

20/00504/FUL

Applicant Mr Norman Davill

Location Lilacs 28 Rose Grove Keyworth Nottinghamshire NG12 5HE

Proposal Erection of a two-storey detached house with parking

Ward Keyworth And Wolds

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application site comprises part of the residential amenity/garden space to No. 28 Rose Grove, a two storey semi-detached property in the built-up part of Keyworth. The amenity space in question is located to the west of the dwellinghouse and is bounded by a mixture of hedgerow and close-boarded fencing. A detached single storey garage is located close to the western boundary of the site.
2. The application site lies at the end of a cul-de-sac and is bounded by existing residential properties on all sides. Pedestrian and vehicular access is directly off Rose Grove.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

3. The site has the benefit of outline planning permission granted in July 2019 for the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a two storey detached dwelling with new dropped kerb access to 28 Rose Grove. The outline application included approval of all matters apart from 'appearance' (i.e. matters of access, landscaping, layout and scale).
4. The application subject of this report was originally submitted as a reserved matters application, seeking approval of matters relating to appearance, layout and scale. During the course of determination, it came to light that the application had been submitted in the incorrect format (i.e. a reserved matters rather than a full application) as there is no mechanism to approve matters through a reserved matters application that were previously approved at outline stage. The application was subsequently converted to an application for full planning permission and was subject to further consultation.
5. The proposed three-bedroom dwelling is roughly L-shaped with a footprint of circa 82m². At its deepest and widest points, the dwelling would measure approximately 10.3m deep and approximately 8.65m in width. The dwelling would be two-storey at the front, dropping to single storey at the rear.
6. The dwelling would be of traditional design with a double-height front bay and a pitched roof. At its highest point, the ridge of the roof would measure circa 7.7m, with an eaves height of circa 4.8m.
7. The proposed materials are facing brick and grey roof tiles.

8. Off-street parking is proposed to the front of the dwellinghouse, adjacent to the front entrance and adjacent to the protruding two-storey wing.

SITE HISTORY

9. 19/01359/OUT - Demolition of existing garage and construction of two storey detached dwelling with new dropped kerb access to 28 Rose Grove (Outline application for approval of access, landscaping, layout, and scale) – Planning permission granted 30th July 2019.

REPRESENTATIONS

Ward Councillor(s)

10. One Ward Councillor (Cllr Inglis) objects to the proposal on grounds which can be summarised as follows:
- Support comments made by neighbours in relation to it being over intensive to the size of the plot and an over development in relation to existing properties.
 - There are concerns regarding loss of privacy, loss of light and to possible overshadowing of solar panels.
 - This is a just a summary to representations made to Ward Councillor and in relation to valid reasons already published in public comments.
 - On the previous outline planning application 19/01359/OUT the Parish Councils decision was not published or referred to in the delegated report:

Keyworth Planning minutes 01/07/19

“19/01359/OUT Lilacs, 28 Rose Grove, Keyworth, Nottingham, NG12 5HE Demolition of existing garage and construction of two storey detached dwelling with new dropped kerb access to 28 Rose Grove (outline application for approval of access, landscaping, layout and scale)

Resolved: OBJECT DRAFT Page 2 of 2 Comments: Over intensive development of a single plot – garden grabbing. Insufficient parking, the addition of an extra dwelling as proposed will not leave space for parking for the existing dwelling”

Town/Parish Council

11. Keyworth Parish Council object to the proposal. The following concerns are cited:
- Over-intense development of a single plot.
 - Insufficient car parking for new proposed dwelling.

Statutory and Other Consultees

12. The Nottinghamshire County Council as Highway Authority have not provided comments on the proposal, instead referring to their standing advice.

