

**Application Number:** DM/2021/00182

**Proposal:** Demolition of existing two-storey dwelling. Construction of a two-storey replacement dwelling including integral garage and amended access

**Address:** Woodmancote, Highfield Road/ Highfield Close, Osbaston, Monmouth

**Applicant:** Miss Juliet Bucknall

**Plans:** Block Plan 5302 P01 - D, Floor Plans - Proposed 5302 P02 - B, Elevations - Proposed 5302 P03 - A, Other NP253HR/JBUC/ACP - , Tree Protection Plan NP253HR/JBUC/AIPP - , Site Plan 5302 P05 - C, Bat Survey A BAT SURVEY OF WOODMANCOTE, Eric Palmer MCIEEM, Link Ecology Ltd. Dated March 2019 - , Bat Survey Update Bat Survey By: Eric Palmer MCIEEM Link Ecology Ltd. September 2020 - , Tree Survey Tree Survey and Arboricultural Constraints Report - , Drainage GRAYS-10165-TN01-R0 - , Planting Plan 17-74-PL203 Rev A - A, Drainage 10165-GRY-XX-XX-DR-C-002 Rev P1 - , Tree Survey Tree survey and arboricultural constraints report Notes to exp Section 3 Arb constraints Nov 2020 - , Tree Protection Plan NP253HR/BUC/AIPP 1 - Arb impact \_ Tree protection

## **RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE**

Case Officer: Ms Jo Draper  
Date Valid: 03.08.2022

### **3 1.0 APPLICATION DETAILS**

#### 1.1 Site Description

This is a full planning application for a replacement dwelling, new access road and an amendment to the domestic curtilage of Woodmancote, Highfield Road, Monmouth. The application site is located within the development boundary of Monmouth.

The existing property, Woodmancote, is a 1950s detached house and the plot measures 0.5 hectares and is densely covered by mature foliage and trees. The site is currently accessed from Highfield Road. There are neighbouring properties on the opposite side of Highfield Road and to the east of the application site. There is a field to the south and west of the existing house, this area is subject to a current planning application (DM/2019/01300) which is also being presented to Planning Committee alongside this application. DM/2019/01300 originally proposed five new detached dwellings, a replacement dwelling, and a new access off Highfield Close through the plot of what was 8a Highfield Close; this dwelling has been demolished. During the course of the application the riverine phosphate pollution issue emerged, leading to the five dwelling element being removed from the scheme. Planning application DM/2019/01300 is now for a replacement dwelling only.

The area is characterised by a mix of house types. The existing dwelling is situated in an elevated position with views all around to the surrounding countryside. The house is screened from distant views by the substantial mature trees in the existing garden. The existing boundaries are demarcated by hedgerows and mature trees.

#### 1.2 Proposal Description

The proposed replacement dwelling is situated on the footprint of the existing dwelling. The proposed scheme is contemporary in design with some traditional forms in terms of a pitched roof

two-storey element for the main part and ancillary single storey elements. The agent has stated that the house will be constructed with a highly insulated airtight timber frame using the principles of 'Passivhaus' as far as possible within the constraints of the site (as the mature trees restrict the position, layout and form of the house significantly). Revised plans have been submitted that have reduced the scale of this proposal.

There is a green roof proposed on parts of the proposal. The proposal includes a ground floor bedroom and an integral single garage with workshop/storage. External materials proposed comprise timber cladding, rendered walls, aluminium clad windows and doors, green roofing and natural slate roofing.

The site boundary was amended during the course of this application to close the existing vehicle access from Highfield Road and use the shared access proposed to serve the adjacent development proposed under Planning Application DM/2019/01300. The plot of 8a Highfield Close was purchased by the applicants to facilitate access to the adjacent site that serves the development proposed under DM/2019/01300; this has since been demolished and it is proposed that this new single access serves both this replacement dwelling and the single replacement dwelling proposed on the adjacent site under DM/2019/01300. This single shared access serving both properties is proposed to run adjacent to the rear boundary of numbers 4, 6 and 8 Highfield Close. It is proposed to close the vehicle access serving this property onto Highfield Road, making it pedestrian only.

