

DARTMOOR NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Friday 26 June 2020

Present: S Barker, A Cooper, G Gribble, P Harper, G Hill, J McInnes,
S Morgan, D Moyse, J Nutley, N Oakley, C Pannell,
M Renders, P Sanders, P Smerdon, P Vogel, D Webber, P Woods

Officers: Mr C Hart, Head of Development Management
Mr J Aven, Deputy Head of Development Management
Mr P Twamley, Planning Officer
Mr G Gover, Solicitor (acting on behalf of Devon County Council)
Mr N White, Monitoring Officer
Mr P Townsend, Highways Officer (Devon County Council)

Apologies: K Ball

The Chairman reminded Members of the meeting protocol and that the meeting would be recorded. Members were requested to ensure that they referred to relevant page or slide numbers when making a comment or raising a query.

Members were also reminded that when voting, consistent language should be used i.e., *For the motion, Against the motion or Abstain.*

1415 Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday 22 May 2020

The minutes of the meeting held on Friday 22 May 2020 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

1416 Declarations of Interest and Contact

All Members received an emails email regarding 0152/20 The Old Fire Station, Chagford.

Mr Harper declared a personal interest in Item 2 – 0547/19 Canonteign Manor, Christow and will not vote. He also declared a pecuniary interest in Item 4 0184/20, Burrator Reservoir, Sheepstor and will leave the meeting for that item.

Mrs Hill declared a personal interest in Item 1 – 0167/20 Higher Weddicott Farm, Chagford and will leave the meeting for that item. She also declared a personal interest in item 0152/20, The Old Fire Station, Chagford due to being a on the Parish Council.

Mrs Pannell declared a personal interest in Item 4 0184/20, Burrator Reservoir, Sheepstor and will leave the meeting for that item.

Mr Smerdon declared a personal interest in 0550/19, Hayes Field, Widecombe-in-the-Moor due to knowing a supporter.

1417 Applications for Determination by the Committee

Members received the report of the Head of Development Management (NPA/DM/20/014).

Mrs Hill disconnected from the meeting.

Item 1 – 0573/19 – Removal of condition 1 to planning permission granted under ref 0203/13 to allow building to be used as an unrestricted dwelling (Full Planning Permission), Higher Weddicott Farm, Chagford

Speaker: Mr Rogers - Applicant

The Case Officer stated to Members that the application is for a conversion from a holiday let to an unrestricted dwelling. The removal of the condition, which limits the property to a holiday let, would help the applicant in these uncertain times as the holiday rental has been severely impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic. The Case Officer expressed his sympathies regarding the loss of income in these unprecedented times, but stated that there is no justification for a permanent change. The Government Covid-19 restrictions on the use of holiday accommodation are being lifted on 4 July 2020.

Mr Rogers stated that he does not intend to stop trading as holiday accommodation, but requires the freedom to rent out the property on a 6 – 12 month short term tenancy to have some secure income. Mr Rogers stated that even with the restrictions being lifted in July, he and his wife have concerns about multiple people renting the property, potentially putting themselves at risk of the virus. If they were able to rent out the property for longer to a single tenant (6-12 months) this would not be an issue. He stated that the planning policies have not taken in to account the loss of business from a pandemic and people still need to have an income.

In response to a Members question, Mr Rogers stated that he had applied for financial Government assistance but had not had any success.

The Case Officer stated that the Government had changed some permitted planning rights, but with the restrictions being lifted on the use of holiday accommodation, there is no material justification for this application.

The Head of Development Management confirmed to Members that the removal of the condition is permanent and if the condition is removed the dwelling could be used for that purpose and sold as an unrestricted open market dwelling.

Mr Sanders proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr McInnes.

A Member stated that this is not a new dwelling and as highlighted in the report, these are exceptional circumstances, which is considered an acceptable reason for lifting the condition. The business has been negatively impacted by the restrictions over the last few months and the health concerns raised by the applicant could be long lasting. By making this an open market property will prevent another dwelling being built elsewhere.

A Member stated that the planning rules are not able to be changed for individuals. There are funds available to help the businesses that have fallen through the gaps during the pandemic. If the planning regulations are changed for one application, it could set a precedent for others. Tourism on Dartmoor will pick up, especially as many people will be holidaying in the UK this year, rather than going abroad.