Local Residents and the General Public

13. Five representations have been received from local residents objecting to the proposal. The concerns raised are summarised as follows:
- a. Overdevelopment of the site – The proposed dwelling has a width of 8.7m, compared to 6.3m on the original submission. Thus the revised dwelling is significantly larger than that originally proposed with a footprint of 89.61sqm compared to 65.31sqm, representing a 37% increase in footprint. Does this not constitute over-development of the site by the Council's criteria?
 - b. Overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring property to the rear (Brecon, 1 Briar Close) – the increased width of the proposed dwelling worsens the overlooking issue. Having a wider footprint by 2.4m means that the dwelling will extend further west, this extends the scale of the building and increases the angles of overlooking into the ground floor bedrooms of 1 Briar Close and the adjacent patio to the side. This significantly increases the loss of privacy created by the proposed development.
 - c. The proposed development is not in keeping with the character of the community of existing buildings at the top of Rose Grove as well as those adjacent to the back of the proposed build.
 - d. The build, which according to the revised plans is somewhat larger than those originally submitted, will be 'squeezed' into a relatively small garden space, affecting the density of the properties at the top of Rose Grove, unacceptably changing its character and the nature of the area. It is essentially an exercise in 'garden grabbing'.
 - e. It will negatively affect the value of the existing properties.
 - f. The build can also be objected to on grounds related to its positioning: restriction of light and invasion of privacy for a number of adjacent homes.
 - g. The proposed build will restrict light to solar panels on neighbouring property – it is therefore not consistent with the Borough Council encouraging its residents to adopt a green energy strategy. It will also cause financial loss.
 - h. In terms of privacy, windows to the left side of the proposed build will directly look into neighbouring property and front living areas although the revised plan somewhat mitigates this issue (especially if those windows are of frosted glass). However, this particular invasion of privacy will be small compared to that effecting the properties to rear of and across from the proposed build.

- i. Traffic access to the top of Rose Grove is already difficult due to the number of vehicles owned by existing properties and by the number of service/emergency vehicles visiting these properties. It is also used as a turning area for vehicles visiting properties lower down Rose Grove. The proposed build will unacceptably increase traffic density at the top of Rose Grove not only to the inconvenience and health and safety of existing residents but also those of the emergency services.
- j. The water supply to the top of Rose Grove and drainage provision, as well as electricity and gas supplies, have long been problematic. Another property would add to the strain on these services.
- k. This proposal conflicts with the Keyworth Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan in several respects relating to the protection of existing environmental assets (Policy E1 & E2). The proposal does nothing to 'protect and enhance the landscape' (Policy E2, p57).
- l. A counter to objections raised might be the need to increase housing build in Keyworth. However, in the context of (at least) three substantive developments on the periphery of the 'village', the addition of one house in the centre of the 'village' squeezed onto a modest garden area against local opposition would seem an indefensible proposition.
- m. The maximum distance of the first floor bedroom windows to rear bedroom windows in neighbouring property will be approximately 20 metres, at an angle of approximately 45 degrees. The line of sight from the nearer windows will be shorter, but at a slightly reduced angle. So still a clear view in either direction. This will result in unacceptable level of overlooking/ loss of privacy.
- n. The upper floor windows will look down on most of the garden to the neighbouring property to the rear and part of the patio, which runs alongside the bungalow. Unfortunately, the part of the patio that will be most visible is that which is enjoyed most in the summer as it is a sheltered and sunny spot.
- o. The plans for the development have increased the size of the new property significantly. The garden will be much smaller than recommended by the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide, as quoted in the initial report, and appears to constitute overdevelopment of the site.
- p. The proposed building will be directly opposite property on Rose Grove and the upstairs windows will directly look down into the whole of the front bedrooms.
- q. Would like to add the Parish Council Report comments of "garden grabbing" and their objection to the application and wonder why this was completely ignored when the original outline application was approved by Rushcliffe planning.
- r. Building work is already underway on the original house.

- s. Laying the foundations for a two-storey house so close to the boundary will undoubtedly cause damage to the fence, trees adjacent to it and shade borders going forward.
- t. The new build will overlook and dominate the front of neighbouring property.
- u. The application lodged recognises that there has been no consultation with neighbours over the plans.