The shared access runs parallel with the rear common boundary of 4, 6 and 8 Highfield Close. 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 Highfield Close, the distance from the boundary (the centre of hedge) and the new access is approx. 3m in 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 a swale, while a filter drain is proposed along the edge of this shared access drive.

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 to the rear of 6 Highfield Close and adjacent to the proposed replacement dwelling subject to DM/2019/01300. The access also forks off to the south (this is remaining from the original submission of DM/2019/01900 for the six dwellings that included the residential unit to the south, the five dwellings have been removed whilst the phosphates and drainage issues are being addressed, although the first part of the access has been kept in with this application boundary). Within the site that was 8a Highfield Close this is to become the proposed attenuation area, with proposed planting and drainage accommodating a rain garden and cellular storage.

It is proposed to alter the residential curtilage boundary of Woodmancote shifting it to the south to square off the site accommodating a rain garden in the revised garden curtilage as well as other ecological enhancements the details of which the agent has requested are provided as a condition if this application is approved. There are two sections of hedge to be removed: the *Lonicera nitida* hedge (H5) that forms the current southern boundary of the garden is to be replaced by a new hedge slightly further to the south to be of a mixed native species as specified in the Planting Plan. There is also a section of hedge that currently extends to the south that is to be removed to make way for the proposed Rain Garden / Bioretention area planting.

The ecological report submitted with this application recommends in-built bat boxes and nesting provision targeting house martins and swifts for ecological enhancement. Proposals to be included within the new curtilage of Woodmancote and forming part of the ecological enhancements of the whole site include a wildlife pond with hibernaculum and log pile.

Updated tree information has been submitted and this confirms that the proposed new dwelling sits largely upon the footprint of the existing house, the layout having been designed to have a minimal impact upon any of the most significant trees.

There are, however, eight trees of lesser importance proposed for removal, this is as a result of the new vehicular access proposed. It should be noted 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."

## 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 Consideration	
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

S13 LDP Landscape, Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment  
S17 LDP Place Making and Design

### 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

## 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.

### **Technical Advice Notes**

TAN 12: Design

## **5.0 REPRESENTATIONS**

### 5.1 Consultation Replies

**Monmouth Town Council** 04.10.2022 Recommendation: refusal on the following grounds:

1. Lack of information regarding drainage
2. Impact on neighbours
3. Access to property

Concerns were raised about the potential impact on neighbours in regard to access along Highfield Close. Councillors noted the comments made by neighbours, particularly in respect of the possibility that this application was being used as a gateway development. Councillors questioned the need for new access to this development when access is already available on Highfield Road.

Concerns were raised that the change in access to Highfield Close would cause a loss of amenity for existing residents due to the increased traffic using the narrow highway. The increased traffic would include construction vehicles for a period of time which could cause potential obstructions on the highway.

It was noted that previously the committee had raised concerns with the lack of information regarding drainage. Councillors noted the SAB Officer still had concerns about the proposed drainage on site.

**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.

Discharge of foul drainage will be via an existing sewer. I note NRW's commences on application DC/2019/01300 dated 12 August 2021:

We understand from the information available on your website that Welsh Water have confirmed that there is no phosphorus permit at the Monmouth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). Referring to our Planning Advice (May 2021) the applicant should also confirm whether the necessary treatment capacity - to remain within existing discharge permit limits - will be delivered within the current Asset Management Plan (AMP) period. If not, we would expect the applicant to liaise with DCWW regarding phosphorus removal options for the WwTW and discuss what provision could be made to remove additional phosphorus from the connection.

In response to the clarification required by the ecologist regarding reptiles there were three outstanding issues of the ecologist's response from September 2022. Additional information has been submitted to address this.

