

ENTERPRISE INNS PLC

OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF THREE DWELLINGS ON LAND ADJACENT TO THE LETHBRIDGE ARMS, BISHOPS LYDEARD (RESUBMISSION OF APPLICATION 06/11/0015)

Grid Reference: 316731.129141

Outline Planning Permission

RECOMMENDATION AND REASON(S)

Recommended Decision: Conditional Approval

The proposed development is considered to respect the character and form of surrounding residential development. It would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area or the settings of nearby listed buildings. It would not lead to unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents or highway safety. It is, therefore, considered to accord with Policies S1 (General Requirements), S2 (Design), EN14 (Conservation Areas), EN3 (Local Wildlife and Geological Interests); Policies 9 (The Built Historic Environment) and 49 (Transport Requirements of New Development) of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review and the duties outlined in Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 relating to listed buildings and conservation areas respectively.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION(S) (if applicable)

1. Approval of the details of the layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping of the site (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.

Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of S92 (2) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by S51 (2) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

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

(A4) DrNo 2458-123 location plan
(A1) DrNo 2458-121 Proposed site layout
(A1) DrNo 2458-122 sections
(A1) DrNO 2458-120 existing site layout

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

3. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of a strategy to protect wildlife has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall be based on the advice of Devon Wildlife Consultants' submitted report, and a further reptile survey dated February 2011 and include:
- Details of protective measures to include method statements to avoid impacts on protected species during all stages of development;
 - Details of the timing of works to avoid periods of work when the species could be harmed by disturbance;
 - Measures for the retention and replacement and enhancement of places of rest for the species.

Once approved the works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timing of the works unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the resting places and agreed accesses shall be permanently maintained. The development shall not be occupied until the scheme for the maintenance and provision of the new resting places and related accesses have been fully implemented

Reason: To protect wildlife and their habitats from damage bearing in accordance with Policy EN3 of the Taunton Deane Local Plan and guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement 9.

4. Visibility splays shall be provided at the new accesses as indicated on drawing HBHT11006/SK01 rev A produced by Hydrock Byways & Highways, such that there is no obstruction to visibility in excess of 900mm in advance of the lines indicated on the drawing. Such splays shall be provided prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To ensure that adequate visibility splays are available for the traffic likely to be attracted to the site, in the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy 49 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review.

5. The boundary wall along Station Road shall be altered to accommodate the requirements of condition (4) and shall be extended along the eastern side of the proposed access as shown on drawing 2458-121 and in accordance with details that shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority as part of the details submitted in accordance with condition (1). The works required by this condition shall be carried out prior to the occupation of

the dwelling hereby permitted and thereafter maintained as such.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area in accordance with Policy S2 of the Taunton Deane Local Plan and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

6. Full details of the boundary treatment to all plots shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority as part of the details submitted in respect of condition (1). The approved details shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the plot to which they relate.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory boundary treatment is proposed in the interest of the character and appearance of the conservation area, and the settings of nearby listed buildings in accordance with Policy S2 of the Taunton Deane Local Plan and Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

7. (i) The landscaping/planting scheme that shall be submitted to and approved pursuant to condition (1) shall be completely carried out within the first available planting season from the date of commencement of the development.

(ii) For a period of five years after the completion of the landscaping scheme, the trees and shrubs shall be protected and maintained in a healthy weed free condition and any trees or shrubs that cease to grow, shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of similar size and species or other appropriate trees or shrubs as may be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development makes a satisfactory contribution to the preservation and enhancement of the local character and distinctiveness of the area in accordance with Taunton Deane Local Plan Policy S2.

Notes for compliance

1. The 'half hip' roof design shown on the indicative section drawings is not considered appropriate for the detailed design required by condition (1).

SITE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY

The site comprises a parcel of land within the grounds of the Lethbridge Arms public house. The site is currently fenced off from the pub, and has an overgrown/unkept appearance. It extends across the western side of the pub site from Minehead Road to the north to Station Road to the south. The site has frontage to both of these roads.