PLANNING POLICY

- 14. The Development Plan for Rushcliffe consists of The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (referred to herein as the 'Core Strategy') and The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land & Planning Policies (referred to herein as the 'LPP2'). The Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan form part of the Development Plan and is a material consideration in the determination of the application.
- 15. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide are material considerations in the determination of applications.

Relevant National Planning Policies and Guidance

- 16. The relevant national policy considerations for this proposal are those contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the proposal should be considered within the context of a presumption in favour of sustainable development as a core principle of the NPPF.
- 17. Section 5 (Delivering a sufficient supply of homes) is relevant to this application. Paragraph 68 states that Local Planning Authorities should *"...support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions, giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes..."*
- 18. The proposal should also be considered under section 12 of the NPPF in terms of achieving well-designed places. In line with NPPF paragraph 130, permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Relevant Local Planning Policies and Guidance

- 19. Policy 1 of the Core Strategy reinforces a positive and proactive approach to planning decision making that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 20. Policy 3 of the Core Strategy outlines the distribution of development in the Borough during the plan period. The policy promotes urban concentration by directing the majority of future development towards the built-up area of Nottingham and the Key Settlements identified for growth of Bingham, Cotgrave, East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington.

21. Core Strategy Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) seeks to ensure that new development makes a positive contribution to the public realm and sense of place, and has regard to the local context and local characteristics.
22. Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the LPP2, in particular criteria 4, relating to scale, density, height, massing, design, layout and materials, is relevant to the determination of this application.
23. Policy H1 (Housing Strategy) of the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan states that applications for infill development within the settlement boundary will be supported subject to compliance with other Development Plan policies and provision of suitable vehicular access and sustainable links to shops and services.
24. Policy TA2 (Highways and Access) of the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan states that all new development should ensure that it includes suitable measures to accommodate traffic entering and leaving the development.
25. The 2009 Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide provides guidance on issues associated with layout of new dwellings, including suggested garden sizes and relationship/distances to neighbouring properties.

APPRAISAL

26. Outline planning permission was granted in July 2019 for the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a two storey detached dwelling with new dropped kerb access to 28 Rose Grove (ref. 19/01359/OUT). This permission remains extant.
27. The current application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a two-storey detached house with parking.
28. In light of the above, the main issues of relevance to the determination of this application are considered to be as follows, the principle of development; impact on the character and appearance of the area; impact on residential amenity; and parking/highways matters.

Principle of development

29. The application site is located within the built-up part of Keyworth, a key settlement identified for growth in the Local Plan. The village centre and a wide range of facilities are located approx. 1km away. As such, it is considered that the application site occupies a sustainable location, accessible to a range of services other than by use of the private car.
30. The principle of the erection of a two-storey dwelling, along with a dropped kerb access, has been established through the granting of the outline application in 2019. This is a material consideration in the determination of this application.
31. Overall, the principle of residential development on the site is considered to accord with the spatial strategy contained within Policy 3 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

32. There are a variety of properties and plot sizes along Rose Grove. The top of Rose Grove (where the application site is located) is typified by one and one and a half storey properties set in larger plots. There are also a small number of two storey properties in the immediate vicinity. The previous planning permission for a two storey dwelling on this site remains extant and represents a fallback position.
33. The proposed dwelling would be set slightly back from the frontage, close to the centre of the plot, occupying a similar build-line to the neighbouring properties to the east (i.e. No. 28, 26, 26A and 22 Rose Grove). Although the dwelling would have a total depth of 10.3m, the rear section, with a depth of 3.2m, would be single storey, across the full width of the dwelling. Furthermore, the two storey element would be 'L' shaped with the western elevation, closest to the boundary with the neighbouring property, having a depth of 5 metres. The single storey element of the proposed dwelling would extend circa 3m behind the rear wall of the two storey element of 28 Rose Grove. To the rear of this property was a single storey element, which has recently been demolished and a new extension is in the process of being constructed. The rear elevation of the proposed dwelling (single storey element) would be roughly level with the rear elevation of the extension at No. 28.
34. Whilst the proposed dwelling would have a larger footprint than that previously approved in respect of the outline application, the scale of the property would not be out-of-keeping with surrounding properties or the general character of the area.
35. The property would have a private (rear) amenity space amounting to approximately 64sqm. Whilst this would be below the level recommended in the Residential Design Guide, it would only be slightly smaller (approximately 3sqm) than that proposed in the layout on the previously approved outline planning permission, and would be similar to the amount of amenity space to be retained for No. 28 and that available at No.26.
36. As stated previously, there are a variety of plot sizes along this part of Rose Grove. Whilst smaller than some, the plot size of the proposed dwelling is not considered to be at odds with the character of the locality. Bearing in mind the amount of amenity space that would remain and the distance to boundaries, it is not considered to constitute an over-intensive form of development.
37. Due to the size of the plot and the layout proposed, the enlargement of the dwelling, through subsequent extensions to the property that could potentially be constructed under permitted development, could result in the overdevelopment of the plot. As such, it is recommended that a condition be imposed on grant of permission removing permitted development rights for such additions.

