV C focusses on 1 new dwelling, improved access and proposed attenuation area. The proposal is located in a corner of the existing field, in a locally

elevated location with the backdrop of existing trees and boundaries of Woodmancote and properties on Highfield Close to the north and east. To the south is an existing field hedge which stretches east to west. The proposed individual dwelling as opposed to the original application of five dwellings would appear to demonstrate less visual impact and potential impact on as per LVA statement Appendix 1 by nature of location, localised topography and setting. The applicant has sought to mitigate for the loss of the nine trees within a planting scheme to the south of the site within the application boundary. The overall scheme layout, material selection and planting plan inclusive of green roof (roof B) to main building is broadly acceptable - however the following observations will require further clarification.

- It is noted that planting plan ref 17-74-PL-204 REV 0 does not include a specification or aftercare prescription for the proposed green roof. Further clarity would be welcome. This can be provided prior to determination or as a condition should the application be approved.

- It is noted that the southern boundary edge on plan ref 5201 P 001 REV C indicates existing hedge as being retained however it is not clear if there is to be additional stock proof fencing to the south of the site and along the proposed access. Further clarity would be welcome. This can be provided prior to determination or as part of a condition should the application be approved.

- Sustainable energy In line with PPW11; the submission should consider opportunities for sustainable design principles in the design process. For instance there could potentially be additional opportunities for areas of EV charging points and air source heat pumps. Additional GI with associated ecological benefits would be welcome adding to the reduction of overall carbon foot print and increase energy efficiency.

Overall it is considered from a Landscape and GI perspective that the revised proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the urban setting, localised landscape and provisions of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11) February 2021 and policies S1, DES1, LC5 and NE1 of the adopted LDP.

Welsh Water: No objection

We have reviewed the information submitted as part of this application with particular focus on the Technical Note: Drainage - Surface Water and drawing number 10165-GRY-XX-XX-DR-C (Proposed SUDS plot 1). We can confirm discussions have progressed to establish the drainage arrangement and status of the public sewer network in the area and are content with the conveyance of surface water at a limited discharge rate. Condition is recommended accordingly.

MCC Land Drainage Engineer: No objection

Surface Water Drainage: Revised comments following clarification from DCWW:

The proposed development will require a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) designed, constructed and maintained in accordance with the Statutory Standards for SuDS in Wales and approved by MCC as SuDS Approving Body (SAB). The SAB has received and undertaken initial review of the proposed SuDS (SAB application reference SAB/2022/055). The proposals appear to have identified a suitable surface water drainage destination (DCWW have confirmed that they consider the sewer to be combined rather than foul). The proposals include high quality green SuDS features including a green roof and rain gardens which are welcomed by the SAB. We therefore have no objection on grounds of surface water drainage.

The detail of the SuDS proposals will be further examined during appraisal of the SAB application (a separate process to the planning application).

Flooding

Flood risk maps provided by Natural Resources Wales do not indicate the site to be at particular risk of flooding. Our database of previous flood events does not record any flood events in close proximity to the site. Our database of drainage and flood assets does not record any drainage or flood assets in close proximity to the site. We therefore have no objection to the proposed development on flooding grounds.

MCC Highways: No objection

The highway authority has already provided comments in respect of the proposed means of access and the development as a whole and offers no further comments or observations in respect of this application other than to reiterate the recommended highway conditions to control the development as a whole. The highway authority would recommend therefore if the application is determined then conditions are required to ensure that the replacement dwelling is developed and built out with minimal disruption; this includes requirement for the access and turning area to be in place prior to works commencing on site (including demolition), no surface water to drain onto the highway and the submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan.

MCC Trees: Tree officer comments given for both DM/2019/01300 and DM/2021/00182.

The tree officer has left the authority and the GI/Landscape Officer has reviewed the updated information in the absence of a replacement tree officer. Concerns were raised by the previous tree officer and this is addressed in full below. It appears on review that most areas of concern raised by the tree officer have been addressed across the two applications within the submitted information, notes and with reference to previously submitted information. The area identified and not sufficiently addressed relates to details of regular site monitoring of tree protection and monitoring within an Arboricultural Method Statement.

Submitted information

DM/2021/00182

Tree survey and arboricultural constraints report:- Notes to expand on Section 3 of the Arb constraints report Nov 2020

Arb impact and tree protection plan NP253HR/BUC/AIPP 1

DM2019 01300

Tree survey and arboricultural constraints report :- Notes to accompany Arb impact and tree protection plan NP253HR/BUC/AIPP 2

Arb impact and tree protection plan NP253HR/BUC/AIPP 2

DM/2019/01300 Tree officer comments and requirements as of 01.11.2022 . These comments are also relevant to DM/2021/00182. The concerns raised are listed below, and in review of the additional information submitted to address these concerns the GI Officer's comments are given below:

The applicant originally submitted a tree survey and accompanying tree constraints plan in February 2021. These documents by Jerry Ross Arboricultural Consultancy covered the entire site and related to the original proposal. Despite a significant change to the proposed site layout (including a proposed SuDS plan), the tree information has not been updated to reflect this. In addition, the original tree report is dated January 2018, and is therefore now four and a half years out of date and it is likely that the condition of the trees on site has changed within that time. This previously raised concern that insufficient information has been provided for the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to consider the impact of the proposals upon the trees within and adjacent to the red line development boundary of the proposals, there was a holding objection in place until full tree information is provided which demonstrates that trees and their root protection areas will not be damaged by the proposals.

Latest response following submission of information: An update to the Tree survey and Arboricultural constraints report has been provided 15.12.2022 and 11.12.2022 in the form of notes to accompany the tree impact and protection plans for both DM/2019/01300 and DM/2021/00182.

This is confirmed as being acceptable.

