

WA/2018/1912
Mr & Mrs Abrahams
05/11/2018

Erection of dwelling with associated parking (as amplified by information received 30/05/2019) at Plot 1, Springfield, 30 Frensham Vale, Lower Bourne GU10 3HT

Parish/Town: Farnham
Ward: Farnham Bourne
Case Officer: Mr Chris Turner

Neighbour Notification Expiry Date 18/12/2018
Expiry Date 30/12/2018
Extended expiry date NOT AGREED

RECOMMENDATION That permission be REFUSED

Site Description

The application site is located on the northern side of Frensham Vale. It comprises a two storey detached dwelling with associated residential curtilage to the front. There is woodland to the rear of the plot. The area is characterised as residential.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for:

- 1 x five bedroomed, two storey detached dwelling.

The dwelling is proposed to the front of the existing dwelling adjacent to Frensham Vale, behind an existing tree belt.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision
WA/2018/0797	Erection of 2 dwellings and a detached garage along with associated landscaping	Refused 09/10/2018

Planning Policy Constraints

Thames Basin Heath 7km Buffer Zone
Wealden Heaths I SPA 5km Buffer Zone

Ancient Woodland 500m Buffer Zone
 Land Outside Built-up Area Boundary – Farnham Neighbourhood Plan
 Countryside beyond the Green Belt

Development Plan Policies and Guidance

The Development Plan and relevant policies comprise:

- Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 1): SP1, SP2, ALH1, ST1, RE1, RE3, TD1, NE1, NE3, CC1 and CC4.
- Farnham Neighbourhood Plan (made May 2017): FNP1, FNP10, FNP11, FNP12, FNP13 and FNP30.
- Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 (retained policies February 2018): D1, D4, D8, and D9.
- South East Plan: Saved policy NRM6

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) due weight has been given to the relevant policies in the above plans.

Other guidance:

- The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF)
- The National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 (NPPG)
- Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD)
- Council’s Parking Guidelines (2013)
- Surrey Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (2018)
- Farnham Design Statement (2010)

Consultations and Town/Parish Council Comments

Town/Parish Council	Farnham Town Council strongly objects to the erection of a dwelling (along with a further two proposed dwellings, application WA/2018/1931 and WA/2018/1932, at the same location) not in line with Farnham Design Statement and Neighbourhood Plan Policy FNP1a), d), f), g), FNP10 and being outside the Built up Area Boundary. The subdivision of larger plots is unacceptable as it has detrimental impacts on the characteristics of the semi-rural area. The front of the site
---------------------	---

	is in Flood Zone 3.
Environment Agency	No objection.
Surrey County Council Highways	No objection subject to the implementation of conditions.
Surrey Wildlife Trust	No objection subject to the implementation of conditions.

Representations

Site notices were displayed around the site on 11/12/2018.

Neighbour notification letters were sent on 22/11/2018.

45 letters have been received raising objection on the following grounds:

Harm to countryside and semi-rural character of area

- The proposed house is situated beyond the Built Up Area Boundary and would have a harmful impact on the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and the Area of Special Environmental Quality.
- Development erodes the rural and wooded landscape.
- The proposal comprises urban creep and would lead to the infilling of the gap between the existing settlements of Lower Bourne and Rowledge.
- The proposal would lead to the pressure of fragmentation and overdevelopment.
- The provision of a driveway has already contributed to the erosion of the semi-rural character of the area.
- The removal of the existing fence should not be regarded as a planning benefit for the proposal.

Flood Risk

- The proposal would increase the risk of flooding to nearby properties; the culvert running parallel to the road is often at full capacity and frequently spill onto the road;
- It has not been demonstrated that the site is sequentially preferred or that the proposal meets the exception test with regards to flooding.
- No evidence of safe escape has been provided in the event of flooding as the only escape route is across the flood plain and there is no dry escape route beyond local roads (as required by the Flood Risk Practice Guide).
- The flood risk assessment undertaken by the applicants is flawed and does not account for climate change.
- There are technical inaccuracies in the Flood Risk Assessment.

Biodiversity

- The urbanisation of the site would harm the biodiversity of the area and erode the Frensham Vale Wildlife Corridor 04.

Contrary to Farnham Neighbourhood Plan

- The development is not sustainable as it does not accord with the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan (outside of Built Up Area Boundary) and there is not extenuating circumstance to warrant a departure from the Plan; it is not required in order to meet housing allocations.
- The proposal would not enhance the Countryside.
- Although there is a Farnham Neighbourhood Plan Review, this does not provide a basis for arguing for ad hoc release of land that is demonstrably in conflict with up-to-date development plan policies and boundaries because there is an agreed 5 year land supply.