Impact on residential amenity

38. The application site is bounded on all sides by existing residential dwellings. Concerns have been raised that the proposed dwelling would be overbearing in respect of neighbouring properties and would result in unacceptable loss of light/overshadowing and overlooking/loss of privacy.

39. The submitted plans show the proposed dwelling would be located between 6.6m and 7m from the rear (northern) boundary i.e. the boundary with 'Brecon' (No.1 Briar Close). The rearmost part of the proposed dwelling would be single storey only with a depth of 3.2m. Therefore, the two-storey part of the dwelling would be located between 9.8m and 10.2m from the rear (northern) boundary. Brecon is a single storey dwelling with bedrooms located at the rear (west) end of the property. Whilst the development proposal would result in additional built-development, given the intervening separation distance (approx. 13m at closest point) it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would appear unacceptably overbearing nor result in unacceptable overshadowing or loss of light.
40. In terms of potential for overlooking/loss of privacy, the closest first floor window of the proposed dwelling would be located circa 17m from the rear facing bedroom windows of Brecon. Whilst there would be some increased potential for overlooking, the views would be from bedroom accommodation and angled, and relatively distanced. Increased potential for overlooking would also be afforded of the rear garden of Brecon, though views towards the part of the garden closest to the bungalow would again be angled and relatively distanced. Due to the intervening boundary treatment (a mature hedgerow) additional overlooking would not be afforded from the single storey part of the proposed dwelling. Overall, whilst there would be some increase in overlooking as a result of the proposal, it is not considered to be so significant as to justify refusal. In particular, it is not considered that the level of overlooking would be significantly different to the already approved proposal, which remains extant.
41. In terms of the neighbouring property to the west (Walnut Lodge), at the closest point, the proposed dwelling would be located circa 1m from the western boundary. The facing elevation of Walnut Lodge's garage would be approximately 2.5 to 3m from the new dwellinghouse (which would be predominantly single-storey at this point). The facing elevation of the main part of Walnut Lodge would be circa 11m from the new dwellinghouse. In light of the separation distance and the orientation of the dwellings in their respective plots, it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would appear unacceptably overbearing, nor result in unacceptable overshadowing or loss of light to the amenity area of the neighbouring property or main habitable room windows. The only first floor window proposed in side (west) elevation, facing Walnut Lodge, would serve a bathroom. A condition is recommended requiring that this be obscured glazed and top-opening only. The first floor bay window (serving a bedroom) may also be afforded views towards Walnut Lodge – however, these would be angled and distanced. Overall, there would be no unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy in respect of the property to the west.
42. Whilst the proposed dwelling would be located on the eastern boundary (i.e. the boundary with No. 28 Rose Grove) and circa 3m from the facing elevation, given the orientation/siting of the respective properties and bearing in mind that no windows are proposed in the side (eastern) elevation of the proposed dwelling, the proposal would not appear unacceptably overbearing nor resulting in unacceptable overlooking/loss of privacy.
43. The proposed dwelling would be afforded a rear garden of approximately 64sqm. In terms of the distance to the rear boundary, the new dwelling would

be sited between approximately 6.6m and 7m from the rear boundary. The Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide recommends that detached properties are afforded gardens of 110sqm. It has been accepted under previously established guidelines that rear gardens should have a depth of 10m to the boundary.

