

DESCRIPTION

The application site lies within an area of land designated as residential land. It is accessed by a lane measuring around 3 metres in width from Elmfield Avenue with stone dykes either side over most of its length, and consists of an area approximately 380 square metres. The land slopes slightly towards Elmfield Avenue. The site is a narrow rectangular shaped piece of land which is termed a backland area as it is located between the rear gardens of the surrounding flats and houses with no frontage to a public road.

Currently on the site is a commercial building, which appears to be disused but was last occupied by an electrical business (J & M Electrical). The buildings comprise a small workshop (approx. 5m high, 10m wide and 15m long), office (approx. 4m high, 5m high and 5m long) and parking and turning area.

Also within the application site is part of the original stone dyke that would have run down the lane to Elmfield Avenue. Surrounding the site are a number of mature trees and bushes, measuring between 4m and 15m in height approximately. There are also a number of dwellings contained within traditional granite and slate-roofed buildings, as well as two storey traditionally designed properties to the North that are one and a half storeys in height (No's 33 & 35 Bedford Place) and to the South (No's 1 & 2 Elmfield Place).

HISTORY

A7/1900 Demolition of existing office/workshop and construction of 4 No.flats.
Appeal (P/PPA/100/400) Dismissed, 03.07.2008.

Dismissed on the grounds that the access to the site for both pedestrian and vehicles would be via an unsatisfactory narrow lane without a segregated footpath, with very poor visibility at its junction with Elmfield Avenue, to the serious detriment of public safety. The second reason for dismissal of the appeal was due to and the separation distance between the block of flats and 33 Bedford Place was insufficient, causing loss of privacy to the garden and dwelling of Bedford Place.

A8/1770 Demolition of existing office & workshop, change of use and erection of 4no flats. Refused (Committee Decision) 15.01.2009.

Refused on the grounds that the access is substandard and there is no provision of a footpath. A shortfall of car parking spaces within the site, and poor visibility at the junction with Elmfield Avenue. Furthermore, that by virtue of its design and choice of materials, the proposed building was considered unsatisfactory having regard to the surrounding area.

PROPOSAL

Detailed planning permission is sought for the erection of a pair of semi-detached houses, which would replace the existing commercial buildings. Each dwelling would have three bedrooms. The proposed dwellings would measure 7.8 metres

to the ridge. The roof has been designed to be asymmetrical, so that the eaves at the front (west elevation) would be 3.9 metres high, with flat roof dormers in the roof off the wall-head, whilst the rear elevation (east) would have an eaves level of 5.2 metres in height. The frontage of the residential units measure 10.3 metres, occupying the full width of the site, to the stone dykes along the boundary. The depth of the semi-detached houses measure 9.9 metres. To the front of the dwellings would be a small area of planting and an area for bin storage, approximately 1.5 metres deep. The plans show that the bin storage would be covered. To the rear each house would have a garden 5.7 metres wide by 10 metres in length.

Four car parking spaces are shown within the application site, with turning facilities.

The submitted plans show that the boundary walls which run along Elmfield Place, adjacent to Elmfield Avenue, would be lowered over the first one metre in length to 0.9 metres in height.

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO SUB-COMMITTEE

Objections from more than five households, and as such the application is required to be determined by the Development Management Sub-Committee in line with the approved Scheme of Delegation.

CONSULTATIONS

Roads – no objection in principle. Parking spaces of 2 per dwelling is in accordance with the Councils standards. The height of the wall along Elmfield Place, adjacent to Elmfield Avenue, should be lowered over a distance of one metre to one metre in height. This appears to require consent from neighbouring properties, any consent must require the wall to be lowered. The road should be demarked to indicate a shared use surface, as indicated on the plans.

Environmental Health - In principle no objection to the proposal as it would reduce the amount of vehicular movement thus reducing any potential air quality issues. It requests conditions to be imposed on any consent with regards to the hours of construction of the development and to ensure adequate bin storage.

Flooding – comments, no observations.

REPRESENTATIONS

A total of 18 letters of representation have been received objecting to this application. The points raised are summarised as follows:

Previous application.

- Previous application was refused by Council, and an earlier application was dismissed on appeal by the Reporter.