General

- The development does not overcome previous reasons for refusal for the development of the site for 3 houses.
- The proposal comprises garden grabbing.
- This is one of three applications made for the same overall existing garden site. It is imperative that three plots must be viewed as a single application and they would have a cumulative negative effect.
- The site falls within the Buffer Zones of the Wealden Heaths and Thames Basin Heaths SPAs.
- The same reasons that saw an application at 35 Frensham Vale refused apply to this application.
- The proposal conflicts with the Farnham Design Statement 2010, FNP1 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan and Policies D1, D4, RE1 and BE3 of the Local Plan 2002.

1 letter has been received neither in support or objection

Planning Considerations

Principle of Development

Policy SP1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 states that when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It will always work proactively

with applicants to find solutions so proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

Policy SP2 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 states inter alia, the Council should maximise opportunities for the redevelopment of suitable brownfield sites for housing.

The site is previously developed land and could therefore be considered suitable for development subject to other Policies in the Development Plan.

Five year housing land supply

The Council published its 5 year housing land supply statement in July, with a base date of 1st April 2019. This document confirms that, with an additional buffer of 20%, the Council has 5.2 years' worth of housing supply. Therefore, the Council can demonstrate the requirement of paragraph 73 of the NPPF.

Notwithstanding this the contribution of 1 additional dwelling would not make a significant contribution to the five year housing land supply.

Planning history and differences with previous proposal

The planning history is a material consideration.

Planning permission has been previously refused under application WA/2018/0797 for the erection of two dwellings.

The differences between the current proposal and that application are:

- The proposal is for a single dwelling and the dwelling is now orientated to face towards the west. The dwelling is roughly in the same location as 'Plot 1' of permission WA/2018/0797. The elevations have been revised and the proposal no longer features an integrated garage.

The test is whether having regard to the changes, the current proposal has overcome the objections to the previously refused scheme and is acceptable in its own right.

Impact on Countryside beyond the Green Belt and Visual Amenity

The site is located within the 'Countryside beyond the Green Belt' outside any defined settlement area. Policy RE1 states that in this area the intrinsic

character and beauty of the countryside will be recognised and safeguarded in accordance with the NPPF.

Policy FNP10 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2017 states that outside the 'Built up Area Boundary', priority will be given to protecting the countryside from inappropriate development and is broken into parts 'a-e'. Parts 'b', 'c' and 'd', refer to designations not relevant to this application. The parts 'a' and 'e' of the policy states development would only be permitted whereby it would:

- a) be in accordance with Policies FNP16, 17 and 20 or other relevant Policies in the Neighbourhood Plan or other relevant planning policies applying to the area.
- e) would enhance the landscape value of the Countryside and, where new planting is involved, use appropriate native species.

Policy FNP11 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan states that proposals that fail to address impacts upon the visual setting, landscape features of the site and surroundings and biodiversity or which lead to increased coalescence will not be supported.

Policy TD1 of the Local Plan 2018 (Part 1) requires development to be of high quality design and to be well related in size, scale and character to its surroundings. Retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 are attributed substantial and full weight respectively due to their level of consistency with the NPPF 2019.

The Farnham Neighbourhood Plan advises that new development should be designed to be a high quality which responds to the heritage and distinctive character of the individual area of Farnham in which it is located.

The site is located within 'The Bourne' character area. The Farnham Design Statement (2010) outlines that new development within 'The Bourne' should respect and be sympathetic to the immediate architectural surroundings in terms of pattern, scale, material and form. Building heights should reflect those in the area and the effect on the street scene should be carefully considered. It goes on to state trees and hedges are essential features of 'The Bourne'.

The proposed dwelling would be located to the front of the existing residential dwelling. Views into the existing site are partially obscured by the existing tree line adjacent to the highway; however, there is a large degree of intervisibility from the highway. In the wider context views into the site are limited.

The introduction of built form in this location would be noticeable in short term views which would be harmful to the overall landscape. The proposal would result in built form which would not maintain the visual interests of the surrounding area

Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is located within proximity of the settlement boundary to the east and there are other dwellings along Frensham Vale. Officers note that the dwellings become more sporadic to the west of the settlement boundary. The scattered dwellings in the surrounding area characterise the sense of openness and lack of built form. As such a new dwelling in this location would erode this character.

The applicant has submitted plans which show the provision of new planting and hedgerows, with a view to enhancing the existing landscape and have provided details of the species that would be used. The applicant also proposes to remove an existing wooden fence from the site where it adjoins the public highway.