To the east of the site, at its northern end, the site adjoins the pub beer garden and car park. Moving south, the western side of the site adjoins a barn, probably a former stable building, which is subject to application 06/11/0028 for conversion to a dwelling. The site is generally level, set slightly higher than Station Road, behind a hedgebank, on its southern boundary and sloping up gently to Minehead Road, where the boundary is formed by a hedgebank, post and wire fence and close boarded fence.

To the west of the site, at the southern end, a close boarded timber fence separates the site from a neighbouring bungalow, which has some windows facing the site. To the northern end of the western boundary, a block wall and close boarded fence separates the site from 1 Minehead Road, a 1.5 storey dwelling. Directly opposite the site, across Minehead Road is 'West View' a two-storey grade II listed dwelling.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of 3 detached dwellings. All matters are reserved for subsequent consideration, although indicative plans showing access, layout and scale have been provided.

The indicative plans show that two dwellings would be served by a new access from Minehead Road and one via a new access from Station Road. Plot 1, from Station Road, would be set well back on its plot broadly in line with dwellings to the west, with a detached garage alongside the dwelling. This would be attached to a garage for the barn conversion, subject to application 06/11/0028, if permitted. Indicative details show that the dwellings would all be two-storey.

Planning permission was sought earlier this year for the conversion of the barn to a dwelling and the development of 4 dwellings on land to the west. These applications (06/11/0013 and 06/11/0015 respectively) were withdrawn.

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION RESPONSES

Consultees

BISHOPS LYDEARD & COTHELSTONE PARISH COUNCIL - The Council objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The proposal would damage the long term viability of the business of The Lethbridge Arms. The Lethbridge Arms is an important and historic building within the village, as well as being a key business. As the nearest pub to the West Somerset Railway, it has excellent viability with a large footfall from tourists. Its business is key to the economic well being of the village. Under Local Plan Policy EC9 it is stated, 'Proposals which lead to the loss of existing or identified business, industrial or warehousing land to other uses, including retailing, will not be permitted unless the overall benefit of the proposal outweighs the disadvantages of the loss of employment or potential employment on the site'. To date there has been no assessment done of the impact to the pub of the loss of its gardens should this proposal go ahead.
- The density of the proposed build is out of character with the conservation area. The two storey dwellings are also out of keeping with surrounding properties and would block the view of the listed fives wall.
- Sub standard visibility splays as proposed by the applicant are unacceptable.

The description of Minehead Road as a quiet residential street is not correct. The road is well used by traffic exiting the A358 to enter the village and to drive on to Cothelstone. Station Road is bus route and has a large volume of through traffic.

- The area at the junction of Gore Square and Minehead Road is well used with vehicles parking to use local businesses. Construction of an access here would cause loss of parking spaces which would be damaging to local business.
- Slow worms can be seen basking in the hedgerow on Station Road on summer evenings. Destruction of this to construct an entrance would cause a loss of habitat.
- Both The Lethbridge Arms and the Fives Wall are important historic landmarks in the village. The proposal would detract from the setting of both of these landmarks.
- The Council notes that comments from Transport Development have not been received to date. This is unfortunate, as the Council was not able to refer to or comment upon any observations they may have raised.

SCC - TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT GROUP – Comments currently awaited, but in respect of the previous application for 4 dwellings on this site, using the same access points, made the following comments:

The proposed development is for the erection of four dwellings which will be located within the development boundary limits of Bishops Lydeard and there is no objection in principle. Two of the dwellings derive access from/onto Minehead Road and [one], from/onto Station Road which are both classified unnumbered highways and are subject to a 30mph speed restriction. It would appear from personal observations that both of these roads are well utilised local routes from/onto the nearby A358 county route.

It would appear that the car park for the pub/hotel is being reduced in size as a result of this application, which could result in vehicles wishing to utilise the Lethbridge Arms, being displaced onto the adjoining public highway causing an obstruction/hazard to road users.

It should be ensured as part of new development proposals that sufficient onsite parking and turning is provided within the site for each dwelling, but not to the detriment of any existing use.