Access

- Elmfield Place is not in ownership by the applicant. Without the consent of the owner(s) the road markings cannot be implemented in accordance with Roads requirements;
- Elmfield Place is too narrow and sub-standard for road and pedestrian access, thus increased risk to pedestrian safety. Contrary to the Council's Supplementary Guidance Subdivision and Redevelopment of Residential Curtilages;
- The lane is single width which would result in reversing manoeuvres onto Elmfield Avenue.

Pedestrian Safety

- The access is used by four other residential properties, an additional two units would increase the risk to pedestrian safety.

Impact on Street

- The proposal would increase traffic along Elmfield Place and Elmfield Avenue;
- The existing street is at capacity with car parking, it is therefore not possible for the amount of spaces as shown on the plans to exist.

Business

- Object to use of workshop as outlined in application which would generate 15-20 vehicles per day. Raises safety, noise and traffic concerns.

Amenity

- Loss of privacy;
- Loss of daylight;
- External materials not in-keeping;
- Design not in keeping with the traditional properties;
- Noise arising during demolition and construction;
- Traffic noise (current use operates during business hours, proposed use could generate traffic 24 hours a day);
- The houses would not have a frontage to the street thus constituting an alien form of development in terms of density, character and pattern of development. This is contrary to the Council's Supplementary Guidance Subdivision and Redevelopment of Residential Curtilages. General presumption against new dwellings in rear garden ground of a dwelling where it would not have a frontage to a public road.

Other

- Loss of mature trees and wildlife;
- Disruption to sewage network;
- Fire tenders would be unable to access the houses in the event of a fire;
- No need for more houses;
- Loss of view;
- Demolition of existing building will undermine structural integrity of boundary wall which might collapse;
- Would result in both commercial and residential uses operating on the site;

- No change of use has been granted by the Council from an electrical workshop to a mechanical garage;
- Applicant not rightful owner, site is understood to be leased;
- The turning area and two car parking spaces on the site are not in the applicant's control/ownership.

PLANNING POLICY

Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) February 2010 – The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 requires decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Material considerations should be related to the development and use of land (25).

The planning system should promote development that supports the move towards a more economically, socially and environmentally sustainable society (35).

The policy seeks to promote appropriate housing development, particularly within existing settlements, seeking high quality development that is sympathetic to its setting, and takes into consideration amenity.

Aberdeen Local Development Plan, 2012.

Policy D1 Architecture and Placemaking – ensures that high standards of design are achieved through a number of considerations, including context, to ensure that the proposed development makes a positive contribution to its setting and its design is acceptable.

Policy D2 Design and Amenity – outlines a number of considerations which shall be taken into account when assessing a planning application in the interests of amenity considerations.

Policy H1 Residential Areas – within residential areas proposals for residential developments will be approved in principle so long as it (i) does not constitute over development; (ii) does not have an unacceptable impact on character or amenity of the surrounding area (iii) does not cause loss of open space (iv) complies with Supplementary Guidance: Curtilage Splits; and (v) complies with Supplementary Guidance: House Extensions.

Policy T2 Managing the Transport Impact of Development – new developments will need to demonstrate that sufficient measures have been taken to minimise the traffic generated. Maximum car parking standards are set out in Supplementary Guidance on Transport and Accessibility.

Policy R6 Waste Management Requirements for New Development – necessity to provide areas for storage of bins in relation to general and recyclable household waste.

Policy R7 Low and Zero Carbon Buildings – consideration of technology and building methods to reduce carbon, particularly in relation to energy requirements associated with occupancy (e.g. heating, lighting).

Supplementary Guidance

Householder Development Guide – in the interests of residential amenity.

Low and Zero Carbon Buildings – improving the energy performance of buildings by considering the use of renewable energy technologies and other buildings methods to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

Subdivision and redevelopment of residential curtilages – primarily aimed at consideration of development which involves additional dwellings within the curtilage of existing dwellings, and the demolition of existing dwelling(s) and replacement with new dwelling(s) at a higher density.

Transport and accessibility – car parking standards and access considerations, having regard to road safety.

Waste Management – within curtilage provision for three wheelie bins (an area 2 metres x 1 metre to accommodate all the bins).