Officers consider that the introduction of built form in this location and the overall impact of development would be harmful to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, which would not be mitigated through the planting of native species in this location or the removal of an existing wooden fence.

Given that the proposal would be harmful to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, in the interest of sustainable development it would not be considered entirely consistent with the environmental objective of sustainable development as set out within paragraph 8 of the NPPF.

Officers consider that that the conclusions of the submitted Landscape and Visual Impact assessment do not represent a fair assessment of the development and do not agree with the conclusions that the provision of a dwelling in this location would result only in the loss of residential lawn and that the removal of close board wooden fence and use of native planting would outweigh the harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Notwithstanding this conclusion, the provision of one new dwelling would not lead to increased coalescence between settlements.

The proposed dwelling would be two storeys in form and would be distinctive in their design. Notwithstanding the comments above in relation to landscape, the proposed scale of the dwellings would be appropriate. The materials proposed would be considered acceptable and would not be harmful to the character of the surrounding area.

The proposal would therefore be considered to conform with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, Policies FNP1 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2017 and retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002. However, the proposal would therefore be considered contrary to Policy RE1 of the Local Plan 2018 and Paragraphs 8 and 170 of the NPPF.

Impact on residential amenity

Policy TD1 of the Local Plan 2018 (Part1) seeks to ensure that new development is designed to create safe and attractive environments that meet the needs of users and incorporate the principles of sustainable development. Retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 are given substantial and full weight respectively due to their consistency with the NPPF 2019.

The Residential Extensions SPD advises that there should be a minimum of 18m from proposed windows to the residential amenity areas of adjoining neighbours and a minimum of 21m from the rear elevation of existing dwellings to the rear elevation of proposed dwellings.

Residential dwellings surround the site. To the north is the host dwelling and its associated amenity area, with a tennis court and swimming pool. The proposed dwelling would be orientated so that the side of the

To the north is the host dwelling, the primary amenity area to this dwelling is located to the south of the host dwelling and therefore sits adjacent to the amenity areas of the proposed dwelling. The proposed dwellings are considered to be adequately separated not to have a materially harmful impact on the host dwelling or other surrounding neighbours by way of an overbearing impact, harmful loss of light or outlook.

The proposed dwelling would be adequately separated from the host dwelling and would meet the Residential Extension's guideline in relation to the separation distance to amenity areas and the elevations of this dwelling from proposed windows. Officers are therefore satisfied the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the privacy of the host dwelling. In relation to the adjoining neighbour at Springfield Lodge, the proposed dwelling would have first floor windows with an outlook to the west. Owing to the proposed separation distance, Officers are satisfied the proposal would not have a harmful impact on privacy of this dwelling.

Officers are satisfied that the proposed dwelling would be adequately separated from the neighbours to the south that it would not have a materially harmful impact on the privacy of these neighbours.

The proposal would therefore be considered to conform with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, Policy FNP1 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2017 and retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002.

Standard of Accommodation

The Government Technical Housing standards – nationally described space standards (2015) requires dwellings to meet certain internal space standards in order to ensure that an appropriate internal standard of accommodation has been provided for future occupiers. Until the Council has a Local Plan Policy in respect of these standards, they should only be given limited weight and used as guidance to inform the decision on this proposal.

Policy TD1 seeks to maximise the opportunity to improve the quality of life, health and well-being of current and future residents through the provision of appropriate private amenity space and appropriate internal space standards for new dwellings.

The proposal would provide 1 x 5 Bedroom dwelling with bed space for 10 persons.

The proposed dwellings would meet all the required standards regarding floor area and bedroom sizes. Furthermore, the bedrooms each meet the required minimum widths and are served by an appropriate level of light and outlook. As such, the proposal is considered to provide an adequate standard of accommodation for future residents.

The proposed dwelling is located adjacent to some mature trees, as such Officers have had regard to the impact of these trees onto the overshadowing of the dwelling and the amenity area. Officers consider that whilst the dwelling would at times be partially shaded by the adjoining tree belt, Officers would be satisfied that it would not have a harmful impact on the amenity of this dwelling.

The proposal would therefore be considered to meet the required internal space standards and would provide suitable private amenity space in accordance with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan 2018 (Part 1).

Impact on Trees

Policy NE2 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 states that the Council will seek, where appropriate, to maintain and enhance existing trees, woodland and hedgerows within the Borough. Retained Policies D6 and D7 of the Local Plan

2002 are attributed full and significant weight respectively due to their level of consistency with the NPPF 2019.