The Somerset Parking Strategy sets out the following provision:

C3 Flats and Homes

<i>1 bedroom unit</i>	<i>1 car space per dwelling</i>
<i>2-3 bedroom units</i>	<i>2 car spaces per dwelling</i>
<i>4+ bedroom units</i>	<i>3 car spaces per dwelling</i>

SCC Turning diagrams are available on request.

I have outlined the detailed issues in respect of this development:

- A segregated turning area to ensure that all vehicles can enter and exit the highway in a forward gear (perpendicular to the highway) when all of the parking spaces are occupied.
The parking and turning areas denoted on the indicative layout plan, does not

meet the highway standards, although it may be able to be achieved if the dwellings were set back further into the plot. However this leads to the issue of the land that may have been incorporated into the scheme that was previously part of the Lethbridge Arms car park.

- There shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 900mm above adjoining road level forward of a line drawn 2.4m back from the carriageway edge on the centreline of each access and extending to points on the nearside carriageway edge 43m either side of the access.
- The new accesses shall incorporate splays on both its sides to the rear of the existing footway/highway based on co-ordinates of 2.0m x 2.0m, (pedestrian visibility).
- The new access/drive shall be properly consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel).
- Drop kerbs should be installed at the carriageway edge and a vehicle crossover constructed across the footway fronting the site for the width of each access where applicable.
- Provision shall be made within the site for the disposal of surface water so as to prevent its discharge onto the highway. A soak away design sheet has been provided for further information.
- The gradient of any access shall not be steeper than 1 in 10.

Taking the above points into consideration the Highway Authority considers that based on the submitted information sufficient onsite parking and turning in addition to essential visibility splays cannot be provided within the site, therefore the proposal is considered to be detrimental to highway safety for all road users and it is therefore recommended for refusal.

HERITAGE LEAD – I do not consider that the proposal will have a detrimental impact on the character of area therefore no objection to principle. Clearly details will be important at the reserved matters stage.

SCC ARCHAEOLOGY – The site is within the Area of High Archaeological Potential. There is potential for the development to impact on locally significant archaeological remains relating to medieval and early post-medieval occupation.

For this reason, archaeological monitoring is required and a condition should be imposed to this effect.

Representations

8 letters of OBJECTION have been received, raising the following comments:

- The application is a poor rehash of that recently withdrawn, even commenting in the planning statement that it is for the erection of 4 dwellings. This should be corrected.
- The application incorrectly describes the land as 'land adjacent to the Lethbridge Arms' when it should be 'land at the Lethbridge Arms'. The erection of a post and rail fence does not legally separate the land from the pub. The loss of the land would result in the loss of parking spaces, play area and beer garden. The skittle alley has already been destroyed. The Inn is a vital service to the village providing valuable employment and given it's location near to WSR and Taunton should have every chance of success as it has in the past.

