



Report to Planning Committee 9th November 2023
 Business Manager Lead: Lisa Hughes – Planning Development
 Lead Officer: Jennifer Wallis, Planner, ext. 5370

Report Summary			
Application Number	23/01429/FUL		
Proposal	Erection of a Four Bedroom Bungalow		
Location	Land Adjacent to Fosse Road, Farndon NG24 3UB		
Applicant	Mr P Palmer	Agent	Mr Clive Davies
Web Link	https://publicaccess.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=details&keyVal=RZ8GGDLBJYY00		
Registered	14 August 2023	Target Date	9 September 2023
		Extension of time	13 November 2023
Recommendation	That planning permission be REFUSED for the reason set out in Section 10.0 of this report		

This application has been referred to the Planning Committee for determination by the Local Ward Member, Councillor Jack Kellas, who considers the revised plans submitted provide flood compensation to address the previous reason for refusal. In addition, Farndon Parish Council Support the application, which is contrary to the Officer’s Recommendation to Refuse.

1.0 The Site

The application site relates a parcel of land measuring approximately 0.24 hectares in area, within the built-up area of Farndon. The site is surrounded to the northeast, northwest and southwest by existing residential development, and by Fosse Road (the former A46) to the southeast.

The site is located within Flood Zones 1 and 2 as defined by the Environment Agency flood maps which means it is at low and medium risk of main river flooding. The north-western part of the site is within Zone 1 and the south-eastern part is within Zone 2. There is a small area in the south-east corner of the site which is at low risk of surface water flooding.



The site has been cleared of vegetation.

2.0 Relevant Planning History

22/01331/FUL - Full planning application for the erection of 1 four-bedroom bungalow. Refused by the Planning Committee on 09.12.2022, for the following reason:-

01

The application site contains land which is located within Flood Zone 2 as defined by the Environment Agency data maps. Core Policy 10 and Policy DM5 of the adopted Development Plan as well as Chapter 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2021) sets out the due process for assessing new development within areas at risk from flooding. The Local Planning Authority must first apply the Sequential Test and then only upon satisfaction of this should the Exceptions Test be applied. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal would fail the Sequential Test as there are other more preferable sites at lower risk from flooding within the District on which such a use should be located. There are no reasons to restrict the area in which the Sequential Test is applied. In addition, the proposal would result in an increase in the loss of floodplain storage without sufficient onsite level-for-level compensatory storage or offsite compensation and thus would result in an increase in flood risk elsewhere to other more vulnerable developments, contrary to the NPPF (2021).

As such the proposal is contrary to Core Policy 10 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (2019) and Policy DM5 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD (2013), as well as Chapter 14 of the NPPF (2021), PPG, which are material planning considerations.

14/00859/OUT - Outline planning application for 1 dwelling (appearance, landscaping and

scale as reserved matters). Refused under delegated authority on 16.06.2014 for the following reasons:-

01

The site is located in Flood Zone 2 and is therefore at risk of flooding. It has not been demonstrated that there are no other reasonably available sequentially preferable sites, which are at a lower risk of flooding, where the development proposed could be located. The Council has a proven 5 year land supply of available land at lower risk of flooding across the district that are sequentially preferable to this site. The Sequential test submitted with the application fails to make adequate assessment of land across the district. As such, the application fails the Sequential Test contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and Core Policy 10 of the Core Strategy.

02

The site is located within Farndon which contains a limited range of services but it is not classed as a sustainable location for new growth within the Adopted Core Strategy. The application fails to demonstrate an identified proven local need for new housing in this area. It is therefore considered that development of this site would result in an unsustainable form of development that would have an adverse impact upon a rural area and undermine strategic objectives contrary to Policy Spatial Policy 3 of the Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.

03

In the opinion of the local planning authority the applicant has failed to demonstrate the associated risk caused by the development to any potential protected species using the site due to the loss of trees and natural habitat. As such the proposal fails to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and policy DM5 of the Adopted Allocations and Development Management DPD.

