

REPORT TO THE WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date of Meeting	4 February 2015
Application Number	14/06682/FUL
Site Address	64 Wingfield Road Trowbridge Wiltshire BA14 9EN
Proposal	Erection of 8 dwellings and associated works
Applicant	Shepperton Homes
Town/Parish Council	TROWBRIDGE
Ward	TROWBRIDGE CENTRAL
Grid Ref	384674 157595
Type of application	Full Planning
Case Officer	Matthew Perks

Reason for the application being considered by Committee

This application is brought to Committee at the request of Councillor John Knight for consideration of the scale of development, visual impact upon the surrounding area, the relationship to adjoining properties, the design of the development, highway impact and parking.

1. Purpose of Report

To consider the above application and to recommend that planning permission be granted.

2. Report Summary

The plans under consideration are revision to those initially submitted, following negotiation. The number of units on site has been reduced from 9 to 8.

The key issues to consider are:

- The principle of development in this locality;
- Neighbouring amenity and Landscaping/Design.
- Access and parking; and
- Ecological considerations

Neighbourhood Responses:

Initial Plans: 7 responses were received,
Revised Plans : 4 responses received, all objections.

Trowbridge Town Council

Initial Plans: No Objection on first response but subsequently resolved to object for reasons outlined in “Summary of Consultation Responses” below.

Revised Plans : No comments received.

3. Site Description

The application site of some 3100m² in extent lies to the north of Wingfield Road, Trowbridge, approximately 800m west of the town centre. The Trowbridge (Newtown) Conservation area abuts the site to the east and is characterised in this vicinity by Victorian dwellings on properties of fairly generous proportions, albeit with permission having been granted to the rear in one instance for a smaller subdivision. To the west and north there are relatively modern residential developments on more modest plots. The plans indicate that access would be centrally located on the Wingfield Road frontage.

The site is currently occupied by a bungalow-style dwelling with rooms to the roofspace served by dormers, and outbuildings. The garden is of a generous size and is largely laid to lawn and planting beds, with a disused tennis court on the western half of the site.

Permission was granted under application reference 00/01910/OUT for Residential development of half (approximately) of the site on 15 June 2001. This permission has lapsed.

4. Planning History

W/00/01910/OUT	Residential development (outline – 2 x 3-Storey dwellings) : Permission : 15 June, 2001
W/89/01148/FUL	Erection of single garage : Permission : 08 August 1989

5. The Proposal

The application is for the construction of four x 4 bed houses and four x 3 bed houses, all two storey in height, and with associated access and parking following the demolition of the existing dwelling. An existing access on to Wingfield road from the eastern side of the site would be stopped up, to be replaced by a centrally located entry point onto a cul-de-sac that would provide for 13 parking spaces, 7 detached garages and 2 further garages attached to proposed dwellings.

6. Local Planning Policy

The Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) was adopted at a special council meeting on January 20th 2015; and as such, it can be afforded ‘Full Weight’ in planning terms although it is still subject to a 6-week potential challenge.

The site lies within Trowbridge Settlement Limits. Core Policies 1 and 2 in the Wiltshire Core Strategy are aimed at the sustainable provision and retention of services and facilities within such limits. Trowbridge is a “Principle Settlement” within the settlement hierarchy. Core Policy 1 states that: “Wiltshire’s Principal Settlements are strategically important centres and the primary focus for development. This will safeguard and enhance their strategic roles as

employment and service centres. They will provide significant levels of jobs and homes, together with supporting community facilities and infrastructure meeting their economic potential in the most sustainable way to support better self containment.”

Core Policies 60 to 62 relate to sustainable transport and impacts arising from new development on the transport network including highways. Core Policy 50: (Biodiversity and Geodiversity) is also relevant where the ecologist identified ecological considerations on site.

Design and Place Making are the subject of Core Policy 57 (Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping) and Landscaping is addressed in Core Policy 51.

In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework applies with particular reference to sustainable development, the delivery of a wide choice of accommodation, transport infrastructure, the historical environment and nature conservation.