- The separation of the pub from its garden has led to the failure of the pub business and it is currently closed. Future owners should not be prevented from running a successful pub because the land has been separated.
- Rear gardens in Bishops Lydeard are supposed to be protected from development.
- 1 Minehead Road will be overlooked.
- The access from Station Road has poor visibility creating a danger for vehicles emerging. The access statement notes that the recommended visibility splays cannot be provided, which is a concern especially in a village where excess vehicle speed has been noted frequently and remains a concern to many local residents. The Highways Officer states that visibility of 2.4 x 43m should be provided and this has not been addressed. Providing visibility splays to the centre of the carriageway would have an impact on vehicle and pedestrian safety and is against all highway safety guidelines.
- It is stated that traffic speeds on Station Road are 'slow' when in fact they are recorded as being between 20 and 30 mph. The traffic survey is flawed, not accounting for peak flows between 8-9 and 17.00-18.00 on both roads.
- Additional traffic and access onto Minehead Road is undesirable, although the detriment to pedestrian safety could be ameliorated if the developer paid for a footway along Minehead Road. Minehead Road is not lightly trafficked as suggested. It serves shops in Gore Square and is used as a short cut from the A358. There are normally 9-10 cars parked between Gore Square and 1 Minehead Road. Residents of Gore square who have no garages also park there, including some customers of the Lethbridge Arms (when it was open). Parked cars do not increase visibility but further aggravate highway safety.
- There will be a loss of parking on Minehead Road.
- It cannot be guaranteed that the owners of the dwellings would have just two vehicles. With 3 vehicles parked on the property it is impossible to enter and exit in a forward gear. The tracking diagrams also pre-suppose that residents will have 'medium' sized cars.
- It cannot be proven that vehicle parking has a positive effect on reducing vehicle speeds or that a number of pedestrians walk along Minehead road without any significant cause for concern. There is in fact a real cause for concern as there are 6 children who live in the road and have to live in Minehead Road and use the road to get to school.
- There will be parking and congestion on the blind bend on Station Road.
- There is a perfectly good access to the site; two more should not be permitted.
- The new build houses seem to be crammed very closely together. The style of layout is very modern being born of a desire to be able to market homes as 'detached' and is more normally found on modern estates. Housing in this area tends to be terraced/attached or detached but more widely spaced.
- The development is not of a modest scale as the entire site will be disturbed with extensive excavations across the plot being made for the purposes of foundations and the provision of services. Archaeological investigation prior to development may require a revision of development layout, which cannot be achieved after the development has been permitted. Therefore, an archaeological assessment should be carried out prior to the grant of any planning permission.
- The proposed development should respect the setting of the conservation area, ensure that appropriate alternative uses are found for the buildings which are to be retained and a landscaping scheme should be incorporated within the scheme design, as for the requirements for residential development

at Gore Farm, allocated in the Taunton Deane Local Plan. Pedestrian links to the village should be improved as part of the proposals.

- The proposed dwellings are not in keeping with the smaller bungalows and chalet bungalows surrounding the site. They would overshadow the surrounding areas and would overlook the immediate adjacent and surrounding properties. The only detached two-storey dwellings are the Lethbridge Arms, West View and The Old Post Office and this is not the prevailing character of the area. The site sections are misleading and the style of the proposed hipped-roof buildings are not in character with the local vernacular.
- Two storey dwellings would overlook a number of existing properties would be obtrusive and would restrict views of the listed Fives Wall. The site is almost 1m higher than Minehead Road, exacerbating the problem.
- Part of the land is a conservation area, natural habitat for slow worms, common lizards, bank voles and a pair of little owls. Excavations would destroy their habitat. The wildlife desk study identifies records of numerous wildlife within the area. The protection of these species would be best served by retaining the site under its present use as a car park and beer garden. There are a large number of Slow Worms in the site.
- Bishops Lydeard will be in danger of losing its village status if every piece of available land is infilled in this way.
- The housing density and type is not appropriate for the site. Two low level bungalows with access via the existing pub access would be preferable. The sections show half hipped gables for the new houses – this does not fit with the local vernacular. There is very little in the application on which to make a detailed assessment.
- The site is within the curtilage of the listed Fives Wall and would be detrimental to its current prominent location and use within the community.
- If development must take place on the site, small scale holiday lets or supplementary accommodation for the Inn would be more appropriate and beneficial to the business and village. It would be beneficial to carry out restoration of the Fives Wall. Pavement provision at Gore Square would be beneficial.

PLANNING POLICIES

S4 - TDBCLP - Rural Centres,
EN15 - TDBCLP - Demolition Affecting Conservation Areas,
EN12 - TDBCLP - Landscape Character Areas,
EN23 - TDBCLP - Areas of High Archaeological Potential,
EN14 - TDBCLP - Conservation Areas,

DETERMINING ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS

The site is within the settlement limit for Bishops Lydeard and the development is considered to be acceptable in principle. The main issues in the consideration of this application are the impact on the character and appearance of the area – including the approach to the conservation area and setting of listed buildings, the impact on neighbouring residents, the impact on highway safety and archaeology.

Character and appearance of the area

This part of Bishops Lydeard is characterised by generally spacious development, with detached or semi-detached dwellings set in relatively large plots. The site has frontage to two separate roads, Minehead Road to the north and Station Road to the south. These two street scenes need individual consideration.