3.0 The Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of one single storey detached four bedroomed dwelling to the northwest of the site, with vehicular access from Fosse Road to the southeast of the site.

The approximate dimensions of the proposed dwelling are:

25m (length) x 14m (width) x 5.5m (ridge) x 2.5m (eaves)

The dwelling is set back some 88m from the road frontage and would be served by a long access road (3.2m wide), with three parking spaces half-way along its length. Ground levels are highest at its north-western end (13.1mAOD) and lowest at the south-eastern end (12.31m AOD) near to the road. The access road would be elevated to 12.7m AOD and therefore a max. of approx 400mm above current ground levels.

The site is to be enclosed by a 1.8m high vertical boarded timber fence, there is new tree

planting in the centre of the site and a new hedgerow proposed along the road frontage either side of the access.

Plans and documents considered comprise:-

Location plan;

DRWG no. 1D/11/2020 Rev D Site plan;

DRWG no. 2D/11/2020 Rev D Proposed bungalow and plans elevations;

DRWG no. 3/11/2020 Topographical survey;

Revised Flood Risk Assessment June 2023

The layout and design of the dwelling is identical to that previously considered and refused under 22/01331/FUL, although there are some differences to this submission which include:-

- A 'Floodplain Compensatory Storage Area' with 40 cubic metres of storage capacity (Base Level 12.35mAOD) is proposed along part of the south western boundary of the application site (within Flood Zone 1). Reference J on the revised Site Plan.
- Pipes to allow floodwater to flow under the elevated driveway, 225mm diameter@ 7500mm c/c, with 1.0m diameter catch pit at access point and exit, are also proposed. Reference K on the submitted Site Plan.
- The Flood Risk Assessment Report has been revised and updated to address the loss of floodplain.

4.0 Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of 25 properties have been individually notified by letter. A site notice has been displayed near to the site and an advert has been placed in the local press.

Site visit undertaken on 12 September 2023

5.0 Planning Policy Framework

The Development Plan

Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2019) (ACS)

Spatial Policy 1 – Settlement Hierarchy

Spatial Policy 2 – Spatial Distribution of Growth

Spatial Policy 3 – Rural Areas

Spatial Policy 7 – Sustainable Transport

Core Policy 3 – Housing Mix, Type and Density

Core Policy 9 – Sustainable Design

Core Policy 10 – Climate Change

Core Policy 12 – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

Allocations & Development Management DPD Adopted July 2013 (ADMDDP)

Policy DM5 – Design

Policy DM7 – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

Policy DM12 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Other Material Planning Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (online resource) (PPG)

NSDC Housing Need Survey by Arc 2020

Residential Cycle and Parking Standards and Design Guide SPD 2021

6.0 Consultations

NB: Comments below are provided in summary - for comments in full please see the online planning file.

(a) Statutory Consultations

Environment Agency – No comments made - the development falls within flood zone 2 and therefore the LPA should apply national flood risk standing advice (FRSA) in this instance.

NCC Highway Authority - This application can be considered under Standing Advice. (Previous comments in response to 22/01331/FUL - This is a proposal for a single bungalow accessed from Fosse Road which is a 40mph road at this location. Visibility is acceptable as the verge is wide. Parking requirement for this four-bedroom bungalow is three spaces. Due to the length of the access driveway, a refuse collection point near the junction with Fosse Road should be provided so that refuse lorries do not need to enter the access, nor carry distances be exceeded. The width of the drive should be a minimum of 3.6m to accommodate an emergency. The width of the access should be a minimum of 2.75m plus 0.5m either side if bound by a hedge or fence. Works to construct the access will be within highway therefore the applicant should be aware of the note below. We would not wish to raise objection and would request conditions.)

(b) Town/Parish Council

Farndon Parish Council – Support.

However, Members were aware of the impact the removal of mature landscaping has had on the adjacent residential properties. The Planning Authority to be asked to include a condition that mature trees and extensive landscaping be included along the boundaries to replace that lost when the site was cleared. Further, Members asked that consideration be given to including a condition for the hedge along the Fosse Road boundary to remain to lessen the impact on bio-diversity and to maintain the eyeline.