7. Summary of consultation responses

Trowbridge Town Council

Raised no objection in an initial response. This was subsequently revised to an objection in relation to the high density of properties on the development and height of new dwellings that would overshadow existing properties. The impact on neighbouring properties was potentially harmful and materials did not match the surrounds. In addition to this inadequate arrangements were proposed for parking space and drainage was potentially inadequate and could therefore cause flooding. Traffic congestion will be worsened and could potentially lead to severe accidents.

The Town Council did not comment on the revised plans.

Highway Officer

The revised plans were prepared and submitted with consideration for issues initially raised by the highway officer who is now satisfied with parking, manoeuvring and access arrangements. Regarding the site frontage, the officer is of a view that a 3m footway should be required due to the increase of the vehicle movements at the proposed junction to provide adequate space to minimise the risk of pedestrians stepping into the carriageway. (Discussed further below).

Urban Design Officer

Initial Plans: The Officer noted that the area to the east is characterised by large houses set back from Wingfield Road in generous plots. The layout had been altered following pre-application discussions which included the Officer. The density of development is not particularly high and the positioning of the buildings along the front of the site has been well conceived in order to follow the building line of the adjacent property. However, the officer recommended that the layout around the cul-de-sac should be altered. No written comment was received on the revised plans but the officer expressed satisfaction with the revisions in discussions.

Archaeologist

No heritage assets (archaeology) lie within or close to the proposed development site. There is little indication that any heritage assets with archaeological interest would be impacted and therefore no recommendations in relation to this application.

Housing Officer

Initial and revised plans : The officer noted that the proposed site lies within Trowbridge and that the applicant is proposing a scheme of 9 (then 8) dwellings. There would be no requirement for an affordable housing contribution to be made.

Education Officer

Initial and revised plans: The development has been reviewed in terms of current assessment methodology, and whether or not exceptional demand for places here should trigger contributions from sites with units under 10 units number. It is confirmed that in this case, no S106 contribution would be required for education.

Environment Services Officer (Public Open Space)

In noting the demolition of the existing dwelling, and the consequent net additional 7 units the officer advised that a Public Open Space contribution would be required. Following discussions and negotiation with the agent, the amount agreed was £3,296.

Ecologist

The officer noted that the submitted bat survey confirmed the presence of a single Lesser Horseshoe bat and its usage of the existing garage building as a resting place (roost), but there is no evidence of roosting bats using the existing bungalow. It would therefore be necessary for the developer to apply for derogation (a development licence) from Natural England to allow the proposed demolition of the existing garage and the re-development of the site to proceed. Mitigation for the loss of the Lesser Horseshoe bat roost will also be required as part of the proposed development, the officer recommended design changes and that full mitigation details should be submitted. With regard to vegetation the importance of an existing hedge was noted and it was recommended that a planting/landscaping scheme was submitted. Lighting details are also important given the presence of the bat species. Site clearance should also be undertaken with due consideration for the potential presence of reptile species.

Wessex Water

No objection, noting only that new water supply and waste water connections will be required from Wessex water to serve the development. The response was confirmed for the revised plans.

8. Publicity

- Three schools in close proximity to each other on busy Wingfield road. Parking and traffic hazard would be increased. Further disruption to surrounding properties;
- 9 Units on this land would be overdevelopment;
- Trees and hedges should remain in situ;
- Application for 9 dwellings is “the result of people taking advantage of the housing situation that exists at the present time and are looking, purely for monetary gain irrespective of any inconvenience and discomfort to the surrounding community.”