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 to be ruled out or 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 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

From a Landscape and GI perspective the proposed two-storey dwelling footprint although larger is aligned to avoid tree RPZ and orientate to provide a more sustainable and energy efficient aspect. Due to the current mature nature of the existing garden and boundary treatments it is considered that the visual impact on the wider landscape setting and urban character of the proposed lower profile dwelling will be minimised. It is noted on plan ref 5302 P 01 A that there will be a break in hedge boundary as well as ecological enhancements in association with a surface drainage feature. Further clarity would be welcome to include any new soft landscaping as part of a SuDS scheme plus mitigation for loss of hedge.

From a Landscape and GI perspective the revised planting plan and layout as per dwg 17-74-PL-203 rev A is acceptable. A landscape maintenance and management plan will be required that includes proposed maintenance and management of landscape elements of the SuDS i.e. rain garden, swale and attenuation areas inclusive of filter changes and reinstatement of planting / seeding if impacted.

The plan document should also show planting details and methodology for tree planting in the vicinity of the attenuation cellular storage and outfalls to ensure root barriers are considered to ensure integrity of the system. This can be provided prior to determination or as a condition should the application progress to approval

The proposed demolition of existing two-storey dwelling. Construction of a two-storey replacement dwelling including integral garage and amended access will not from a landscape and GI perspective have a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the wider valued landscape, provisions of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11) February 2021 and policies S13, NE1 and LC5 of the Monmouthshire County Council Adopted Development Plan 2011-2021. Conditions 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

Having reviewed the updated information provided, we have no further comments to make and would direct the applicant to our earlier comments for this application and the related DM/2019/01300.

Following receipt of a re-consultation dated 24/11/2021 the highway authority has reviewed the application and the supporting information uploaded to the planning website on 02/11/2021 and thereafter does not affect the highway authority's earlier position regarding this application.

The application proposes the demolition of an existing dwelling and construction of a replacement with an amended means of access. The amended means of access and the proposed dwelling replacement has been the subject of a separate planning application, planning application number DM/2019/01300, that is currently not determined.

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 highway; 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 eight objections have been received. The points raised are as follows:

-This development already has access from Highfield Road, therefore further access from Highfield Close would be superfluous.

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 another planning submission for a further six houses on the adjacent fields and they should be dealt with as one.

- 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.

- The house already has an established access directly onto Highfield Road and that should be kept in our opinion 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

-We always understood that planning guidance was for no more than five dwellings off a private drive. The applicants plan for a further six houses off this drive which will make it seven dwellings off a private drive and compound all the associated issues. Is this good practice, especially as this one 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 400-500m<sup>2</sup>. 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 there would be detrimental impact due to 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 our property might be welcome on the one hand, it is not only a rich habitat for a number of 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 behind us as it proposes 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 wanton destruction of a perfectly serviceable and attractive house - the access to this new development must only be from Highfield Road.
- 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 visitors' 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 zone 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.

- We have pointed out a number of times that this 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. I wonder if this has been considered as a route for water that comes out lower down the hill?
- The site plan as shown currently also has a water holding and storage. Given I have a water storage reservoir on my site that we are using 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 you calculated the existing and new requirements for the site and why are they being directed to a mains sewer when there might be an existing alternative water course across the site?

- 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

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 constituents and these are the concerns which have been put to me by a number of local residents.

### 5.3 Other Representations

No further comment requested

### 5.4 Local Member Representations

No formal comment submitted

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. As such the principle of the proposal meets the requirements of Strategic Policy S1 and Policy H1 of the LDP in principle, 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/2019/01300) in that there is a new shared access proposed that serves both this development and the neighbouring property.

#### 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. This existing dwelling has aspects that have merit, but the main elevations have been subject to piecemeal alterations and the dwelling appears to be in poor condition. In its place, this application proposes to build an individually designed three bedroom dwelling which shares the same language and palette of materials as the adjoining proposed development. It is designed to meet high environmental standards whilst respecting the

mature trees that frame this site. There is the main two-storey element which is traditionally pitched and proportioned, rendered gable-walled elements are unified with timber clad single-storey elements under a green roof. The proposed dwelling sits comfortably on the site, nestled within the mature trees on site that works with cladding and natural materials and helps to 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, with overhanging canopies helping to mitigate any overheating. The proposed new dwelling is not considered to have an adverse impact on the visual appearance of the area, moreover, will contribute to the visual appearance of the area, by virtue of the high quality design and how it sits within the mature landscaping that frames the site.