An updated tree constraints plan has been provided for both DM/2019/01300 and DM/2021/00182 and show the relevant root protection areas (RPAs) for the retained trees and how they relate to the proposals, inclusive of service runs and excavations.

This is confirmed as acceptable.

A Tree Root Protection Plan (TRPP) for the site clearance and construction phases of the project showing the type and position of the protective fencing to be used around the retained trees has been partially provided. Updated Plan ref NP253HR/BUC/AIPP 1 indicates type but not position of protective fencing. However original plan ref NP253HR/BUC/AIPP (DM/2021/00182) and NP253HR/BUC/AIPP 2 (DM/2019/01300) does.

This is confirmed as acceptable

d) An Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) has been provided for:

a. Proposed alterations and excavation within RPAs has been provided and is broadly acceptable

b. A specification for the proposed new access road and MS to avoid damage to roots has been provided and is broadly acceptable (DM/2021/00182) and is included in the TREE REPORT - WOODMANCOTE MONMOUTH R2 under DM/2019/01300

However, the AMS has not provided details of regular site monitoring of tree protection and monitoring. This could be provided as a condition for both DM/2019/01300 and DM/2021/00182 and the following condition is therefore recommended to cover this point:

An updated Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) by a qualified arborist shall be provided prior to the commencement of works. The AMS shall include details for the proposed monitoring of tree protection and tree condition inclusive of a chronological programme for site monitoring and production of site reports to be issued to the LPA at the demolition and development phases.
Reason : To safeguard valuable green infrastructure assets in accordance with Council Policy S13 - Landscape, Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment.

5.2 Neighbour Notification

To date 13 objections have been received. Many of the objections raise concern regarding the original scheme which was for the six dwellings that were previously proposed on this site. The points raised in relation to the current development for a single replacement dwelling, (as well as the concern regarding the potential for the site to lead to further development) are listed below

- The shared access is unnecessary as the adjacent development already has access from Highfield Road, therefore further access from Highfield Close would be superfluous
- Woodmancote already has an established access directly onto Highfield Road and that should be kept rather than bringing a long drive through fields to access onto Highfield close which is substandard in width and will add to the issues for existing residents
- The current access to the field could be used as the entrance to the development, and vastly increased and widened, this could serve as a valuable passing place on Highfield Road, which is very steep and narrow, and is currently unpleasant to negotiate. This would be a vast improvement to Highfield Road, and would stop Highfield Close from becoming a new and dangerous rat run
- This is intrinsically linked to the application Woodmancote and should be considered as one application
- This application would set both the location and principle for the access road which we have previously objected to a number of times due to loss of amenity, noise, privacy, light and general insensitive design. They are trying to circumvent the issues by slipping it through as part of this application.
- Planning guidance was for no more than 5 dwellings off a private drive. The applicants plan for a further 6 houses off this drive which will make it 7 dwellings off a private drive and compound all the associated issues. Is this good practice, especially as Woodmancote does not need a new access?

- This application will still need to comply with SAB requirements as the area of the new drive alone will be 400-500m². The level and form of drive will naturally channel rainwater run-off towards the houses at the bottom of Highfield Close unless there is meaningful surface water attenuation and swales etc., built in rather than just expecting a gravel top surface to do the job
- Why can't any drive be located further from our boundaries with a protected landscape zone and trees incorporated to minimize the impact upon us? Surely that would be a more sensitive approach and would also help offset the negative ecological impact, loss of mature trees etc caused by this application
- There has been no recognition of our concerns and detrimental impact of noise, light etc. The road scrapes our boundaries and turns us almost into an island without any consideration. Moving it all further away would allow a proper tree planting zone and help alleviate these issues. It would also enable the vegetation and mature trees alongside our neighbours to be retained rather than obliterated, keeping significant screening and ecological habitat
- The road to the rear has dimensions from the middle of our privet hedge and not the field fence, which is the actual boundary, so this distorts the true picture. There is no space for a proper landscape buffer and the planting plan shows silver birch trees literally right on the true boundary. These grow to 25m and will spread over our property and overshadow us, how / who will maintain these? There is the same issue with hedging on the southern boundary and how this will be maintained from one side or who will be responsible
- All SAB features, including the swale along our boundary will presumably need to be adopted by them. Will they accept trees as shown?
- The apparent piecemeal nature of the development means that construction traffic could be using the road for years and we will suffer long term noise and associated discomfort if seven additional properties are to be built
- The development of one house is one thing but the unsympathetic, overdevelopment of the land which will be overbearing in nature to existing properties is not acceptable
- I would question why there are two planning applications for one project
- Question the accuracy of the boundary line shown on the plan
- While the tidying of the neglected boundary with neighbour's property might be welcome, it is a rich habitat for bird species but also would serve as a screen between our property and the proposed new development
- This is part of the wider application for development of the field as it proposed to be accessed off that development. Surely it should be withdrawn and clearly added to this application rather than adding further plots in underhand manner?
- This proposal will compound the issues we have previously objected to of over-development, loss of privacy and amenity and general nuisance from traffic / light / pollution from the development that would wrap around us in the currently insensitive scheme
- This proposal will directly affect the residents in Highfield Close so why have we not been notified?
- There will be loss of trees / mature hedgerows and loss of ecology
- The overbearing nature of the houses and reduction in privacy / amenity will be significant as well as the impact in terms of noise, light, fumes and disruption from vehicles throughout the day and evening including residents and visitor cars, delivery vans and lorries etc
- Leaving slightly more space behind the neighbour would also allow a more sensitive SAB scheme with swales for sustainable drainage as well as habitat creation and then structural landscape and tree planting zones to form a meaningful buffer, which would surely be a better and more sensitive scheme than swathes of permeable hardstanding?
- The same would apply to the side - why not locate the new road in the middle of that strip with SuDS features and structural landscape either side rather than scraping it along the side of neighbouring property?
- This development is intrinsically linked to the current application for the wider development of the field by the same applicant, and they should be assessed as one rather than slipping it, and the access road, through in a underhand way. Why has this not been made clear in the application information and why is the ownership of the adjacent field not outlined in blue on the site plans?
- Neighbour has discovered an old brick/concrete culvert that seems to run across the site (the demolished bungalow access) and onto my property
- The site plan as shown currently also has a water holding and storage, there is a water storage reservoir on neighbour's site used for grey water and as a means for coping with the excess

surface water that occurs due to the poor porosity of the heavy clay. What happened if the proposed water storage is inadequate but is above my property and overflows?