- Drainage and sewage disposal at maximum efficiency and greater use would cause problems;
- Previous application for two bungalows on site rejected; Loss of privacy through overlooking of gardens and property;
- Houses in Wren Court are on lower ground than the development site meaning the new houses, particularly plots 5 & 6 look directly down and into the gardens, behind them;
- Should development be granted either the current 2.5m hedging should be kept or be replaced by fencing and planting to at least that height;
- 10m separation distance to boundaries should be required;
- Idea of extending existing yellow lines doesn't deal adequately with number of cars during school start and finish times;
- While noting that proposed build style of houses and the frontage of the site has been developed to bridge the difference between the conservation area and newer housing stock, the use of white render is out of keeping with the area;
- In principle in support for redevelopment of 64 Wingfield Road but there are issues with the proposal to extend the double yellow lines to cover the full extent of since this creates hazards with drivers simply ignoring them; bottlenecks during busy school times; overspill parking in surrounding area; lack of visitor parking for existing residents; street scene not appropriate, where development should blend with the surrounds and dismiss the idea that an Arts and Crafts Movement style is appropriate; Consideration should be given to remove the existing trees between plot 1 and the boundary to 66/68 Wingfield Road in favour of erecting fencing and to provide a mix of fencing and shrubbery to improve privacy;
- No. 66 Wingfield Road not consulted (Officer note: Advertising records indicate that neighbour correspondence was indeed sent to that address)
- Stone facades should be required (rather than brick and render) to match houses on the north side of Wingfield Rd and removal of flat roof dormer windows.
- Density should be reduced;
- Increase in parking spaces from 2 to 22 (expected increase of 1100% in vehicle numbers within the proposed development site) implies a huge increase in the number of exits and entrances from and to the property, associated increase in traffic hazards;
- Much greater distance of the 2-storey dwellings from site boundary, to reduce overshadowing and loss of privacy to neighbours.
- Safe play area with facilities for toddlers, within development should be provided;
- Visitor parking should be provided within the development.

9. Planning Considerations

9.1 Principle of Development

The NPPF states that “planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise’ and that ‘in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development’.

The site lies within Trowbridge Settlement Limits as defined within the Wiltshire Core Strategy. Core Policies 1 and 2 in the WCS are aimed at the sustainable provision and retention of services and facilities within such limits. Trowbridge is a “Principle Settlement” within the settlement hierarchy. The site is therefore by definition in a sustainable location and the principle of further residential development is therefore accepted.

9.2 Landscaping, design and potential loss of neighbouring amenity

The site is currently occupied by one existing dwelling and the tennis court. This would be replaced by a development of 8 dwellings. The initial proposal was for 9 dwellings but this was reduced following on-site discussion and input from the Urban Design Officer. In the light of neighbour, highway and Town Council comments, a re-layout was submitted aimed at addressing key issues including the relationship to the neighbouring dwellings, and highway concerns (discussed further below).

Key changes from the initial scheme include the re-siting of the dwelling proposed to plot 4, which had the potential for overshadowing and loss of light to the rear of the dwelling to the north at No. 10 Wren Court. Concerns were that the relative location of this property to the north of the site meant that the 25 deg “rule of thumb” vertical viewing angle from rear facing windows of the existing dwelling to the ridge of the proposed unit, indicating potential harm, was exceeded.

The agent revised the plans, relocating the unit towards the south, handed the proposed dwelling so that the massing was reduced, and submitted a “Daylight and Sunlight Analysis” in terms of the guidance set out in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Report of 2009: “Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight”. The BRE report advises that: *“If, for any part of the new development, the angle from the centre of the lowest affected window to the head of the new development is more than 25 deg, then a more detailed check is needed to find the loss of skylight to the existing buildings.”* The submitted analysis included a diagrammatic presentation which demonstrated that only a small part of the apex of the ridge of Plot 4 is above the 25 degree viewing plane. The remaining 180 deg horizontal field of view from the rear of the dwelling would remain unobstructed above the vertical viewing plane by any development. The very limited encroachment of a part of the apex of the gable end is concluded by the analysis to be *de minimis* in terms of loss of daylight which would be more than offset by the remaining field of view, and also the application of a light coloured render to the gable. The materials indicated in the drawings are for an off-white render.