44. Notwithstanding the above, the Design Guide recognises that, in line with government guidance, a variety of garden sizes are required. The garden size and distance to boundary would be comparable with nearby properties including No. 28 and No. 26 Rose Grove (and to a lesser extent 26A Rose Grove). It would therefore not be out-of-keeping with the character of the immediate locality. As the plot is not enclosed and there are no buildings directly to the rear, it is not considered that the residential amenity space associated with the new dwelling would appear overly cramped or would be unacceptably overlooked.
45. Overall, the impact of the proposal on residential amenity is not considered to be such that it would justify refusal of the development proposal.

Parking/highways matters

46. Off-street parking is proposed to the front of the dwellinghouse, adjacent to the front entrance and adjacent to the protruding two-storey wing.
47. Concerns have been raised by local residents on the grounds of highway safety and increased traffic/on-road parking as a result of the proposal. The NPPF (para 109) makes clear that development should only be refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts would be severe.
48. The Highway Authority have not provided comments on the proposal, instead referring to their standing advice. It is noted that they did not object to the outline application and that their response stated that *"it is not envisaged that this proposal will severely compromise highway safety"*. They recommended that the outline permission be subject to a number of conditions regarding provision/surfacing of the proposed driveway, provision of a dropped kerb etc. It is recommended that these conditions are imposed on the grant of permission for the full application.
49. Given the scale of the proposal (i.e. the erection of a single three-bedroom house with off-street parking) and, bearing in mind the comments from the Highway Authority, it is considered that a robust reason for refusal could not be sustained on highways grounds.

Other Matters

50. Concerns have been raised by a Ward Councillor and local residents that the Parish Council's objections in respect of the outline application (Ref. 19/01359/OUT) were not taken into consideration in the granting of outline planning permission in July 2019. The Borough Council has no record of comments being submitted by the Parish Council. Nevertheless, as there was no objection from a Ward Councillor, the outline application would have remained a delegated decision. The application was granted as it was considered to accord with local and national planning policy.

51. In terms of the issues raised in respect of the water/electricity/gas supplies, these are matters to be addressed with the utility providers and are not material planning considerations.
52. Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the proposal on neighbouring house prices. This is not a material planning consideration and is not, therefore, relevant to the determination of the proposal.
53. Concerns have been raised that the proposal would conflict with Neighbourhood Plan Policies E1 and E2 regarding blue/green infrastructure and landscape/biodiversity. The main thrust of Policy E1 is to ensure that larger scale developments provide appropriate green and blue infrastructure, although the policy also seeks to protect existing infrastructure. Furthermore, it is clear from the wording of Policy E2 that this relates to landscape “...surrounding the settlement of Keyworth...” As the site forms part of an existing residential curtilage in a built-up part of Keyworth, it is not considered that its development would result in a significant adverse effect on landscape or biodiversity assets, or conflict with these policies.
54. Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the proposal on the solar panels installed on the garage to the neighbouring property to the west. Government policy seeks to address the impacts of society’s activities on climate change and to reduce carbon emissions by, amongst other things, encouraging the generation of energy from renewable sources. Therefore, the environmental benefit of the solar panels and any impact on them needs to be balanced with other material planning consideration, including the provision of additional housing in a sustainable location, albeit limited to a single dwelling in this instance, and the fact that there is already an extant permission for a detached dwelling on the site.
55. The solar panels cover a significant proportion of the south facing plane of the garage roof, stretching beyond the two storey element of the proposed dwelling. The part of the proposed dwelling immediately to the east of the garage would be located some 2.5 to 3m away and would be predominantly confined to single-storey (approximately 0.5m of the two-storey section would be located opposite the garage). It is considered that there would be unobstructed sunlight to the panels during early part of the day and possibly some impact when the sun moves round to the south, although the impact would vary depending on the time of year. Overall, the potential for impact on the solar panels is not considered to be so significant as to justify refusal of the application and that any impact is outweighed by the provision of additional housing in a sustainable location, on a site which benefits from extant permission.