### 6.2.2 Place Making

This area is characterised by spacious plots, individually designed residential units, houses set back from the highway frontage but with no uniform building line and featuring mature trees set within both private land and on the highway verges. This application site also meets these characteristics, the proposed dwelling is a high quality individually-designed contemporary dwelling which works in association with the mature landscaping that is being retained and frames the site and is totally in character with this 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 has sought to address this by removing the existing vehicle access from Highfield Road and moving it to 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, whilst viewpoints from the west will see this highway against the backdrop of houses and a landscape buffer and as such, will not be out of keeping with the character of the area. The proposed development has retained what is characteristic within this area maintaining that sense of place, whilst addressing a feature that is less desirable by altering the vehicular access.

### **6.3 Landscape**

The application site is situated on the crest of the hill with vantage points from the surrounding area; such viewpoints are interspersed by substantial mature trees that screen distant views of the site particularly from the north and the west. From a Landscape and GI perspective, the proposed two-storey dwelling footprint, although larger, is aligned to avoid any tree root protection zone and works with the mature trees that envelope this site. Due to the current mature nature of the existing garden and boundary treatments it is considered that the visual impact on the wider landscape setting and urban character of the proposed lower profile dwelling will be minimised. There will be a break in the hedge boundary, with ecological enhancements in association with a surface drainage feature proposed within the small extension of garden curtilage. There is a need for further clarity regarding new soft landscaping which is required as part of a SuDS scheme plus mitigation for loss of some hedge, the detail of this will be secured by relevant planning conditions. There are eight trees of lesser importance that are proposed for removal, this is as a result of the new vehicular access proposed, all of these proposed removals involve trees of moderate to low quality (retention category C).

The neighbours have raised concern regarding the loss of the trees, in particular a willow tree, requesting that the access drive is shifted further away thus allowing this tree to be retained. The latest information submitted with the supplementary 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 in total twenty-nine 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 and replaced with a significantly higher number of trees.

There are two sections of hedge that are to be removed due to the proposed extension of garden curtilage and the accommodation of the proposed Rain Garden / Bioretention area planting. The new curtilage boundary is planted with an ecologically rich indigenous species hedgerow. Further ecological enhancement and mitigation of hedgerow would be secured via planning condition.

There is potentially a landscape impact arising from the proposed shared access drive, and whilst it started as an access road serving six dwellings as part of DM/2019/01300, five houses have been removed in this case and Woodmancote added. Thus the new access would serve two dwellings. The key issue is whether this access is visually acceptable in this case. The siting of the access drive is visually less intrusive by siting it towards the rear boundaries of the neighbouring dwellings, 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, and 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 no. 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 part of the development and provides a gap between houses in this street frontage resulting in this plot not being dominated by hard surfacing; there is no wider adverse landscape impact as a result of this aspect of the development.

The proposed demolition of the existing two-storey dwelling and construction of a two-storey replacement dwelling including integral garage and amended access will not, from a landscape and GI perspective, have a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the wider valued landscape, the provisions of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11) February 2021 and policies S13, NE1 and LC5 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 Council's 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 seed mixes and gapping up/planting of native hedgerows shown on the Planting Plan are welcomed. Drainage features will be subject to SAB approval with an opportunity to benefit wildlife wherever possible. A detailed specification and Habitat Management Plan would need to be secured by planning condition.

Discharge of foul drainage will be via an existing sewer. NRW's latest response to the replacement dwelling on the adjacent site under DM/2019/01300 provides 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, the development is acceptable and complies with relevant planning policy.

## **6.5 Impact on Amenity**

The existing mature trees and hedges along the Highfield Road boundary provide sufficient landscape screening between the existing development and neighbouring properties to the north of the site. Closest properties to the redevelopment are Ty Bryn, Highfield Road, 4 Highfield Close and if approved Plot 1 of the proposed new replacement dwelling.