The units to Plots 5 and 6 were also re-orientated. In the original plans windows facing north would have been directly inter-visible with upper-level windows to habitable rooms in dwellings to the north at a distance of approximately 17m – well below the normally accepted guideline of 21m (although this is not adhered to in all cases in modern estate development, it does represent an established guideline in terms of achieving privacy). Upper level windows would furthermore have been within 5.5m of the boundaries of the neighbours to the north. The dwellings to Plots 5 and 6 are now proposed to be orientated with primary and rear elevations facing west and east respectively. The issue of loss of privacy has been raised. However, the main section of the rear elevations to the new units would be some 9m from the boundary (two smaller bedroom windows would be at a minimum of 7m). Any overlooking would be restricted to the rear half of the elongated rear garden to the east, with the existing dwelling itself being some 20m from the nearest new upper-level window and at

an obtuse viewing angle. Furthermore, with the retention of the substantial hedge for ecological purposes (see below) it is considered that an unacceptable loss of privacy would not arise. Unacceptable overshadowing would not arise given the distances from the boundary and the presence of the hedge.

The units on Plots 3 and 4 would have west-facing rear windows at between 9m and 12m from the western boundary which is satisfactory. No's 6 and 7 Swallow Drive lie beyond the land to the rear of 66 Wingfield Drive at a minimum distance of 19 m from the rear of the two new dwellings.

Plots 1 & 2, and 7 & 8 would accommodate semi-detached pairs which would form feature buildings onto the Wingfield Road frontage, mirroring each other on either side of the access. The Design and Access Statement notes that the units "...closest to the access road step forward to form a gable with a projecting bay window, and allows the roof to continue down and over the garage. Together with its adjoining unit, this then gives the impression of a large, single dwelling providing a similar massing to its existing neighbours." The urban design officer supports the siting (the remainder of the plots were adjusted around the cul-de-sac following initial comments from the officer). Landscaping to the frontage would include new trees to either side of the access.

The existing dwelling is of no particular architectural merit and given the application site situation in a location that effectively forms a transition between the historic area of Wingfield Road to the east and the modern suburban development to the west, the overall design is aimed at responding to the transition with the more formal frontage buildings. The street elevation has been composed with attention to building detailing and boundary treatments to address the neighbouring Conservation Area frontage.

Density/level of development on site has been raised as an objection. The site is located in a context of varying surrounding densities and would itself have a density of 38 units/ha which the Urban design officer confirms is "not particularly high". In considering this aspect it is accepted that the conservation area to the east is characterised by properties with generous grounds resulting in low densities, but to the west and north of the site the more modern developments in Nightingale Road, Wren Court and Warbler Close have highly variable densities including relatively tight-knit terraced development on small properties. Whilst it is acknowledged that part of the adjacent context includes the larger, fairly generous plots the east, the proposal would form its own cluster of dwellings of a relatively uniform design theme and identity set around the new parking/access cul-de-sac. This is considered to be wholly acceptable.

Building materials have been raised in objector comments, with the view being expressed that matching materials to the surrounds should be used. In evaluating this it is noted that a mix of materials exists in the area. The traditional buildings within the conservation area are a mix of stone with red brick present in some side elevations. In the modern estates in the vicinity use has been made of reconstructed stone under grey roof tiles. The existing dwelling on site (to be demolished) is a mixture of white render under plain red tiles. An established uniform "character" in terms of materials is therefore not in place, and (again) the proposed development would in any event form its own cluster of buildings with a separate identity. The feature units to the road frontage would have a mixture of red brick/reconstituted stone at ground floor level with off-white render above, under plain tiles with black rainwater goods. Fenestration frames and doors would be of timber. The remaining units would all have off-white render under tiles with the same treatment to rainwater goods, fenestration and doors. Seen in this context the proposed materials are considered wholly acceptable.

With regard to landscaping, the site currently has a number of trees and large shrubs which would be unavoidably lost. The proposal includes the replacement of the hedge to the northern boundary because of its intrusion into the site. However (also discussed below under ecological matters) a landscaping scheme that provides for the retention of a key beech hedge to the eastern boundary, as well as feature trees softening the layout has been submitted and is considered acceptable. The beech hedge would form a robust vegetated boundary between the site and the conservation area to the east, whilst also performing a screening function. A specific condition requiring its protection is recommended.