- How have the existing and new requirements for the site been calculated and why are they being directed to a mains sewer when there might be an existing alternative water course across the site?

-The pathways on our cul-de-sac are used by the residents regularly. Furthermore the proposed build will seriously affect the privacy of all residents on Highfield Close

- Snow and ice make Highfield Close impossible to safely drive a vehicle on it without suitable intervention from MCC's Highways Department.

- There is inadequate parking provision on the Close itself for visitors / deliveries to properties already there, should their driveways be parked upon. The Close is not wide enough to support additional vehicles e.g. delivery vans / lorries, trades people, 'BT Openreach' / other statutory agency vehicles, building development contractors etc. for more than just a few minutes

- Any further increase in traffic would be a danger to all road users

- The shared private drive must have a series of passing spaces along the drive to allow the safe passing of two cars or to be at least 4.1m wide over its length. If the applicants to the development have foreseen this why haven't they foreseen the resulting difficulties on the actual road that forms Highfield Close?

- An increase to air and noise pollution to all those living in the Close and its immediate vicinity during any building process, as well as to the eventual living conditions of further residents should any development take place.

- In the proposed plans there are to be trees and hedges to be removed from the garden to the rear of 'Woodmancote House' and the adjoining field. Behind the property of 6 Highfield Close are trees 8. (Portugal Laurel), 9. (Weeping Willow) and 10. (Ash) and a length of high hedge all of which form part of the natural local landscape character

In the twenty two years that I have been visiting no.6 that rear hedge has been maintained by the neighbour - both on its top and on his side

- I note that the existing boundary between nos. 8 & 8a shows that the vegetation/hedge planting is to be retained. Drawing no. 17/74-PL-201 (the Richards Partnership Project: Woodmancote, Monmouth. Entitled Woodmancote Planting Plan) refers. Why not behind 6 & 8?

- During the course of the year, the vegetation not only supports local wildlife but also acts as a noise barrier to what is going on in the field and housing beyond. They would also be improving air quality by absorbing local patches of CO2. It would appear from the reports that other hedging is to be removed and replaced with posts and wire - hardly conclusive to cutting down on air and noise pollution from a planned roadway shown to the rear of proposed properties 4, 5 & 6 and to the rear of the existing properties, opposite, on Highfield Close

- The addition of housing will add to the risk of flooding as additional surface water will be generated from any development. What contingency plans are in place to remove any surface water generated by the buildings and road proposals into Highfield Close itself and into the gardens of neighbouring properties

- The existing mains sewer, already, I believe, at/near capacity, may need to be renewed or rerouted causing major problems to the present occupants of Highfield Close and, especially, to the owner of no.5 Highfield Close, whose property the main sewage pipe runs through

- MCC Planning Department should perhaps be aware of the lessons learned from the times they gave permission to the former owner of number 4 and present owners of 3 and 8 Highfield Close to extend their own properties and the resulting discomfort to all occupiers of the Close during construction

- The original planning permission granted to rebuild a bigger property on land at 8a Highfield Close, formerly occupied by a bungalow and now knocked down, has apparently been changed. This is because one property was to be in situ on site

- Further Ecological Surveys were carried out in March 2019. Why hasn't there been any further surveys carried out in March 2021?

- Will any proposed construction traffic access the site of Woodmancote?

- Affect local ecology

- Close to adjoining properties

- Development too high

- General dislike of proposal

- Inadequate access

- Inadequate parking provision

- Increase danger of flooding
- Increase in traffic
- Increase of pollution
- Loss of privacy
- Noise nuisance
- Not enough info given on application
- Out of keeping with character of area
- Over development
- Strain on existing community facilities
- Traffic or Highways
- Queried whether all neighbours should be consulted
- Information missing from plans
- Residential Amenity

5.3 Other Representations

Member of Parliament David Davies:

I understand a planning application has been submitted to demolish an existing two-storey dwelling and build several detached properties on Highfield Road in Osbaston. However, it has been brought to my attention that access to the site for the external works to take place will be via Highfield Close.

As you may be aware, Highfield Close is a very narrow cul-de-sac whereby two vehicles are unable to pass each other without having to mount the pavement. It has therefore been suggested that this road would be highly unsuitable for large construction vehicles and would cause significant disruption to local residents.

I must declare that I have a personal interest in this case as I also live in the local vicinity.

Although, I will make clear that I am contacting you on behalf of my constituent and these are the concerns which have been put to me by a number of local residents.

5.4 Local Member Representations

No comment received to date

Please note all representations can be read in full on the Council's website:

<https://planningonline.monmouthshire.gov.uk/online-applications/?lang=EN>

6.0 EVALUATION

6.1 Principle of Development

Monmouth is identified in Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategic Policy S1 as a main town where new build residential development is permitted subject to detailed planning considerations and other policies of the LDP. The principle of the proposal meets the requirements of Strategic Policy S1 and Policy H1 of the LDP, subject to detailed planning considerations. The development would not be subject to any affordable housing contribution as it would be a replacement of the existing dwelling. This application relates to the neighbouring development proposal (DM/2021/00182) in that there is a new shared access proposed that serves both this development and the neighbouring replacement dwelling. Both planning applications are being presented together to Planning Committee.