EVALUATION

Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the provisions of the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Tesco Stores Ltd has submitted an appeal to the Supreme Court against the decision of the Inner House of the Court of Session to refuse its application to quash the Aberdeen Local Development Plan. Tesco has been unsuccessful regarding both an interim suspension and a full appeal in front of three judges in the Inner House and the Council has received robust advice from Counsel that the reasoning of the Inner House is sound and there are strong grounds to resist the appeal.

Planning applications continue to be determined in line with the Aberdeen Local Development Plan but the appeal is a material consideration and the Council has to take into account the basis for the legal challenge when determining applications. It should also be pointed out that the Court indicated that, even if Tesco's arguments had found favour, it would have been inclined to quash the plan only in so far as it related to Issue 64 (Allocated Sites: Woodend...Summerhill... etc.) and that it would be disproportionate to quash the whole plan.

This evaluation has had regard to and taken into account the legal challenge. None of the policies or material considerations which apply to this application

would be affected by the terms of Tesco's challenge. The recommendation would be the same if the application were to be considered in terms of the 2008 Aberdeen Local Plan.

Principle of the development.

The site lies within an established residential area, and is identified as 'residential area (H1)' within the Aberdeen Local Development Plan.

Policy H1 requires that proposals for new residential development be assessed against the following considerations:

- (a) does not constitute over development;
- (b) does not have an unacceptable impact on the character or amenity of the area;
- (c) does not result in loss of valuable and valued open space;
- (d) complies with SG on Curtilage Splits;
- (e) complies with SG on House Extensions.

Should proposals for new houses comply with the above, then the development would normally be approved.

Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan seek to ensure good quality design compatible with the architecture in the locality, whilst ensuring that the development would not have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants. Supplementary Guidance (SG) provides guidance on such matters, including Harmony of Uses, Householder Development Guide, and Subdivision and redevelopment of residential curtilages.

Policy R6 and SG on Waste Management seeks to ensure that there is sufficient space reserved for wheelie bins within new residential developments, for household waste and recyclables. It is considered that there is sufficient space to accommodate this.

Policy T2 and SG on Transport and Accessibility seeks to ensure that sufficient measures have been taken to minimise traffic generated; and sets out maximum car parking standards.

The principle of the development is therefore considered acceptable as it lies within an existing residential area, however, this is subject to material considerations of design (individual and impact on streetscape); impact on residential amenity (privacy, loss of light, etc); road safety issues; and other material planning considerations.

Design

The site is back land development, and does not have a public frontage. It is surrounded by residential properties on all sides. Surrounding properties are a mixture of one and a half storeys and two storeys in height, primarily granite blocks with natural slate roof. The residential units are a mixture of houses and flats.

Currently the site is occupied by commercial premises, which appear to not be currently in use. The commercial unit would be demolished to make way for this development.

The proposed development is a pair of semi-detached houses. The houses are rectangular in form with asymmetrical roofs. The front elevation would have a lower eaves height than the rear elevation. The roof to the front would have a number of flat roof dormers off the wall-head. The external materials would include blockwork, with a drydash render to the rear elevation. The roof would be in zinc.

The application was subject to pre-planning advice with the Planning Service where no objections were raised in connection with the design during that time from the Planning Officer and the Roads Officer.

The scale of the development is modest, with a ridge height of 7.8 metres. The width would be contained by the boundary walls. The roof would be partially hipped. Given that the development would not be seen from public vantage points it is considered that there are no objections to its design. It is noted that the design is not in-keeping with the traditional style of adjacent buildings in design and materials. However, given its location on balance it is considered acceptable as they would not be seen in the same streetscene as other houses, and have been designed to minimise impact on residential amenity.

Amenity

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of visual amenity for the reasons discussed under design above.

An assessment has been carried out in terms of loss of light (using Building Research Establishment assessment) on the adjacent householders by the proposed development.

It is considered that none of the adjacent properties would suffer an unacceptable loss of light based on the BRE assessment. Some of the adjacent gardens will experience some loss of light, but it is not considered that this would be at an unacceptable level in planning terms, due to the limited height of the houses and that the loss of light would be primarily to the adjacent properties to the side affecting only the rearmost part of their gardens.