9.3 Access and Parking

The application was accompanied by a "Transport Statement" and the Highway Officer, having received additional information and layout details beyond that, is satisfied with parking, access and manoeuvring, including for refuse disposal vehicle access. The parking area would be set back behind the units facing the street frontage and be accessed from the south directly off of Wingfield Road. 13 open and 9 garage parking spaces and would be arranged around a turning head that would accommodate manoeuvring for a refuse vehicle.

The highway officer has no objections in relation to additional traffic or parking issues that are raised by the Town Council and objectors, but did recommend a 3m wide pedestrian walkway to the site frontage given the increased use of the relocated access and the proximity of the nearby schools. However the agent has submitted additional supporting documentation which raises a number of considerations. The required visibility splays of 204m by 43m splays will be provided in both directions through very minor adjustments to the wall in the immediate vicinity of the access only. There are refuges crossing of Wingfield Road approximately 30m to the west of the site and a Pelican crossing approximately 75m to the east, limiting school related pedestrian movements across the site frontage itself. The development is restricted to 7 net additional residential units and the number of pedestrian and cycle movements likely to be generated would not in, in isolation, justify widening of the existing footway. Removal of the on-street parking across the site frontage would increase the perceived width and ease of use of the existing footway, in conjunction with the removal of the close boarded fencing which tops the existing wall and its replacement with open railings at a lower level. The Introduction of a short length of cycleway across the site frontage (50m) is not considered practical as to the east of the site the existing footway reduces to a 1.4m width.

The site was re-visited in the light of these comments and, apart from the argument presented by the consultant, it is evident that the existing narrow pavement width to the east in itself would create a potential hazard where cyclists/pedestrian footway users would be forced to either continue along the narrow footway or move on to the carriageway in any event. Apart from these highway considerations the attractive stone wall that would be slightly re-aligned at the access to achieve visibility, but retained towards either side of the site, presents a continuation of the appearance of the immediate road frontage within the conservation area to the east, creating a degree of transition in the street boundary treatments.

Particular concerns were raised by objectors with regard to parking issues. Wholly adequate on-site parking would be provided and the highway officer has confirmed that no parking would be permitted on the Wingfield Road frontage to the site.

It is considered that, subject to relevant conditions, the application can be supported from the highway perspective.

9.4 Ecology

The application was accompanied by an “Ecological Assessment and Bat Survey” and a subsequent “Bat Survey Report” following the comments of the Ecologist. Further, in the light of those comments, revisions were made to the garage details and to the landscaping proposals. The Ecologist has confirmed that the proposals are now acceptable, and has recommended conditions. Mitigating measures include the provision of bat boxes and the retention of the beech hedge to the eastern boundary of the site as a natural habitat enhancement. It is considered therefore that ecological issues have been properly addressed.

9.5 Other matters

No on site open space play areas are included in the proposal and the Open Space Officer has agreed that a contribution of £3,296 would be accepted. This can be achieved by way of a S106 Agreement. This would address satisfactorily, although not entirely, the neighbour observation that a play area should be provided.

In respect of sewerage capacity (a matter raised by objectors) the developer would need to satisfy Wessex Water with regard to foul drainage connections, and that Authority has raised no objections. Details of sewerage would be a building regulations matter. Flooding is raised in comments as a potential issue. The site has no designation in terms of Environment Agency criteria as being subject to flooding hazard. It is considered that a surface drainage condition would satisfactorily address this issue.

No on-site play area has been proposed (a matter raised by some objectors) but the Open Space officer has agreed that a sum for off-site provision is acceptable. In addition there is a mix of various formal (e.g. school playfields) and informal open space in the vicinity, with access to the open countryside over footpaths under half a mile to the west.

10. Conclusion

In view of the above evaluation of the proposal, it is considered that the development should be granted approval, subject to the completion of a S106 agreement and conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Permission be granted at a future date in the event of the Development Control Manager being satisfied as to the prior completion a legal Agreement to secure an index-linked financial contribution of £3,296 towards the provision of open space facilities, and subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON:

To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 No development shall commence on site until details and samples of the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs have been submitted to and approved in

writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON:

In the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

- 3 Subject to the further requirements of Condition 4, all soft landscaping comprised in the approved details of landscaping on Plan 3631/01 Rev H shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. All shrubs, trees and hedge planting shall be maintained free from weeds and shall be protected from damage by vermin and stock. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. All hard landscaping shall also be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON:

To ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for the development and the protection of existing important landscape features.