6.2.1 Good Design

There is no overwhelming type of house design within the surrounding area or a strong architectural style in the vicinity of the site. The existing dwelling has already been demolished. In its place is the site for the new shared access while the new proposed dwelling would be tucked into the field to the rear of Woodmancote to the north and no. 6 Highfield Close to the east. This application proposes to build an individually-designed four-bedroom dwelling to meet high environmental standards and uses high quality materials that work with a similar palate to that proposed on the adjacent site, Woodmancote. The green-roofed elements are a positive

contributing factor to the handling of surface water run-off as part of the SuDS design as well as being an ecological asset; with overhanging canopies helping to mitigate any overheating. There is the main two-storey element which is a flat-roofed, contemporary structure. Rendered gable walled elements are unified with timber clad single-storey elements under a green roof. This is staggered alongside a one and half storey traditionally pitched and proportioned building that is set at a lower ground level with the ridge just below the top of the roof on the main structure. The proposed dwelling works with the ground levels and effectively nestles the development into the site. The orientation of the property is such that the mass of the new development is north-south facing, minimising any potential over-dominating impact upon neighbouring properties; only Woodmancote, the adjacent property to the north will see within close range the main bulk of the elevations. This, however, is mitigated by the proposed development being set at a lower ground level and the generous separating distance. The neighbouring properties along Highfield Close have sight of the shorter gabled ends, but these gable ends are relatively narrow and the built form is staggered; the height has been reduced with the fall in ground levels and the built form is broken up to provide breathing space in between the two main elements of this dwelling. The proposed dwelling sits comfortably on the site, nestled within the topography and would be set against the backdrop of the dwellings on Highfield Close. The form, design and use of natural contemporary materials, coupled with the levels of the site, result in a development that is of a high-quality design that would comply with the relevant planning policies.

6.2.2 Place Making

The area is characterised by individually designed dwellings on spacious plots with mature trees. This development does not immediately add to the sense of place as it is not in the public domain, although there are some glimpsed viewpoints of the development from the west of the site and views from neighbouring dwellings. The orientation, form and staggered layout of the dwelling breaks up the mass of the proposal. This, combined with flat, green-roofed elements, ensure views are maintained for the existing properties in Highfield Close. The landscaping scheme delivers additional trees within this setting, softening the backdrop and retaining and enhancing the landscape belt that helps to assimilate the proposed development into the surrounding area.

What is also a characteristic of this area are the narrow highways and in places sub-standard private accesses to individual houses. This application site delivers a different solution and provides a new shared access with Woodmancote, taken from Highfield Close and wrapping around the rear boundary of 4, 6 and 8 Highfield Close, providing a shared access around the rear. This access can be partly viewed from the neighbouring properties, but once the landscaping matures along the buffer, this will be screened, while viewpoints from the west will view this highway against the backdrop of houses and a landscape buffer. This is not considered to detract from the sense of place.

6.3 Landscape

The visual prominence of an area is a principal consideration in establishing the potential impact on its character or the experience of the area. The site is open to views from the rural landscape to the west, over which there are open panoramic views from within the site. However, it remains well hidden from public views in the immediate vicinity. The application site is a corner of the existing field, in a locally elevated location. There is backdrop of existing trees and the boundaries of Woodmancote and properties on Highfield Close to the north and east. The character of part of the site itself would inevitably change from one of rough grassland to one that is partly developed; however, most of the site remains as open grassland and the new dwelling which sits to the forefront of the dwellings on Highfield Close and adjacent to Woodmancote will be viewed within this context. The proposed individual dwelling has less visual impact and potential impact on the skyline by virtue of its location, local topography and the setting.

The applicant has sought to mitigate for the loss of trees within a planting scheme to the south of the site but within the application boundary. The overall scheme layout, material selection and planting plan inclusive of the green roof to the main building are acceptable. There is further clarification required on the maintenance of the green roof and specification of boundary materials, although this can be covered by planning condition

There are eight trees of lesser importance that are proposed for removal; this is as a result of the new vehicle access proposed, all of these involve trees of moderate to low quality (retention category C).

The neighbours have raised concern regarding the loss of the trees, in particular the willow tree, requesting that the access drive is shifted further away thus allowing this tree to be retained. The latest information submitted to support the application notes, "that the suspected decay in the existing willow is likely to mean that even if it were to be retained it is likely that it would have to be pollarded or even felled within the next few years". The tree is indeed visible from one or two neighbouring properties, although its loss of amenity would be mitigated by the proposed planting of four replacement trees in its immediate area, specified in the planting plan as three silver birches (*Betula pendula*) and one cut-leaved alder (*Alnus glutinosa* Laciniata). There are a total of 29 new trees indicated on the planting plan. Given that all category A and B trees are being retained and only eight category C trees are being removed and replaced with a significantly higher number of trees this is considered to be acceptable in landscape terms.

There are new stretches of native indigenous hedgerow proposed along the north, west and east boundaries, with further ecological enhancement and mitigation hedgerow relating to the hedgerows to be secured via planning condition.

There is potentially a landscape impact arising from the proposed shared access drive. Whilst this application started as an access drive serving six dwellings as part of DM/2019/01300, five houses have been removed and Woodmancote added, thus it would serve two dwellings. The issue is whether this access is visually acceptable in this case. It is stated in the supporting information that the access is positioned as low into the contours of the site as practical to further limit the impact on the properties along Highfield Close as well as on the overall skyline when viewed from further afield. The siting of the proposed access drive is visually less intrusive by reason of its location towards the rear boundaries of the neighbouring dwelling, as it sits against the backdrop of the proposed landscape buffer and the dwellings to the rear. It also does not involve significant alteration in ground levels; the potential intrusion is therefore softened by the backdrop that makes this part of the access drive visually acceptable.