(c) Representations/Non-Statutory Consultation

Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board – No comments received.

(Previous comments in response to 22/01331/FUL - The site is within the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board district. The Board maintained Corner House Farm Drain Feeder, an open and culverted watercourse, exists to the South of the site and to which BYELAWS and the LAND DRAINAGE ACT 1991 applies. Surface water run-off rates to receiving watercourses must not be increased as a result of the development. The suitability of soakaways, as a means of surface water disposal, should be ascertained prior to planning permission being granted. Soakaways should be designed to an appropriate standard and to the satisfaction of the Approving Authority in conjunction with the Local Planning Authority. If the suitability is not proven the Applicant should be requested to resubmit amended proposals showing how the Site is to be drained. Should this be necessary this Board would wish to be re-consulted. The design, operation and future maintenance of site drainage systems must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority and Local Planning Authority.)

5 Representations have been received supporting the application on the following grounds:

- The site is an eyesore, harmful to the visual amenities of the area.
- Developing the site would enhance the neighbourhood, and contribute to Farndon being a desirable place to live.
- If undeveloped, the site could become a target for fly tipping.
- Replacement hedge and tree planting should take place on the site, to mitigate for the loss of trees and wildlife.
- When copse was cleared, experienced loss of privacy and increase in traffic noise and no regard to trees or wildlife, however, do not wish to continue to overlook waste ground. Support application with conditions to reinstate blackthorn hedge and replanting trees.

7.0 Comments of the Business Manager – Planning Development

The key issues are:

1. Principle of Development
2. Impact on Flood Risk
3. Impact on Highway Safety and Parking Provision
4. Impact upon Residential Amenity
5. Impact upon Trees and Ecology
6. Impact on Design and Housing Density

The assessment below is identical to the wording of the report presented to Planning Committee in December 2022 under 22/01331/FUL, with the new assessment in bold.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes the principle of a presumption in favour of sustainable development and recognises the duty under the Planning Acts for planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The NPPF refers to the presumption in favour of sustainable development being at the heart of development and sees sustainable development as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. This is confirmed at the development plan level under Policy DM12 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD.

Principle of Development

The starting point for considering development is against the development plan which is up to date for decision making purposes.

Spatial Policy 1 and 2 provide the settlement hierarchy for the District and Farndon does not feature within it. The settlement is therefore an 'other village' and so the development should be considered against Spatial Policy 3 of the Amended Core Strategy (ACS). This policy states that beyond Principal Villages, proposals for new development will be considered against the criteria of location, scale, need, impact and character. SP3 states that development should be located in villages, this means locations within the existing built extent of the village, which includes dwellings and their gardens, commercial premises, farm yards and community facilities. It would not normally include undeveloped land, fields, paddocks or open space which form the edge of built form. Although the land is considered to be undeveloped it is surrounded by existing residential development and is considered to be located within the settlement of Farndon.

The location, scale, impact and character of the proposal is considered acceptable in general. The NSDC Housing Need Survey 2020 states that within the Rural South Area, the housing need for 4-bedroom bungalows is not the highest need for the area. The greatest need is for 4 or more bedroom dwellings (35.8%) with 3 bedroomed houses next (20.2%), followed by 12 bedroomed dwellings (15.5%) and then 2 bedroom bungalows (14.4%). Farndon's own housing need survey (2016) also concluded that the greatest need within Farndon itself is for 2, 3 and 5 bedroomed dwellings, and 3 and 4 bedroomed bungalows. There is clearly a need in Farndon for bungalows and the proposal is considered to help meet this need.

The principle to develop the site with residential is largely acceptable subject to further onsite assessment which is outlined below.