A number of concerns have been raised in relation to loss of privacy. The side gables are blank, and therefore no loss of privacy would occur to the properties to the side. To the front of the pair of houses a distance of 17 metres would exist between the western façade and the application site boundary. To the rear a distance of 9.9 metres would exist between the rear façade and the rear boundary of the application site; whilst between the rear elevation and the elevation of 33 Bedford Place a distance of 23 metres. On that basis it is not considered that the proposed development would cause loss of privacy to

adjacent properties. The Council's Supplementary Guidance Subdivision and Redevelopment of Residential Curtilage, notes that a minimum separation between windows of existing and proposed habitable rooms should be 18 metres. Furthermore the Supplementary Guidance states that for dwellings up to two storeys in height, the rear garden should be a minimum of 9 metres. On that basis it is considered that the proposal would not cause loss of privacy.

Between the gardens of the two dwellings a fence is proposed along the boundary, it is considered necessary to secure full details by condition to ensure that the privacy of future occupants is secured.

A letter of representation states that the houses would not have a frontage to the street thus constituting an alien form of development in terms of density, character and pattern of development, contrary to the Council's Supplementary Guidance Subdivision and Redevelopment of Residential Curtilages. That there is a general presumption against new dwellings in rear garden ground of a dwelling where it would not have a frontage to a public road.

In response the Council's Supplementary Guidance Subdivision and Redevelopment of Residential Curtilages states that in most cases the predominant pattern of development in suburban residential areas is one of dwellings in a formal or semi-formal building line fronting onto a public road with back gardens. It continues to state that in these areas the redevelopment of a site that result in dwellings that do not front onto a public road constitutes a form of development that is alien to the established density, character and pattern of development. It states that there is a general presumption against the construction of new dwellings in rear garden ground of dwellings in circumstances where the new dwelling does not front onto a public road.

The application site does not consist of garden ground. It is the redevelopment of a commercial site. The proposed residential units would not have a frontage to the public road, but it is considered that in this case the units would not undermine the existing residential amenity (loss of light or privacy). The development would replace a commercial unit in circumstances where the access currently exists and it is used by vehicles in relation to the commercial activities at the unit.

Letters of representation objected to traffic noise as the current use operates during business hours. Objectors are concerned that the proposed use could generate traffic 24 hours a day. In response, the proposed use is residential, which would be compatible with the neighbouring land uses. It is not considered that this is an objection which could be sustained.

The issue of noise arising during demolition and construction is discussed below under other considerations.

Road Safety

The Road Engineer has not objected to the planning application subject to conditions requiring (i) reduction in the height of the boundary wall along Elmfield Place over the first 1.0 metre to no more than 1.0 metres in height measured back from the part closest to Elmfield Avenue (ii) provision of four car parking spaces and turning (iii) treatment of the surface of Elmfield Place to indicate a shared surface. In terms of public safety, it is therefore considered that the proposal would not be contrary to planning policies.

It is considered essential that the boundary wall is reduced in height prior to the commencement of development. This is because during demolition and construction, there is a greater degree of a higher volume of traffic. The construction vehicles should be able to exit the site with a clear view to reduce risks of pedestrian collision. On that basis it is considered necessary to apply a condition that the wall is reduced in height in the interests of road and pedestrian safety prior to any work(s) commencing on site.

In letters of representation it has been stated that Elmfield Place is not in the ownership of the applicant, and that without consent from the owner(s) the road markings could not be implemented in accordance with roads requirements. The applicant has served appropriate notice to the owner(s). The applicant would be required to satisfy himself that prior to commencing development that he acquired the necessary permission(s) to provide the necessary road markings. If the applicant fails to do this he is not complying with the terms of the planning permission. It is considered unreasonable to refuse an application on this basis, as the applicant may be able to negotiate with the relevant owners a suitable solution.

Similarly, it is understood that two of the car parking spaces shown on the plan and the turning area is in separate ownership. The alleged owner has indicated that they are unwilling to allow the applicant/developer to use or to buy the land. If the applicant fails to acquire the necessary permission(s) he is not complying with the terms of the planning permission. It is considered unreasonable to refuse an application on this basis, as the applicant may be able to negotiate with the relevant owners a suitable solution.