The access from Highfield Close across the site that was 8a will be clearly visible and will read clearly as an engineered access to the field beyond, however the landscaping and surfacing materials proposed in this part of the site help to soften this element of the development and provides a gap between houses in this street frontage. The plot is not dominated by hard surfacing and there is no wider adverse landscape impact as a result of this aspect of the development.

Overall it is considered from a Landscape and GI perspective that the revised proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the urban setting, localised landscape and provisions of PPW (Edition 11), and policies S1, DES1, LC5 and NE1 of the adopted LDP.

6.4 Biodiversity

This application has been supported by ecological reports (including the recently updated reptile survey) that have been accepted by the ecologist and frame the conditions that secure implementation, compliance and enhancement of ecology on this site. It is accepted that the trees that are impacted by the proposal do not appear likely to be of particularly high ecological value.

Ecological enhancement is proposed and indicated but not detailed in language that enables these documents to be conditioned so a condition requiring ecological enhancement (to include any native/beneficial planting, including native hedgerow planting, integrated bat roost feature; bird nesting feature and hedgehog connectivity measures) are to be submitted and detailed as a planning condition. The proposals for Emorsgate seed mixes and gapping up/planting of native hedgerows shown on the Planting Plan are welcomed. Drainage features will be subject to SAB with an opportunity to benefit wildlife wherever possible. A detailed specification and Habitat Management Plan to be secured by planning condition.

Discharge of foul drainage will be via an existing sewer. NRW's latest response to the replacement dwelling states that they are satisfied that the development is unlikely to increase the amount of phosphorous entering the catchment. This is screened out in further detail below.

It can be concluded therefore that the ecological information submitted confirms that subject to planning conditions that the development is acceptable and complies with relevant planning policy in this case.

6.5 Impact on Amenity

The proposed new dwelling is oriented east - west with the mass of the proposed building facing north and south. The neighbouring properties therefore look onto the narrower end gables, which by reason of the lower ground level are not overly high or dominant in terms of visual impact upon the neighbours, with relief provided with the visual gap between the two staggered wings with a connecting single-storey element. The mass is visible from the north and the south, although the staggered layout and use of materials helps to break up the built form. In addition, there is a significant separating distance between Woodmancote to the north and the closest dwelling to the south that ensures there is no adverse impact on residential amenity.

There is a first floor bedroom window on the east elevation, situated in the main two-storey flat roofed part which is staggered further away from the common boundary to the east with 6 Highfield Close. There is more than a satisfactory separating distance from this first floor habitable window and the common boundary with this neighbouring property and there is no adverse impact upon residential amenity due to overlooking in this case.

The viewpoint from no 6 Highfield Close (and partly from no 8 Highfield Close) will change with the new property being located in the foreground interrupting the long views to the west. The new building would be clearly visible, especially in the short term before the proposed tree planting has had an opportunity to mature. While there would inevitably be some adverse visual effects experienced by these residents who overlook the site, the built form of the proposed dwelling is softened significantly by the form, orientation, design and land levels. Furthermore, the properties on Highfield Close benefit from large rear gardens and the separating distance between the dwellings helps to minimise the impact further. The impact upon the amenity of these neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed dwelling alone is not significantly adverse in this case.

It is stated in the supporting information that the access is positioned as low into the contours of the site as practical to further limit the impact on the properties along Highfield Close as well as on the overall skyline when viewed from further afield. The site's eastern boundary with Highfield Close is formed by a hedgerow, which softens ground floor views over the site.

There is concern raised by neighbours on Highfield Close that there will be an impact upon their amenity due to noise and disturbance and pollution arising from the additional traffic as a result of this development. Highfield Close provides access to 13 dwellings and is an existing well-established residential road. There would be an increase in a maximum of 1 - 2 movements expected during the am peak period but this represents a minimal increase and the proposed access is considered acceptable to accommodate the increase in traffic movements without adversely affecting the neighbouring properties along this highway.

The main amenity issue that is being raised by neighbours relates to the proposed new shared access drive and the noise and disturbance caused by additional traffic using Highfield Close. The issue raised is that this shared access drive opens up the site for potentially further development beyond the two replacement dwellings this access is proposed to serve. This is an understandable concern given that the application was submitted originally as a proposal for six dwellings, five new dwellings have since been removed from the proposal, while the proposed replacement dwelling for Woodmancote has been added to be served via the proposed new access off Highfield Road. However, the access along this section remains unchanged with a spur heading south also included in the red line. This clearly is designed to provide access for further development in the future, but the potential for future additional development is not a consideration of this application and would be subject to a separate planning application that would be considered on its own

merits. What is under consideration in terms of amenity is the access road and how this affects neighbour amenity, not what it may potentially lead to in the future. It must be considered on the basis that if any future development never went ahead, is this development including the access acceptable?

The main issue relates to proximity to the rear boundary of 4, 6 and 8 Highfield Close, and in the case of 8 Highfield Close it passes both the south and west boundaries. Whilst this application is for an access that serves one dwelling, it is prudent given the adjacent proposal to consider this on the basis that this is to be used as an access for two dwellings overall.

The proposed new shared access runs adjacent to the southern boundary of 8 Highfield Close and measures 5.8m in width. There are also facing elevations by 10 and 12 Highfield Close. In the case of these two properties the access has been situated towards 8 Highfield Close on the furthest side to accommodate the proposed attenuation area, planting plans and drainage plans comprising a rain garden and cellular storage; this provides more than a suitable buffer to minimise disturbance upon these properties. With the issue of headlights shining into these properties, the turning area on Highfield Close is orientated so there would be no direct shining of headlights into these properties by cars entering and leaving from this new access.