Conclusion

56. This application is seeking full planning permission for the erection of a two-storey detached house with parking. The application site is located within the built-up part of Keyworth, a key settlement identified for growth in the Local Plan. The principle of the erection of a two-storey dwelling, along with a dropped kerb access, has been established through the granting of the outline application in 2019. This is a material consideration in the determination of this application.

57. The scale, siting and appearance of the proposed dwellinghouse is considered to be broadly in-keeping with the locality. Bearing in mind the size of the plot and the distances to the boundaries, it is not considered to represent over-intensive development.
58. In terms of residential amenity, whilst it is acknowledged that there would be some increase in potential for overlooking to the neighbouring properties (particularly parts of neighbouring gardens), the impacts are not considered to be so significant as to justify refusal.
59. In terms of access/parking, the Highway Authority have not raised any objections to the proposal. Conditions are recommended to ensure that the access driveway and parking areas are provided to an acceptable standard.
60. Overall, the development proposal is considered to accord with local and national planning policy. It is, therefore, recommended for approval.
61. The application was not the subject of pre-application discussions, however after careful consideration, the scheme is considered acceptable and no negotiations with the applicant or agent were considered necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

It is **RECOMMENDED** that planning permission be granted subject to the following condition(s)

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

[To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004].
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan (No date/ reference); Proposed Dwelling – Elevations (Ref. Drawing No. 2); Proposed Dwelling – Site Layout & Floor Plans (Ref. Drawing No.1).

[For the avoidance of doubt and to comply with Policy 10 of the Core Strategy and Policy 1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].
3. The materials specified in the application shall be used for the external walls and roof of the development hereby approved and no additional or alternative materials shall be used.

[To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and to comply with Policy 10 of the Core Strategy and Policy 1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].
4. The first floor window in the side (west) elevation shall be permanently obscured to Group 5 level of privacy or equivalent and non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed. The windows shall be retained to this specification.

[To prevent overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring property and to comply with Policy 1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) there shall be no enlargement or alteration of the proposed dwelling without the prior written approval of the Borough Council.

[The development is of a nature whereby future development of this type should be closely controlled to comply with Policy 1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1 Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no sheds, buildings or structures shall be erected on the site without the prior written approval of the Borough Council.

[The development is of a nature whereby future development of this type should be closely controlled to comply with Policy 1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

7. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until a dropped vehicular footway crossing is available for use and constructed in accordance with the Highway Authority specification to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

[In the interest of highway safety and to comply with Policy 1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

8. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until the access driveway is constructed with provision to prevent the discharge of surface water from the driveway to the public highway. The provision to prevent the discharge of surface water to the public highway shall then be retained for the life of the development.

[To ensure surface water from the site is not deposited on the public highway causing dangers to road users and to comply with Policy 1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

9. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until the driveway and parking areas are surfaced in a hard-bound material (not loose gravel) for a minimum of 5.0 metres behind the Highway boundary. The surfaced driveway and any parking or turning areas shall then be maintained in such hard-bound material for the life of the development.

[To reduce the possibility of deleterious material being deposited on the public highway (loose stones etc.) and to comply with Policy 1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

10. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until pedestrian visibility splays of 1.0 meters x 1.0 meters are provided on each

side the vehicle access. These measurements are taken from and along the highway boundary. The area of land within these splays shall be maintained free from all obstruction over 0.6 meters above the carriageway level at all times.

[In the interest of pedestrian safety and to comply with Policy 1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

11. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until the parking areas are provided in accordance with the submitted plans. The parking areas shall be maintained in the bound material for the life of the development and shall not be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles.

[To ensure that adequate off-street parking provision is made to reduce the possibilities of the proposed development leading to on-street parking in the area and to comply with Policy 1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].