The proposed replacement dwelling will have less impact on Ty Bryn than the existing house, given that it has been relocated and is designed with single-storey elements where a two-storey currently stands. The closest part of the development to Ty Bryn is the garage with its flat green roof which sits alongside Ty Bryn's garage. There is a strong established mature hedge boundary along the eastern boundary that softens and screens the development from the aspect of Ty Bryn and 4 Highfield Close, thus minimising any potential over-dominating impact. There are first floor windows proposed on the east elevation of the proposed dwelling, although the new dwelling is set back from Ty Gwyn so there is no direct overlooking into the neighbour's habitable rooms. In

addition, the separating distance is acceptable which, combined with the intervening boundary vegetation, minimises overlooking into the private amenity space. This applies also to 4 Highfield Close - the separation space and vegetation minimises immediate overlooking. There is more than a sufficient separating distance between this proposed dwelling and the dwelling proposed to the rear on the adjacent site (subject to planning application DM/2019/01300). There is no direct impact upon the amenity of these neighbouring properties as a result of the dwelling alone.

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

The main amenity issue that has been 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 for the adjacent site was submitted originally as a proposal for six dwellings; five new dwellings have since been removed, a single new build dwelling (which is the replacement dwelling for what was previously 8a Highfield Close) remains situated at the furthest point tucked in behind the proposed new south boundary of Woodmancote. 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 potential access for further development in the future. The potential for future further development is not a consideration of this application this will be subject to a separate planning application and 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 numbers 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 presence of the adjacent proposal to consider this on the basis that this is to be used as an access for two dwellings also.

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 indicate this area will comprise a rain garden and cellular storage, providing 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 is 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 2 dwellings, not just one. In the case it is to serve one dwelling there is little difference in vehicular movement. However, in the case of two dwellings there will be a marginal increase in traffic movement adjacent to the neighbour's boundary, although given the separating distance, level changes, coupled with the interspersed vegetation (to be bolstered by infilling the gaps in hedgerow) this is sufficient to prevent this new 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 4.8 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. 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 the case of 4 Highfield Close, there is just this application site being accessed so the traffic movements are for one property. As such, the impact upon this property is mitigated further by the lower number of traffic movements.

A 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, this would also make the access more visible from the vantage points to the west, so whilst this may be advantageous to neighbours it has an impact elsewhere. Thus, the access is to be considered on its merits where it is sited, not on where it could possibly be moved to. In this case, given the site characteristics, level of traffic, separating distance and buffer zone proposed it is considered acceptable.

The proposed development including the means of access is not considered to have a significant adverse impact upon neighbour amenity.

## **6.6 Highways**

The highway authority has 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 the highway and submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan.

The supporting information states that the existing access has poor visibility and restricted access between mature trees, with a hard impermeable drive and parking areas situated under trees.

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 the most this is being considered as a shared drive for two replacement dwellings, subject to this application and the application DM/2019/01300. The Council's Highways 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 DM/2019/01300 the Welsh Government has published a suite of design standards, known as the Welsh Government's Common Standards for Residential, Industrial & Commercial Estate Roads; this 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 provide a dangerous increase in traffic using Highfield Close. There is a 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 the amount associated with one dwelling, 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 over the site frontage 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 direction in a forward gear along Highfield Close. All the properties in Highfield Close benefit from good levels of off-street parking so parking on the road should be limited.

The closure of the existing access as proposed in this application will reduce traffic movements over what is a very narrow section of Highfield Road. Scaling from an OS plan, the average width of Highfield Road over the site frontage is approximately 4.16m (including the verge and narrow footway) and the road is bounded on the application side with mature trees and hedgerow that further reduces available carriageway width and visibility. The absence of an access along this stretch is considered to be an improvement to road safety.

The issue has been raised that the proposed access is too engineered to just serve two dwellings. The 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 for 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. NRW 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 an HRA to determine whether they are likely to have a significant effect on the SAC condition.

This application has been screened in accordance with Natural Resources Wales' interim advice for planning applications within the river 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 as this is a *replacement* dwelling.