Impact on Flood Risk

The proposed access to the site has not change and is still located within flood zone 2 and therefore at medium risk from main river flooding. The house itself would be within zone 1 but is inaccessible from one 1, so I take the view that the proposal needs to be assessed as a whole, given that the two elements are inextricably linked. Para 159 of the NPPF (2023) states inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk. Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) under Table 2 Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification, states the use (dwellinghouse) is classed as a more vulnerable use. Policies DM5, CP10 and Paragraph 162 of the NPPF (2023) states the aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The Planning Practice Guidance states 'Avoiding flood risk through the sequential test is the most effective way of addressing flood risk because it places the least reliance on measures like flood defences, flood warnings

and property level resilience features. Even where a flood risk assessment shows the development can be made safe throughout its lifetime without increasing risk elsewhere, the sequential test still needs to be satisfied. Application of the sequential approach in the decision-making process will help to ensure that development is steered to the lowest risk areas, where it is compatible with sustainable development objectives to do so.' (Paragraph: 023 Reference ID: 7-023-20220825).

Applying the Sequential Test however is normally applied District wide, and for that the Council has a proven 5-year housing land supply whereby it would not be reliant on the use of such land for the supply of housing. However, the Planning Practice Guidance states 'the area to apply the test will be defined by local circumstances relating to the catchment area for the type of development proposed.' (Paragraph: 027 Reference ID: 7-027-20220825). Although this isn't defined by the PPG, it provides examples such as the catchment area for a school or where the development is needed to sustain the existing community. The proposal is for a 4 bedroomed dwelling where it could reasonably accommodate children. Having consulted with Nottinghamshire County Council they state that the local primary school, St Peter's Cross Keys C of E Academy, has a surplus of places over the next five years. However, this one dwelling alone is not considered necessary to sustain the local community and tip the balance of acceptability in the planning balance. Farndon is a well-established community with many local facilities and by applying the Sequential Test to the settlement alone to benefit the school, would not result in such overriding benefit to the community. The proposal would bring about a 4 bedroomed bungalow, which although is not of greatest need within the location would contribute to a clear need for bungalows within Farndon, but again this is not an overriding need to allow the development.

Upon applying the Sequential Test, and given the Council has a proven 5-year housing land supply, there is land available at lower risk of flooding whereby the use can be accommodated and although there are some local benefits with the provision of one dwelling, this would not tip the balance of acceptability in the planning balance. Thus, the Sequential Test is not considered to be passed.

With regards to increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere through the loss of floodplain storage, the NPPF (2023) at paragraph 159 and 164 insists that development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The PPG (which has been updated more recently in August 2022) at paragraph 49 states where flood storage from any source of flooding is to be lost as a result of development, on-site level-for-level compensatory storage, accounting for the predicted impacts of climate change over the lifetime of the development, should be provided.

The updated FRA states that 39m³ of floodplain storage would be lost within Flood Zone 2 to account for the proposed driveway. The updated report states that due to the surrounding floodplain of 14,000m² there would only be a 3mm increase in flood level.

As part of the revised proposals, on-site compensation storage has been proposed, in the form of an area of land measuring 134m² located within Flood Zone 1, which would be lowered to 12.35m AOD (the land is currently between 12.72m and 13.24m AOD) and which would provide 40m³ of compensatory storage.

However, in order to successfully prevent the displacement of flood waters onto other sites elsewhere, from the additional volume taken up by the elevated access road, the compensatory storage would need to be located in Flood Zone 2, as in a flood event, flood waters are not likely to flow onto land within Flood Zone 1. The siting of the proposed flood storage compensatory area in Flood Zone 1 would therefore be of no beneficial use in compensating for flood water experienced in Flood Zone 2 and would need to be located within the higher flood risk area. This does not therefore provide any acceptable form of mitigation.

The proposed development therefore fails the Sequential Test and, as with the previously refused application, would continue to result in an increase in flood risk elsewhere as a result of the volume taken up by the elevated access road across the site within Flood Zone 2. The proposal is thereby contrary to national and local policies on flood risk.