- 4 The hedgerow along the north-eastern boundary of the development hereby approved and as shown on Plan 3631/01 Rev H shall not be removed without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. If, contrary to this condition, the hedge or part of the hedge is removed or destroyed, details of new hedging shall be submitted to the local planning authority and the approved details shall be implemented during the first available planting season after the date of approval.

REASON:

To protect a flight line for Lesser Horseshoe bats.

- 5 Notwithstanding any other approved plan and prior to the commencement of development a plan shall be submitted showing existing and proposed finished land levels and finished floor and ridge levels to all new buildings for written approval by the Local Planning Authority. There shall be no raising of existing ground levels on the site by importation of materials. The development shall be implemented in accordance

with the approved levels.

REASON:

In the interests of visual amenity.

- 6 No part of the development hereby permitted shall be first occupied until the access, turning area and parking spaces have been completed in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans. The areas shall be maintained for those purposes at all times thereafter.

REASON:

In the interests of highway safety.

- 7 The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until the first five metres of the access, measured from the edge of the carriageway, has been consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel) and visibility splays have been provided in accordance with the details shown on drawing GAO1 REV A as contained within the "Transport Statement" dated July 2014. The access shall be maintained as such thereafter.

REASON:

In the interests of highway safety.

- 8 No development shall commence on site until details of all boundary treatments, which shall include the retention of the stone materials to the Wingfield Road frontage to include the reconstruction of the wall to be re-aligned under Condition 6, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON:

In the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

- 9 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the 'Discussion and Conclusions' section on pages 11 - 12 of the Bat Survey report by Stark Ecology dated August 2014 and drawing 3631/04 REV B received on 22

December 2014, as modified by any relevant Natural England bat licence for the development, or unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

REASON:

To ensure adequate mitigation for a European protected species - Lesser horseshoe bat.

- 10 Only passive infrared sensor lights shall be used on the exterior eastern elevation of Plot 6 and no external lighting shall be installed to the rear of the garages containing the Lesser Horseshoe bat roost (Plots 6 and 7), as modified by any relevant Natural England bat licence for the development. No other external lighting shall be installed without the prior approval of the Council's Ecologist.

REASON:

To maintain the eastern boundary as a dark corridor for bats.

- 11 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the 'Discussions and Conclusions' section on pages 14 - 15 of the Ecological Appraisal and Initial Bat Survey report by Stark Ecology dated July 2014 in relation to reptiles, badgers and nesting birds, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Council's Ecologist.

REASON:

To ensure adequate mitigation for UK protected species

- 12 No development shall commence on site until a scheme for the discharge of surface water from the site (including surface water from the access/driveway), incorporating sustainable drainage details, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be first occupied until surface water drainage has been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON:

To ensure that the development can be adequately drained.

13 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

3631-001 REV H Received on 22 December 2014;

3631-011 REV A Received on 26 November 2014;

3631-013 REV B Received on 22 December 2014;

3631-018 REV B Received on 26 November 2014;

3631-019 REV A Received on 26 November 2014;

3631-020 REV B Received on 26 November 2014; and

3631-040 REV B Received on 3 January 2015.

REASON:

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

14 INFORMATIVES:

a) There is a low risk that great crested newts could occur in suitable terrestrial habitats on the application site. Great crested newts are legally protected by The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended), which implements the EC Directive 92/43/EEC in the United Kingdom, and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Please be advised that, if great crested newts are discovered, all works should stop immediately and Natural England should be contacted for advice on any special precautions before continuing, as a derogation licence may be required.

b) Any noise during the construction phase should be limited to 0730-1800hrs Monday to Friday and 0800-1300 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays.

c) The entire site frontage will be subject to parking restrictions by a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) (parking restrictions currently existing either side of the site), this will ensure that the maximum visibility is achieved at all times.