### 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 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 SAB. The SAB 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 all that 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 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 six 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 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. (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 relates to 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.  
(Condition requiring a construction management plan to be submitted)
  - Affect local ecology (addressed in para. on Landscape above)
  - Close to adjoining properties (addressed in para. Impact on Amenity)
  - Development too high (addressed in para Impact on Amenity)
  - General dislike of proposal (addressed in para. on Design)
  - Increase in traffic (addressed in para on Impact on Amenity and Highways)
  - Loss of privacy (addressed in para. on Impact on Amenity)
  - Noise nuisance (addressed in para. on impact on Amenity)
  - Not enough info given on application
  - Out of keeping with character of area (addressed in para. 6.2 on Design)
  - Over development (addressed in para. on Design)
  - Strain on existing community facilities  
(no additional dwellings proposed, so not relevant)
  - Queried whether all neighbours should be consulted  
all adjoining neighbours consulted and a site notice posted
  - Residential Amenity (addressed in para on Impact on Amenity)
- There will be loss of trees / mature hedgerows and loss of ecology (addressed in paras. on Biodiversity and on Landscape)
- There doesn't seem to be any Sustainable drainage / SAB features or design as part of this overall scheme (addressed in paras. on Biodiversity, Landscape and 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. on 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. on Surface Water Drainage).

## **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 WBFG Act.

## **6.11 Conclusion**

The proposed dwelling would sit comfortably on the site, nestled within mature trees on site that work with cladding and natural materials, helping to assimilate the 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 sits within the mature landscaping that frames the site. The proposed development has retained what is characteristic within this area maintaining that sense of place, with a high quality design of property that embraces the landscape assets on this site. It has been concluded that the ecological information submitted confirms that subject to planning conditions the proposed 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. The proposed demolition of the existing two-storey dwelling and construction of a two-storey replacement dwelling including integral garage and amended access 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.

## **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 soft landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include: Soft landscape details shall include: means of protection, planting plan, specifications including cultivation and other operations associated with tree, shrub, hedge, SUDs, grass planting and establishment. To include tree planting methodology and root containment in proximity to SUDS

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

4 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 shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The scheme shall provide for the future management and an implementation timetable. The development shall only proceed in accordance with the approved plan 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

5 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. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved lighting scheme.

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

6 Prior to commencement of development an updated Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) by a qualified arborist will be submitted 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.

7 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, S13, and GI 1 and NE1

8 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 on site and shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation.

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, S13, and GI 1 and NE1

9 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.

10 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.

11 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.

12 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.

13 The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with Sections 4 of the approved reports entitled An Update Bat Survey (Link Ecology, September 2020) and A Bat Survey (Link Ecology, March 2019) and Section 6 of the Update Ecology Report (Link Ecology, February 2021). Should the development not be carried out in strict accordance with the approved mitigation plan/strategy all works shall cease immediately until alternative means of mitigation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed alternative scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the timescale approved within that alternative mitigation scheme. REASON: To comply with the provisions of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and to ensure compliance with LDP Policy NE1 in relation to bats, nesting birds, reptiles and other wildlife.

14 A Green Infrastructure Management Plan shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development. The content of the Management Plan shall include the following;

- a) Description and evaluation of Green Infrastructure assets to be managed including specification and location plan for all habitat creation including planting, creation of a green roof, habitat boxes and hedgehog connectivity measures.
- b) Trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
- c) Aims and objectives of management.
- d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
- e) Prescriptions for establishment of features and management actions.
- f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a twenty-year period).
- g) Details of the person or organization responsible for implementation of the plan.
- h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The management plan shall demonstrate how the scheme considers the predicted impacts of climate change

The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the Green Infrastructure Management Plan are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be implemented. Management shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the approved Management Plan.

REASON: To provide net biodiversity gain in accordance with PPW 11 and to safeguard all Green Infrastructure Assets at the site in accordance with LDP policies, DES1, S13, GI1, NE1, EP1 and SD4

15. 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.