Letters of representation have commented that Elmfield Place is narrow and sub-standard, and contrary to the Council's Supplementary Guidance Subdivision and Redevelopment of Residential Curtilage. That there is an increased risk to pedestrians; that it would increase traffic on the immediate road network; and that the lane is single width which would result in reversing manoeuvres onto Elmfield Avenue. It should be noted that the Supplementary Guidance only has limited consideration as the application is not relating to an existing residential curtilage, as the existing site is not in residential use. However, it should be borne in mind that Roads have not objected to the application.

Business Unit

A number of the letters of representation object to the use of the workshop being changed from an electrical business to a mechanical garage. This does not form part of this application, and therefore should not form part of the considerations. The applicant's supporting statement does state that it is possible that a new occupier of the existing building could generate an additional 15-20 vehicles per day, which in their opinion raises concerns of safety, noise and traffic concerns. It should be noted that there is an existing lawful use on site, but that existing building is currently unoccupied.

The commercial operation could not be in use once the proposed development is advanced on site as the footprint of the houses overlap the commercial buildings. The commercial buildings would have to be demolished to make way for the housing development.

Previous Applications.

Planning application A7/1900 was for the demolition of the existing office/workshop and construction of four flats. The block of flats was proposed to be sited in the eastern corner of the application site. The Planning Committee refused the application on the grounds that access to the site for both pedestrians and vehicles was unsatisfactory due to the narrowness of the lane. There would have been no segregated footpath and poor visibility at the junction of the lane with Elmfield Avenue, to the serious detriment of public safety. The applicant appealed the Council's decision (reference P/PPA/100/400) which was dismissed on 03.07.2008. The Reporter stated that the access to the site for both pedestrian and vehicles was entirely unsatisfactory to the serious detriment of public safety. Furthermore, the Reporter dismissed the appeal due to the insufficient separation distance between the proposed block of flats and 33 Bedford Place, causing loss of privacy to the garden and dwelling of Bedford Place.

Subsequently a planning application (reference A8/1770) was submitted for the demolition of existing office & workshop, change of use and the erection of four flats. This was refused by the Planning Committee on the 15.01.2009. On the grounds that the access was substandard and there is no provision of a footpath; a shortfall of car parking spaces within the site, and poor visibility at the junction with Elmfield Avenue. Furthermore, that by virtue of its design and choice of materials, the proposed building was considered unsatisfactory having regard to the surrounding area.

In considering this current planning application, the concerns of loss of amenity to neighbouring residential premises have been overcome. However, the access into the site remains narrow. In the appeal the Reporter commented that the proposed flats would likely be occupied by families with children who would have to walk along the lane, this concern still remains as the units proposed are now two three-bedroomed units, which are also likely to be occupied by families. The applicant proposes to re-surface the access to show it is shared by vehicles and

pedestrians. Roads have advised that this is acceptable, but no footpath could possibly be accommodated. The poor visibility splays will be addressed to some extent with the lowering of the walls to one metre in height at the junction with Elmfield Avenue, again Roads are satisfied that this will overcome any concerns of pedestrian safety.

Risk

The applicant does not have sole control over the boundary wall which requires to be reduced in height; nor does the applicant have sole control of the land which shows two of the car parking spaces and turning area; nor does he have full control of Elmfield Place which is to be resurfaced with a shared use surface.

There is a risk that the applicant may not be able to obtain permission or ownership of these areas of land to provide the necessary works.

The work(s) to the boundary wall are considered necessary to secure prior to work commencing on site as the existing access is substandard. It is of concern that during construction there is a need to ensure vehicles can exit safely. It is therefore considered necessary to apply a condition that the works to the wall are carried out prior to works commencing on site.

In terms of the provision of car parking spaces and associated turning areas, and surfacing of Elmfield Place, it can only be reasonably required that these works are secured prior to occupation of any one of the houses, not before development commences on site. It is possible that there is a risk that the applicant may not be able to provide these in full. The applicant should ensure that he can meet all the conditions prior to commencing works on site, but there is no guarantee. If the applicant did start work(s) and did not obtain the necessary consent from landowner(s) there is a chance that two houses would have been built with only two car parking spaces with insufficient turning areas. The Council would have to consider whether it was reasonable at that time to commence with enforcement proceedings.

Other Considerations

Letters of representations have raised other matters which have not been previously dealt with elsewhere in this report are addressed in this section.