The site is in a key location on the entrance to the historic part of Bishops Lydeard. Indeed, the conservation area boundary runs along the western face of the barn to the east of the site and encompasses the northern part of the site. The visual impression on both roads is a rapid narrowing, where the wider street created by the large set back of dwellings to the east funnels into a narrower part of the village and more intimate street pattern. The barn and, to a lesser extent, the stone wall to the west are key to this narrowing field of vision on approach to the village along Station Road, whereas on the Minehead Road, the funnelling occurs past the site, adjacent to the pub itself.

To the east of the site, along Station Road, are a number of irregularly spaced detached dwellings, set in large plots. They are generally set well back on the plot with the main garden areas to the front. They are a mix of single, two and 1.5 storey. The proposed dwelling fronting Station Road would sit broadly in line with these dwellings and, accordingly, it is considered to be compatible with the general layout and pattern of development.

To the northeast of the site on Minehead Road are a row of semi-detached 1.5 storey dwellings, a large single storey storage building and, closest to the site, a detached 1.5 storey dwelling. There is a fairly strong building line along the front of the semi-detached dwellings, although this is then interrupted by the storage building and the detached dwelling which is in a slightly forward location. The proposed plot widths for the new dwellings are broadly the same as those existing dwellings on the south side of Minehead Road and, accordingly, the proposed development is considered to respect the character and form of this street. True, the proposed dwellings would be a full two storey and, therefore, slightly bulkier than other dwellings on this side, but they are sited opposite a two storey dwelling and between the existing dwellings and two-storey pub. Therefore, the scale of the proposed dwellings is considered to be appropriate.

Opposite the site, on the north side of the road is the grade II listed 'West View', a handsome two storey double bay fronted brick dwelling. It is considered that the setting for this building is generally derived from the street scene on the north side of Minehead road and, therefore, the proposed development would not be detrimental to its setting. Similarly, the listed five wall within the site is more intrinsically linked with the pub itself and the east elevation of the barn. It is not considered that the setting of this structure would be undermined. The conservation officer has raised no objection in this regard.

The indicative scale drawings indicate half hips for the dwellings and this is not considered to be at all representative of the character of the area or local vernacular. However, the application is in outline with appearance reserved for subsequent consideration. As such, this form of dwelling need not be carried through to the detailed design stage and control would be available at this time. An informative note could be included on any permission to advise that such a roof detailing would not be appropriate.

With regard to the above, the impact on the visual amenities of the area is

considered to be acceptable. The proposal would not harm the settings of nearby listed buildings, and the character and appearance of the conservation area would be preserved, in accordance with the duties contained in Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Neighbouring residents

Plot 1, off Station Road would be sited alongside the existing bungalow, 1 Station Road. It could be ensured at reserved matters stage that no windows were provided in the elevation directly overlooking this property. The indicative plans indicate that the dwelling could be sited close to the boundary, but the neighbouring bungalow is some distance from this boundary and, despite the presence of windows facing the site, it is considered that the proposal would not be unreasonably overbearing on this dwelling. Similarly, plot 3 could be designed such that it did not overlook 1 Minehead Road and, again, it is not considered that the development would be unreasonably overbearing on this property, whose principle windows face north and south.

Based on the indicative layout, the rear of plot 1 would be some 30m from the south elevation of 1 Minehead Road and given this distance, and the slight angle, it is not considered that there would be any unreasonable overlooking in this regard. Plot 3 is shown slightly closer to 1 Station Road, at 24m although the angle is significantly greater.

The front elevations of plots 2 and 3 are directly opposite West View. However, based on the indicative plans, the separation across Minehead Road is around 28m and this is considered sufficient to prevent any unacceptable overlooking.

Final siting and detailed window positions would be controlled at reserved matters stage; based upon the indicative plans provided, the proposals are considered to be acceptable in terms of their impact on neighbouring residents.