The red line boundary along this section runs midway into the hedgerow with the common boundary for 8 Highfield Close, there is a separating distance from the middle of this hedge to the edge of the shared driveway of 1.75m. There is however a strong common boundary, and there is a drop in ground levels from the neighbouring property to the application site. Previously this access served one dwelling which stopped midway along this boundary. The difference with this proposal is that it runs the full length of the side of the property and potentially serves two dwellings, not just one. If it was to serve one dwelling only there would be little difference in vehicular movements. However, in the case of two dwellings there would be a marginal increase in traffic movements adjacent to the neighbour's boundary. Owing to the separating distance, level changes and the interspersed vegetation (which is to be bolstered by infilling the gaps in the hedgerow) there is sufficient mitigation to prevent this access from having a significant adverse impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring property.

Within the site the access runs parallel with rear of 4, 6 and 8 Highway Close, this reduces to 4.8m and then 4.1m, this is set off the common boundary by 3m to 3.1m, there is a buffer proposed comprising a reinforced landscaping strip with trees, hedgerow and a SAB feature. It is stated in the supporting information that the access is positioned as low into the contours of the site as practical to further limit the impact on the properties along Highfield Close as well as on the overall skyline when viewed from further afield. The level of traffic movements resulting from two dwellings coupled with the separating distance and buffer proposed provides a level of mitigation that prevents this from having a significant impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring properties in this case.

The neighbour has raised the issue that as the applicant also owns the land to the west, the development should therefore be shifted further west to provide a more substantial buffer to mitigate further the noise and disturbance arising from the vehicles using the access drive. This has implications upon the drainage design as levels change to the west of the proposed drive, and would also make the access more visible from the vantage points to the west. While this may be advantageous to neighbours it has an impact elsewhere. Therefore, the access is to be considered on the merits of where it is now proposed to be sited, not on where it could possibly be moved to. In this case, given the site characteristics, level of traffic, separating distance and buffer proposed it is considered acceptable in this case.

The proposed development including the access is not considered to have a significant adverse impact upon neighbour amenity in this case.

6.6 Highways

MCC Highways have been consulted throughout this proposal and offer no objections subject to planning conditions. The conditions have been framed to ensure that the replacement dwelling is developed and built out with minimal disruption; this includes requirement for the access and turning area to be in place prior to works commencing on site (including demolition), no surface water to drain onto highway and the submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan.

The neighbours have raised a number of issues, one of which is whether the access is suitable for what would be seven dwellings if the remaining five dwellings came forward in the future. The additional five dwellings are not part of the consideration of this application - at most this is being considered as a shared drive for two replacement dwellings, subject to this application and DM/2021/00182. The Highway Engineer has confirmed that the creation of a new access to serve both replacement dwellings can be accommodated off Highfield Close (it is noteworthy that since the submission of this application Welsh Government has published a suite of design standards, known as the Welsh Governments Common Standards for Residential, Industrial & Commercial Estate Roads that sets out the required standards for private shared drives and limits the number of dwellings to five).

Concerns have been raised that this proposal in addition to the adjacent site would lead to a dangerous increase in traffic using Highfield Close and there is also concern that this highway is too narrow to serve existing traffic with a refuse lorry having to reverse along the highway. The actual additional traffic is at the most associated with one net increase in dwellings, as the adjacent site is a replacement dwelling for 8a Highway Close that was already served from this highway. Highfield Close provides access to 13 dwellings, is approximately 4m wide and benefits from footways on both sides. Highfield Close is an existing well established residential street and is considered acceptable to accommodate the increase in traffic movements, an increase in a maximum of 1 - 2 movements would be expected during the am peak period. Highfield Close benefits from footways whereas Highfield Road along the site frontage of Woodmancote does not. These footways provide pedestrian access to the footways on Highfield Road and Hereford Road and beyond. It should also be noted that the provision of an access off the end of Highfield Close will provide an opportunity for vehicles to turn around and travel in a northerly in a forward gear along Highfield Close. All the properties in Highfield Close benefit from good off-street parking so parking on-street should be limited.

The issue has been raised that the proposed access is too engineered to serve just two dwellings. The Council's Highway Engineer has confirmed that the current proposal does not accord with the standards for what would be considered to be an adoptable residential street but a shared private drive is appropriate.

The proposed new access is acceptable from a highway standpoint and complies with relevant planning policy.

6.7 Flooding

The application site is not in an area at risk of flooding. The flood risk maps provided by Natural Resources Wales do not indicate the site to be at particular risk of flooding. Our database of previous flood events does not record any flood events in close proximity to the site. Our database of drainage and flood assets does not record any drainage or flood assets in close proximity to the site. Therefore there is no objection to the proposed development on flooding grounds.

6.8 Drainage

6.8.1 Foul Drainage

The application site is within the Wye River SAC. Under the Habitats Regulations, where a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, and where it is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site previously (designated pursuant to EU retained law) the competent authority must carry out an appropriate assessment of the implication of the plan or project in view of the site's conservation objectives. Natural Resources Wales has set new phosphate standards for the river SACs in Wales. Any proposed development within the SAC catchments that might increase the amount of phosphate within the catchment could lead to additional damaging effects to the SAC features and therefore such proposals must be screened through a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to determine whether they are likely to have a significant effect on the SAC condition.

The objective around the management of riverine phosphate is to prevent a net gain in dwellings on the land at this time. This application was therefore amended to be solely a replacement dwelling of 8a Highfield Close. Therefore this scheme involves just plot 1, with plots 2 - 6 omitted from the application. It should be noted that the agent has stated that the scheme is designed to facilitate further dwellings to come forward at a time when a nutrient neutrality solution is in place, but any further development will be subject a separate planning application and considered on its own merits.

This application has been screened in accordance with Natural Resources Wales' interim advice for planning applications within the riverine Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) catchments (issued on 2nd May 2021). It is considered that this development is unlikely to increase phosphate inputs as it falls within the following criterion in the interim advice:

Any development that does not increase the volume of foul wastewater

This proposal is a replacement dwelling for 8a Highfield Close. Whilst 8a Highfield Close has been demolished and removed from site, it has the benefit of an extant planning permission (DC/2018/00217) Approved 12/04/2018 for the 'Demolition of concrete sectional bungalow and replace with two storey covered ceiling dwelling. Demolish detached garage and replace with double garage with study over'. This was to be built on the plot of 8a, this site differs in that the position of the replacement dwelling has changed. However, there remains no increase in the volume of wastewater.