The Council's Tree Officer has been consulted on the application. They have not raised objection to the scheme as the proposed dwellings would be adequately separated from the existing trees and there would be no further excavation into the root protection areas as part of this proposal.

The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Policy NE2 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and retained Policies D6 and D7 of the Local Plan 2002.

Impact on Ancient Woodland

The NPPF states that planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh the loss. Policies D6 and D7 broadly support the aims of the NPPF stating that the Council will protect significant trees and groups of trees and hedgerows through planning control.

The application site is within 500m of ancient woodland. As the proposal is for one dwelling it is not considered to be materially harmful to the ancient woodland and would be in accordance with Policies D6 and D7. The proposal is considered acceptable in this regard.

Impact on Highway and Parking Provision

Policy ST1 of the Local Plan 2018 (Part 1) states that the Council will work in partnership with Surrey County Council to ensure development schemes make appropriate provision for parking and maximise sustainable transport modes.

Policy CC2 of the Local Plan 2018 (Part 1) states that proposals will be designed to encourage walking and cycling.

The proposed dwelling would use an existing access and therefore Officers are satisfied that the provision of two dwellings in this location would not prejudice highway safety.

The Council's Parking Guidelines Document advises that for dwellings of this size outside of the Town Centre there should be a provision of three parking spaces per unit and there should be a minimum of three cycle spaces for dwellings of this size.

The dwelling would be served by a double garage and a large driveway. Officers are satisfied that there would be adequate cycle and vehicular parking for this dwelling.

The proposal would therefore be considered to accord with Policy ST1 and CC2 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018.

Impact on Flooding

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk of flooding (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The NPPF goes on to state that development should not be permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding.

Paragraph 163 of the NPPF states that where appropriate applications should be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where in light of this assessment it can be demonstrated that:

- a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;
- b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient;
- c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;
- d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and
- e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.

Policy CC4 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 states that development must be located, designed and laid out to ensure that it is safe and that the risk from flooding is minimised whilst not increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere.

Table 2 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change PPG identifies that buildings for residential development are classified as 'more vulnerable' types of

development and therefore a site-specific flood risk assessment is considered to be appropriate for this proposal.

In support of the application, the applicant submitted a Flood Risk Assessment by the Stilwell Partnership dated October 2018. Following comments from the Environment Agency the applicants submitted a revised Flood Risk Assessment dated May 2019 by the Stilwell Partnership.

The Environment Agency have raised no objection to the proposal and are satisfied that the proposed dwelling is located within Flood Zone 1 and that this has been adequately demonstrated by the site specific flood risk assessment.

The Environment Agency note that part of the existing access across the site to the existing house remains in Flood Zone 3, this part of the access track lies outside of the redline of this application. As the proposal site lies entirely within Flood Zone 1, Officers are satisfied that there would be no risk of flooding to the occupiers of the proposed dwelling.

However as this has been raised by the Environment Agency, Officers have had regard to the part of the access track located outside of the application redline, which is located within the Flood Zone and leads to the host dwelling and have assessed this against the requirements of the EA guidance to determine safety in relation to access and egress.

Waverley Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2018 provides an overview of the risk of flooding across the Borough. Section 5.4 details the requirements for safe access and egress to a site to enable the safe evacuation of people from the site in times of flood and enable the emergency services access to floods during periods of flood.

A safe access and egress route should allow occupants to enter and exit buildings and reach land within Flood Zone 1 using public rights of way without the intervention of emergency services.

Guidance prepared by the EA uses a calculation of Flood Hazard to determine safety in relation to Flood Risk. Flood hazard is a function of the flood depth and flow velocity at a particular point in the floodplain along with a suitable debris factor to account for the hazard posed by any material entrained by the floodwater.

The derivation of flood hazard is based on the methodology in Flood Risks to People FD2320, the use of which, for the purpose of planning and

development control, is clarified in the above mentioned publication and summarised in the below table:

Less than 0.75	Very low hazard - Caution
0.75 to 1.25	Dangerous for some – includes children, the elderly and the infirm
1.25 to 2.0	includes the general public
More than 2.0	includes the emergency services

For developments located in areas at risk of fluvial flooding safe access / egress must be provided for new development as follows in order of preference:

- Safe dry route for people and vehicles.
- Safe dry route for people.
- If a dry route for people is not possible, a route for people where the flood hazard (in terms of depth and velocity of flooding) is low and should not cause risk to people.
- If a dry route for vehicles is not possible, a route for vehicles where the flood hazard (in terms of depth and velocity of flooding) is low to permit access for emergency vehicles. However the public should not drive vehicles in floodwater.

In all cases, a 'dry' access/egress is a route located above the 1% annual probability flood level (1 in 100 year) including an allowance for climate change.