Impact upon Highway Safety and Parking Provision

Paragraph 110 of the NPPF states that schemes can be supported where they provide safe and suitable access for all, which is echoed within Policy DM5. Spatial Policy 7 encourages proposals which place an emphasis on non-car modes as a means of access to services and facilities.

The Council's Residential Parking SPD states that a minimum of 3 parking spaces should be provided for as well as secure cycle parking and space for equipment. A single attached garage is located to the south of the proposed dwelling and 3 parking spaces are provided for within the site approximately 37m from the garage. Although the proposal can provide the required parking provision within the site, the distance between the parking and the property is not desirable at approximately 37m although the parking area would still have natural surveillance.

Nottinghamshire County Council Highways have not raised an objection to the proposal, subject to conditions relating to the minimum width of the access, and the provision of refuse collection points near the junction with Fosse Road. The current plans show a driveway and access to be 3.2m (approximately) in width and as the land to the north and south is highway owned, they would need to ensure it is constructed to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority.

Therefore, although the access and parking arrangements are undesirable, the provision of parking is acceptable and the access would not result in harm to highway safety. It would be the case of 'buyer aware' if the proposal was deemed to be acceptable, regardless of the comments on flooding in the preceding section of this report.

Due to the amount of space within the site, although it is not explicit, it is expected that cycle provision could be accommodated within the garage whilst still maintaining allowances for 3 parking spaces for vehicles.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

Policy DM5 of the DPD states that development proposals should ensure no unacceptable

reduction in amenity including overbearing impacts and loss of privacy upon neighbouring development. The NPPF seeks to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The building is between 10 – 12m from the rear elevations of properties on Staveley Court and approximately 7.5m from the rear of 16 Holmefield to the proposed garage. Due to the distance and the single storey design of the proposal, it would not result in harm to neighbour amenity from overbearing, loss of privacy or light impacts. There is an existing boundary fence surrounding the site which would mitigate the impact of the building. Thus, the proposal would comply with policy DM5 of the ADMDPD.

Impact upon Trees and Ecology

Core Policy 12 (Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure) of the ACS seeks to secure development that maximises the opportunities to conserve, enhance and restore biodiversity. Policy DM5 states that natural features of importance, which are either within or adjacent to development sites should, wherever possible, be both protected and enhanced.

Reports from neighbours have stated that the site has been cleared in recent times of trees and vegetation, however wildlife are still present on the site due to surrounding trees outside the site. One tree remains on the site which has little amenity value and is in poor visual condition.

No arboricultural survey has been submitted with the application nor have any trees been plotted on the submitted drawings, although the Council is unable to consider the harm to these trees, from inspection it is not considered worthy of retention either due to the visual condition and poor public amenity value.

Equally no ecology/biodiversity survey has been submitted to assess the impact of the development on these landscape features, and the Council has not requested one as the proposal is clearly within a flood zone and thus contrary to policy.

Some members of the public have raised concerns over the impact of the proposal upon the local ecology. However due to the lack of features now within the site it is unlikely that the site would harbour any significant ecological activity and the existing trees and landscaping around the boundary would be unaffected by the proposal.

Thus, the proposal accords with the NPPF, Core Policy 12 of the ACS as well as Policy DM5 of the ADMDPD.

Impact on Design and Housing Density

Core Policy 9 requires a high standard of sustainable design that protects and enhances the natural environment and contributes to the distinctiveness of the locality and requires development that is appropriate in form and scale to the context. Policy DM5 mirrors this.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2023) states decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and

landscape setting.

Overall, I consider that the design and the use of the materials on the proposed dwelling would have a neutral impact and the design of the dwelling itself is not dominating within the locale, thus resulting in being acceptable.

The scale of the plot is approximately 0.24 hectares in area. Core Policy 3 of the Council's Amended Core Strategy states densities on unallocated sites should be of 30 dwellings per hectare. At this density the site should provide 4 dwellings. The proposal is below this recommended density and would result in an underutilisation of the land. However, given that half the site is in flood zone 2 and the proximity of the surrounding residential development, this density may not be acceptable to ensure the safety of future occupants and acceptable amenity for existing residents. However, 1 dwelling is proposed within flood zone 1 (apart from the access through zone 2), which for the reasons outlined in the above report, is not considered acceptable.