6.8.2 Surface Water Drainage

The proposed development will require a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) designed, constructed and maintained in accordance with the Statutory Standards for SuDS in Wales and approved by MCC as SuDS Approving Body (SAB). The agents have proposed a sustainable drainage strategy appropriate for the scheme that will also be subject to a SAB application. This strategy has been tailored to serve the wider development of the land and includes permeable paving, rain gardens and shallow wetland attenuation. The proposed landscaping scheme has been amended to align with the sustainable drainage strategy. The proposed drainage and landscaping strategy presented is applied to both planning applications.

The SAB has received and undertaken initial review of the proposed SuDS (SAB application reference SAB/2022/055) and there is no objection on grounds of surface water drainage. The proposals appear to have identified a suitable surface water drainage destination (DCWW have confirmed that they consider the sewer to be combined rather than foul). The proposals include high quality green SuDS features including a green roof and rain gardens which are welcomed by the SAB. The detail of the SuDS proposals will be further examined during appraisal of the SAB application (a separate process to the planning application).

In response to neighbour concerns regarding the landscape buffer and the trees impacting upon the surface water drainage, it is not considered that this will create a conflict with the landscape buffer from the details that have been submitted to date to the SAB team, however this will be subject to further scrutiny during the consideration of the SuDS application, the team are aware of the concerns that have been raised.

A neighbour has raised concern regarding an old brick/concrete culvert that seems to run across the site (the demolished bungalow access). The Council's surface water drainage officer has visited the site and what has been discovered is a concrete covering. This does not have an impact on the proposed development. Concerns regarding surface water holding and discharge rates will be covered in the detail of the SAB application.

6.9 Response to the Representations of Third Parties and/or Community/Town Council

6.9.1 The concerns raised by neighbours and the Town Council are summarised below:

- Access (addressed in para 6.5 Impact on Amenity and 6.6 Highways)
- This is linked to a further 6 houses on the adjacent fields and they should be dealt with as one. (addressed in para 6.5 Impact on Amenity)

- This application would set both the location and principal for the access road which we have previously objected to a number of times due to loss of amenity, noise, privacy, light and general insensitive design. They are trying to circumvent the issues by slipping it through as part of this application. (addressed in para 6.5 Impact on Amenity and 6.6 Highways)

- Suitability of Highfield Close (addressed in para 6.5 Impact on Amenity and 6.6 Highways)

- Compliance with SAB requirements (addressed in para 6.8.2 Surface Water Drainage)

- Why can't any drive be located further from our boundaries with a protected landscape zone and trees incorporated to minimize the impact upon us? Surely that would be a more sensitive approach and would also help offset the negative ecological impact, loss of mature trees etc caused by this application. (addressed in para 6.5 Impact on Amenity and 6.6 Highways)

The road to the rear has dimensions from the middle of our privet hedge and not the field fence, which is the actual boundary, so this distorts the true picture. There is no space for a proper landscape buffer and the planting plan shows silver birch trees literally right on the true boundary. These grow to 25m and will spread over our property and overshadow us, how / who will maintain these? There is the same issue with hedging on the southern boundary and how this will be maintained from one side or who will be responsible.

(There is a condition that covers ongoing maintenance of landscaping to cover this issue).

The apparent piecemeal nature of the development means that construction traffic could be using the road for years and we will suffer long term noise and associated discomfort if seven additional properties are to be built.

(A condition requiring a construction management plan to be submitted is proposed).

- Affect local ecology (addressed in para 6.3 Landscape)

- Close to adjoining properties (addressed in para 6.5 Impact on Amenity)

- Development too high (addressed in para 6.5 Impact on Amenity)

- General dislike of proposal (addressed in para 6.2 Design)

- Increase in traffic (addressed in para 6.5 Impact on Amenity and 6.6 Highways)

- Increase of pollution (addressed in para 6.5 Impact on Amenity)

- Loss of privacy (addressed in para 6.5 Impact on Amenity)

- Noise nuisance (addressed in para 6.5 Impact on Amenity)

- Out of keeping with character of area (addressed in para 6.2 Design)

- Over development (addressed in para 6.2 Design)

- Strain on existing community facilities

(no additional dwellings are proposed, so this would not be relevant).

- Queried whether all neighbours should be consulted

(All adjoining neighbours were consulted and a site notice posted).

- Residential Amenity (addressed in para 6.5 Impact on Amenity)

There will be loss of trees / mature hedgerows and loss of ecology (addressed in para 6.4 Biodiversity and 6.3 Landscape)

There doesn't seem to be any Sustainable drainage / SAB features or design as part of this overall scheme (addressed in para 6.4 Biodiversity, 6.3 landscape and 6.8.2 Surface Water Drainage)

The same would apply to the side - why not locate the new road in the middle of that strip with SuDs features and structural landscape either side rather than scraping it along the side of neighbouring property. (addressed in para 6.5 Impact on Amenity)

Neighbour has discovered a old brick/concrete culvert that seems to run across the site with surface water drainage queries

(addressed in para 6.8.2 Surface Water Drainage).

Proposed construction traffic (addressed in para 6.6 Highways)

Maintenance of hedgerows (addressed 6.3 Landscape; ongoing maintenance is covered by planning condition)

Different standards relating to existing condition of Highfield Close and the requirements for a shared drive on the proposed new access (addressed in 6.6 Highways)

6.10 Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015

6.10.1 The duty to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales has been considered, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, under section 3 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (the WBFG Act). In reaching this recommendation, the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WBFG Act have been taken into account and it is considered that this recommendation is in accordance with the sustainable

development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives set out in section 8 of the WCFG Act.