The submitted Flood Risk assessment states that the Flood Hazard rating for the part of the existing access track outside of the site to the host dwelling would be low.

Officers are satisfied that the dwelling would be located within Flood Zone 1 and that regardless, there would be safe access and egress to other areas outside of the Flood Risk Zone.

Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposal would not increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere and that the proposal would be in accordance with with Policy CC4 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and the Waverley Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Effect on the SPA

The site is located within the Wealden Heaths I SPA 5km Buffer Zone and within the Thames Basin Heath 7km Buffer Zone.

The proposal would result in an increase in people (permanently) on the site. However, due to the availability of alternative recreational opportunities within the area, which could divert residents from use of the SPA, the proposal would not have a likely significant effect upon the integrity of the SPA. An appropriate assessment is not, therefore, required.

Natural England has been consulted on the application and have determined an appropriate assessment is not required.

Biodiversity and compliance with Habitat Regulations 2017

Policy NE1 of the Local Plan 2018 (Part 1) states that the Council will seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity. Development will be permitted provided it retains, protects and enhances biodiversity and ensures any negative impacts are avoided or, if unavoidable, mitigated.

Further, Circular 06/2005 states 'It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before planning permission is granted.'

The application property does not fall within a designated SPA, SAC, SNCI or SSSI. It is not within 200m of ancient woodland or water, and is not an agricultural building or barn. Having regard to this, and the completed biodiversity checklist, it is considered that a biodiversity survey is not required in this instance.

Surrey Wildlife Trust have been consulted on the application. They have considered the submitted ecological report by David Archer Associated dated January 2018.

The report makes recommendations such as the carrying out of a pre-works check and supervision during initial construction works by a suitably qualified ecologist, the covering of trenches if left exposed overnight or the inclusion of a means of escape for animals, the provision of a sensitive lighting scheme in association with the proposed development. The report outlines some biodiversity enhancements such as the inclusion of species rich wildflower meadow areas within the landscaping, native hedging and bee friendly planting, the provision of roost units and bird boxes.

Surrey Wildlife Trust has reviewed the proposals and advised that development is acceptable subject to conditions including that the development complies with the recommendations set out in the ecological report.

Subject to the implementation of conditions, the proposal would therefore accord with policy NE1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018.

Parish Council / Third Party Representations

The majority of comments from the Town Council and Third Party Representations have been addressed within the body of this report. A few remain outstanding.

Flood Risk – The Environment Agency has assessed the application and have raised no objection to the proposal. Officers have assessed the access and egress to the site and subject to an evacuation plan are satisfied that future occupiers would not be at risk from flooding. The site is within Flood Zone 1 and therefore, the proposal does not require a sequential assessment.

Biodiversity/ Wildlife Corridor - Surrey Wildlife Trust have been consulted on the application and do not raise objection to the scheme, Officers are therefore satisfied the proposal would not have a harmful impact on protected habitat or species in the area.

Conclusion

The planning balance assessment concludes that the proposal is not in accordance with the Development Plan and the benefits of one new dwelling would not outweigh the adverse impacts in relation to harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the landscape. As such, planning permission is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

That permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its siting and scale, would materially detract from the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside in conflict with Policy RE1 of the Waverley Borough Council Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018, Policies FNP10 and FNP11 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2017 and paragraphs 8 and 170 of the NPPF 2019.

Informatives

The drawing numbers relevant to this decision are: PL100/N, PL99/E, PL101/C and PL102/C.

The Council confirms that in assessing this planning application it has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, in line with the requirements of Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Case Officer Signed: Chris Turner Date: 30/08/2019

Agreed by Team or DC Manager.....Date:.....

Time extension agreement in writing seen by signing off officer:

Yes No N/A

For Certificate of Lawfulness applications: Use/Operations/Matter

Agreed by Legal services.....Date.....

Agreed by Development Manager or Head of Planning Services

.....

This report has been agreed under the delegated authority by the Head of Planning Services.

Decision falls within(*number reference*) of the Scheme of Delegation
..... (initialled by Authorising officer)

Copy to Policy for SPA or infrastructure contributions? No

Pass File to Enforcement No

Is there an extant Enforcement Notice in place for the same or similar development served no more than 2 years previously? No

Does this application need to be referred to the Secretary of State in line with Town and Country Planning (Consultation) Direction 2009? No

Notify Environmental Health Team of decision (send copy) No

Is this subject to a legal agreement? No

If yes, is there a signed copy on file?

Notify Legal Services of decision if approval and if subject to legal agreement (send copy)