8.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations, officers have considered the following implications; Data Protection, Equality and Diversity, Financial, Human Rights, Legal, Safeguarding, Sustainability, and Crime and Disorder and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

9.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion

Due to the siting of the access through land identified as being within Flood Zone 2 by the Environment Agency data maps, the proposal is considered to fail the sequential test as the Council has other land available within the District at lower risk of flooding and has a proven 5 year housing supply whereby it is not reliant on using land at risk of flooding for speculative development. There are no overriding material considerations to outweigh this.

The applicant also failed to include details of how it would impact upon local ecology and to the existing tree on the site. However, given the lack of visual significance of the remaining tree on the site and the ecological value of the site, it is not considered that this is a justifiable reason in which to warrant a refusal of the application.

Whilst the proposal has been assessed to have an acceptable impact upon neighbour amenity, design, highway safety and parking provision, these are neutral factors and do not affect the planning balance. The provision of one dwelling that would positively contribute to housing stock and housing need and contribution to the local school, does not outweigh the harm identified and would represent unsuitable development in my view. In addition, the proposal is for one dwelling within an already well-established community, and one dwelling is not considered to provide such a necessary and meaningful contribution that it would sustain the local services. **Furthermore, the proposal would also increase flood risk elsewhere as the siting of the proposed flood storage compensatory area is located in Flood Zone 1 where it would be of no beneficial use to flooding occurring in Flood Zone 2.** Therefore, the proposal is considered to be contrary to paragraphs identified within the NPPF (2023) and PPG, Core Policy 10 of the ACS and Policy DM5 of the ADMDPD.

10.0 Reason for Refusal

01

The only means of access or egress to and from the proposed dwelling would be over land which is located within Flood Zone 2 as defined by the Environment Agency data maps. Core Policy 10 and Policy DM5 of the adopted Development Plan as well as Chapter 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023) sets out the due process for assessing new development within areas at risk from flooding. The Local Planning Authority must first apply the Sequential Test and then only upon satisfaction of this should the Exceptions Test be applied. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal would fail the Sequential Test as there are other more preferable sites at lower risk from flooding within the District on which such a use should be located. There are no reasons to restrict the area in which the Sequential Test is applied. In addition, the proposed floodplain compensatory storage is not located in an area to be of any beneficial use in a flood event and therefore the proposal would result in an increase in flood risk elsewhere to other more vulnerable developments, contrary to the NPPF (2023).

As such the proposal is contrary to Core Policy 10 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (2019) and Policy DM5 of the Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document (2013), as well as Chapter 14 of the NPPF (2023), Planning Practice Guidance, which are material planning considerations.

Informatives

01

The application is clearly contrary to the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, as detailed in the above reason(s) for refusal. Whilst the applicant has engaged with the District Planning Authority at pre-application stage our advice has been consistent from the outset. Working positively and proactively with the applicants would not have afforded the opportunity to overcome these problems, giving a false sense of hope and potentially incurring the applicants further unnecessary time and/or expense.

02

You are advised that as of 1st December 2011, the Newark and Sherwood Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule came into effect. Whilst the above application has been refused by the Local Planning Authority you are advised that CIL applies to all planning permissions granted on or after this date. Thus any successful appeal against this decision may therefore be subject to CIL (depending on the location and type of development proposed). Full details are available on the Council's website www.newarksherwooddc.gov.uk/cil/

03

The application has been refused on the basis of the following plans and documents:

Location plan;
DRWG no. 1D/11/2020 Rev D Site plan;
DRWG no. 2D/11/2020 Rev D Proposed bungalow and plans elevations;
DRWG no. 3/11/2020 Topographical survey;
Revised Flood Risk Assessment June 2023

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

Application case file.

Committee Plan - 23/01429/FUL