Highway safety

The application proposes two new points of access. One from Station Road, which would serve plot 1 and, if permitted, the adjoining barn conversion; and one from Minehead Road, serving plots 2 and 3. In terms of both access points, the Highway Authority have raised objection because the visibility that can be provided falls short of their recommendations. Based on the fact that the speed limit past the site is 30 miles per hour, the Highway Authority are recommending visibility splays of 2.4x43m. The applicant, on the other hand, has submitted traffic speed surveys that suggest that actual traffic speeds along both roads justify lesser visibility requirements.

In respect of the Station Road access the applicant suggests that traffic speeds are in the region of 23 miles per hour, so visibility splays of 2.4x30m would be acceptable, in accordance with Manual for Streets guidance. The details submitted with the application indicate that such splays can be provided to a distance 1m out from the carriageway edge in a westerly direction and to the centreline of the road in an easterly direction. Manual for Streets does recommend the provision of splays to the nearside edge of the carriageway, to account for the potential for overtaking vehicles to be on the wrong side of the carriageway. The visibility to the nearside edge is clearly not available in an easterly direction, due to the location of the barn right on the carriageway edge. However, the applicant's traffic consultant argues that measuring visibility to the centre line is acceptable in this instance, as the bend

in the road would make overtaking very unlikely. In the event that there are parked cars to overtake, it is argued that overtaking vehicles would be further reduced in speed, due to the poor forward visibility and, therefore, lesser splays are required.

In respect of the Minehead Road access, the applicant's traffic consultant argues that visibility splays of 2x27.5m should be provided in the westerly direction and 2x19.4m in an easterly direction. The applicant's traffic consultant argues that 2m deep splays are justified as he considers Minehead Road to be lightly trafficked. Local residents disagree with this position and it is true that surveys on Minehead Road were undertaken outside of peak hours. However, there is a high incidence of parked cars along Minehead Road and this would effectively extend the depth of the visibility splay. It also pushes cars out to the middle of the road justifying the proposed splay lines to the centreline of the road.

In this case, there does appear to be merit in the applicant's case. It also appears that the Highway Authority have not taken much account of the applicant's justification in reaching their recommendation – their response makes not comment on the applicant's submissions, rather it reiterates their pre-application advice in respect of their requirements and then states that as they have not been met, refusal is recommended.

Your officers, on this occasion, feel that the applicant has put forward a well reasoned case as to why lesser visibility splays are required and are minded to agree with that position in this case. It is, therefore, considered that the proposal would not be so detrimental to highway safety as to warrant refusal of planning permission.

Other matters

The site is within an area of High Archaeological Potential, so there is potential for archaeology to be present on site. The County Archaeologist considers that a watching brief condition should be imposed to monitor ground works and record any archaeology found on the site.

There has been some concern raised through the representations that the pub has recently closed because the separation of its garden has removed a facility that was fundamental to its viability. It is claimed that removing the facility permanently would significantly jeopardise the future viability of this community facility. Your officer's understanding is that the pub recently closed because the tenant landlady had made some poor management decisions and that the overall owner, Enterprise Inns, was unable to reopen it until they had completed complex eviction proceedings. Indeed, the pub is now open once more and in a verbal discussion with your officer, the current, temporary landlord has explained how he expects the business to be viable in its current form. It is not considered that it can be demonstrated that the application site is so fundamental to the functioning of the public house that planning permission could be withheld on this basis.

Neighbouring residents have also noted that the site is used by wildlife. The submitted wildlife survey explains that the site could provide habitats for badgers, birds and reptiles although it is unlikely that any European Protected Species are present on the site. It recommends that further reptile surveys are carried out prior to the commencement of the development and this can be required by condition.

Conclusions

It is considered that the development is acceptable in principle, would not impact unreasonably upon the amenities of nearby residents or the visual amenities of the area. The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and the settings of nearby listed buildings. Taking account of the applicant's detailed submissions in respect of highway safety and the provision of visibility splays, the proposal is not considered that any harm to highway safety would be sufficient to warrant refusal of planning permission. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and it is, therefore, recommended that planning permission is granted.

In preparing this report the Planning Officer has considered fully the implications and requirements of the Human Rights Act 1988.

CONTACT OFFICER: Mr M Bale Tel: 01823 356454