6.11 Conclusion

6.11.1 The proposed dwelling sits comfortably on the site, nestled within the contours at the corner of a larger grassland area. The proposal is a high quality design that uses cladding and natural materials to help assimilate this development within the context of this area. The green roofed elements are a positive contributing factor to the handling of surface water run-off as part of the SuDS design as well as being an ecological asset. The proposed new dwelling is considered to contribute to the visual appearance of the area, by virtue of the high quality design and how it works with the land levels to nestle the proposed development into the site, against a more urban backdrop with a strong landscaping scheme that helps to soften the visual impact of the proposed development upon the surrounding area.

The proposed development has retained what is characteristic of this area maintaining that sense of place, with a high quality design of property that embraces the topography of the site. The ecological information submitted confirms that subject to planning conditions, the development is acceptable and complies with relevant planning policy. The proposed development, including the access, is not considered to have a significant adverse impact upon neighbour amenity in this case. The proposed demolition of 8a Highway Close has already been undertaken, while the principle of its replacement is already established with an extant planning consent. From a landscape and GI perspective, the proposed new replacement dwelling will not have a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the wider valued landscape. The Highway Authority has been consulted throughout this proposal and offers no objections subject to planning conditions. The conditions have been framed to ensure that the replacement dwelling is developed and built out with minimal disruption.

The proposal has been fully assessed both in relation to the single replacement dwelling and in relation to the shared access. This has been considered on the basis of it providing access to both this dwelling and the adjacent proposed dwelling. In conclusion the proposal is considered to be compliant with all relevant planning policies and is recommended for approval accordingly.

7.0 RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Conditions:

1 This development shall be begun within 5 years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the list of approved plans set out in the table below.

REASON: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved drawings, for the avoidance of doubt.

3 Prior to the commencement of development full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include:

Detailed scaled plans, showing existing and proposed levels.

Proposed and existing utilities/services above and below ground.

Soft landscape details shall include: means of protection, planting plan, specifications including species, size, density and number, cultivation and other operations associated with green roof, rain water garden, planting and seeding establishment.

Hard surfacing materials.

Minor artefacts and structures (e.g. Refuse or other storage units, fencing, signs and lighting).

REASON: In the interests of visual and landscape amenity; in accordance with Policies DES1 & LC1/5 of the Local Development Plan

4 A schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of five years shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing and shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation.

All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

REASON: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by the proper maintenance of existing and / or new landscape features.

5 All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendations of appropriate British Standards or other recognised Codes of Good Practice. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the timetable agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs and ensure the provision afforded by appropriate Landscape Design and Green Infrastructure LC5, DES 1, S13, and GI 1 and NE1

6 Prior to commencement of any construction works a detailed plan of proposed biodiversity enhancement illustrating "net benefit features" to include bird nesting and bat roosting provision identifying location, positioning and specification, The scheme shall provide for the future management and an implementation timetable and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only proceed in accordance with the approved plans and shall be retained as such thereafter.

REASON: To provide biodiversity net benefit and ensure compliance with PPW 11, the Environment (Wales) Act 2016 and LDP policy NE1

7 Prior to commencement of development an updated Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) by a qualified arborist shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The AMS shall include details for the proposed monitoring of tree protection and tree condition inclusive of a chronological programme for site monitoring and production of site reports to be issued to the LPA at the demolition and development phases. The development shall be implemented fully in accordance with the approved AMS.

REASON: To safeguard valuable green infrastructure assets in accordance with Council Policy S13 - Landscape, Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment.

8 Prior to any works commencing on site a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, the CTMP shall take into account the specific environmental and physical constraints of Highfield Close and the adjoining highway network. The CTMP shall include traffic management measures, hours of working, measures to control dust, noise and related nuisances, measures to protect adjoining users from construction works, provision for the unloading and loading of construction materials and waste within the curtilage of the site, the parking of all associated construction vehicles. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CTMP.

REASON: To protect the amenity of the surrounding area in accordance with Policy EP1 of the LDP and to ensure compliance with LDP Policy MV1

9 No development shall commence until details of the design, height and materials proposed for the screen walls or fences shown on the layout plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Such walls and fences shall be erected before the dwelling is completed or occupied whichever is the earlier and retained in perpetuity.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development takes place and to ensure compliance with LDP Policy DES1.

10 Surface water flows from the development shall only communicate with the public combined sewer through an attenuation device that discharges at a rate not exceeding 0.25 l/s.

REASON: To prevent hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system, to protect the health and safety of existing residents and ensure no pollution of or detriment to the environment

11 Before the approved development is first occupied the means of access, together with the parking spaces and turning facilities, shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved plan.

REASON: To ensure the access is constructed in the interests of highway safety and to ensure compliance with LDP Policy MV1.

12 No surface water shall be permitted to drain from the site onto the adjoining highway or into the highway drainage system.

REASON: To ensure no surface water drains onto the highway and to ensure compliance with LDP Policy MV1.

13 No development hereby approved other than that associated with the proposed accesses shall commence until the means of access has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans and turning provision provided to enable all delivery, construction and contractor's vehicles to turn within the curtilage of the site as well as providing for suitable levels of on-site parking.

REASON: To ensure the access is constructed in the interests of highway safety and to ensure compliance with LDP Policy MV1.

14 Notwithstanding the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no lighting or lighting fixtures shall be installed on the building or in the curtilage until an appropriate lighting plan which includes low level PIR lighting, provides detail of lighting type, positioning and specification, and ensures that roosting and foraging/commuting habitat for bats is protected from light spill, has been agreed in writing with the LPA.

REASON: To safeguard roosting and / or foraging/commuting habitat of Species of Conservation Concern in accordance with LDP policies NE1 and EP3.