Given that the proposed house is within an established residential area, it is considered reasonable and necessary to apply a condition in relation to hours of construction, including demolition, which is audible beyond the boundary, to protect the residential amenity of existing residents.

Loss of a view is not a material planning consideration.

In connection with the comment that the houses are not required, the Planning Authority is unable to consider the demand for additional houses. The market would dictate the need for housing in the case of small scale developments.

A letter of representation states that the applicant only leases the site, and does not own the land. In response the planning application states that the land is owned by the applicant, and the Planning Authority has to consider this as factual. In the event planning permission is granted, and the applicant does not own the land, he/she would have to ensure they obtained the relevant owner(s) consent. But no planning harm would have been caused, as planning permission goes with the land and not the applicant. The Planning Authority has to consider that the information submitted is factual, no-one else has written in to claim they own the business premises.

Possible disruption to sewage network is not a material planning consideration, and would be controlled by Scottish Water.

A comment in relation to fire tenders being unable to access the houses in the event of a fire. Fire issues would be dealt with in the consideration of the Building Warrant. There are many technical solutions that could be achieved if required including the installation of sprinklers within the building.

The undermining of the structural integrity of the boundary wall and concerns that it might collapse is a separate matter covered by civil law, which is not a planning consideration. Should the wall be undermined the parties would be encouraged to seek legal advice, but the Planning Authority would have no jurisdiction.

The site is bare of any mature trees, all trees are adjacent to the site. It is not considered that the approval of the proposed development would undermine the trees. As a result wildlife should also remain unaffected.

Conclusion

In considering the above, the Planning Authority is satisfied on balance that the proposed development is considered acceptable subject to conditions, for the reasons discussed above.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to conditions

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The proposed house is acceptable in the location proposed as it would not cause an amenity or public safety issue, and would be sited and designed to not cause harm to the harmony of the streetscape. As such the proposed house has been designed and sited with due consideration for its context, , in accordance with planning Policies D1, D2, R6 H1 and T2 of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan, and Scottish Planning Policy.

it is recommended that approval is granted with the following condition(s):

(1) No development shall commence on site until the boundary wall along Elmfield Place has been reduced in height to no higher than 1.0 metre in height over the first 1.0 metre of its length measured back from its point nearest Elmfield

Avenue. - In the interests of pedestrian safety to ensure vehicles exiting the site can have sufficient visibility splays during the construction phase and occupation of the houses.

(2) No development shall commence on site until full details of the surfacing of Elmfield Place and the car parking and turning area has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt Elmfield Place shall be designed as a shared use surface. The development shall be fully completed in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of any one of the houses hereby approved - In the interests of road and pedestrian safety, and in the interests of visual amenity for the purposes of clarification.

(3) Notwithstanding the details submitted, no development shall commence until full details of the external materials, including type and colour, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority, including samples as may be required. The development shall be fully completed in accordance with the approved details – The planning application did not specify in full the type and colour of external materials, in the interests of visual amenity.

(4) No development shall commence until full details of the proposed boundary treatments, including walls and fences, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Boundary treatments shall also include those between the plots. Details shall include height, specification and materials of the boundary treatment(s). The development shall be fully completed in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of any one of the houses hereby approved - In the interests of clarification, visual amenity and road safety.

(5) that, except as the Planning Authority may otherwise agree in writing, no construction or demolition work shall take place:

(a) outwith the hours of 7.00 am to 7.00 pm Mondays to Fridays;

(b) outwith the hours of 9.00 am to 4.00 pm Saturdays; or

(c) at any time on Sundays,

except (on all days) for works inaudible outwith the application site boundary.

[For the avoidance of doubt, this would generally allow internal finishing work, but not the use of machinery] - in the interests of residential amenity.

(6) No occupation of any one of the units hereby approved shall take place until the parking spaces and turning area as shown on the approved plans have been completed in full. The parking spaces and turning areas shall be retained thereafter for such use. - In the interests of road safety to ensure that vehicles can enter and exit the site in a forward gear.

(7) No occupation of any one of the units hereby approved shall take place until the bin storage area as shown on the approved plans has been provided in full. The bin storage areas shall be retained thereafter for such use. - In the interests of residential amenity and road safety, and to comply with Supplementary Guidance.

Dr Margaret Bochel

Head of Planning and Sustainable Development.