RESOLVED: That permission be REFUSED for the following reason;

1. The proposal is in an area where the Authority would only permit a new dwelling in exceptional circumstances. The proposed development would result in an unjustified and unsustainable open market dwelling in the countryside and is therefore contrary to policies COR2, COR15 and DMD23 of the Development Plan and to advice contained in the English National Parks and the Broads UK Government Vision and Circular 2010 and National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Mrs Hill reconnected to the meeting and took part in the following items.

Item 2 – 0547/19 - Change of use from C3 (residential dwelling) to Sui Generis (holiday let) (Change of Use), Canonteign Manor, Christow

Speakers – Mrs Katherine Metcalfe (Agent for the Applicant)
Mr Chris Bayliss (Objector)

The Case Officer informed Members that the correct plan, available on the website, shows the red line omitting the outdoor pool and sauna area.

The Case Officer reminded Members the application was originally brought to Development Management Committee in February 2020 and Members had previously attended a site inspection. Canonteign Manor is a Grade 1 manor house, 1.9km south of Christow. It lies in spacious grounds, the nearest neighbouring properties are 10m away. There is a total of 6 bedrooms, multiple activity rooms and spa and treatment facilities. The proposed use would require little change to the internal layout and design of the property.

There have been 10 letters of objection, highlighting concerns regarding the potential noise from the outdoor areas and the potential increase in traffic movements. The Case Officer reminded Members that the Pool area and south section of the garden, adjacent to the neighbouring cottages has been omitted from the plans. The proposed unilateral undertaking would state that the pool will be decommissioned and fenced off. The unilateral undertaking would also include house rules would state restricted times for outdoor activities. The unilateral undertaking would be drafted by the applicant and approved by the Authority.

The Case Officer informed Members that condition 7 has been amended to read “The delivery and collection of goods and materials to and from Canonteign Manor, associated with the development hereby approved, shall only take place between the hours of 09:00 and 18:00.”

The Case Officer informed Members that the Parish Council objects to the application due to the potential increase in noise and traffic. The Highways Officer stated that it would be modest amounts of traffic from the Manor and there will only be traffic when it is booked. The Highways Officer clarified with Members the

method to calculate the potential traffic movements – according to statistics, holiday makers are only likely to make 1-2 car movements a day, whereas permanent residents are likely to make 6-8 traffic movements a day. He stated that even with multiple cars visiting the site it would be comparable to the level expected if the house was in permanent residential use.

The Legal Advisor informed Members that a unilateral undertaking is a legal agreement, and if it is breached enforcement can be carried out by the means of a County Court injunction, which could lead to prison.

Members raised concerns regarding the wording in the Heads of Terms which states “No same sex groups are allowed to occupy the property”. The Legal Advisor stated that it could cause issues with the equalities act, and when drafting the unilateral undertaking it should be worded differently. The Case Officer stated that it could say “No same sex groups unless otherwise agreed”. If the Members are minded to grant permission, they would delegate the detail of the unilateral undertaking to the Head of Development Management.

Mrs Metcalfe stated to Members that Canonteign Manor is an important Grade 1 Elizabethan Manor. In the last 60 years it has been transformed from a near derelict wreck to the house it is today. National Heritage Policy encourages the sustainable and viable use of listed buildings to avoid putting them at risk of deterioration. The Manor is currently used as a second home for the owner and it is not the best way to preserve and maintain the historic building. There are currently damp issues throughout the building. The owners recognise their responsibility for the upkeep of the building, but without being occupied on a regular basis, the upkeep becomes financially onerous. The building has been on the market for two years and has had worldwide exposure, other potential purchasers see the building as an investment and it is very likely a potential purchaser would also pursue holiday rental use. The issues raised regarding the proximity of the neighbours and the potential noise issues have been addressed by the fencing off of part of the garden and the decommissioning of the pool, along with time restrictions on outdoor activities. The change of use will not impact on the significance of the building and supplementary Listed Building Consents will deal with the internal alterations required to meet the safety standards of a publicly accessible building. The applicant understands the proposed conditions and the unilateral undertaking needing to be in place before the change of use is implemented.

In response to further concerns regarding the wording of point 3.6 in the Heads of Terms, Mrs Metcalfe stated the wording would be looked at with legal advice. Mrs Metcalfe also stated that this is a sustainable use of the building. In response a question from a Member, Mrs Metcalfe stated that the house keeper would inform guests of the rules upon their arrival and that having the unilateral undertaking makes the rules stricter and therefore easier to enforce.

Mr Bayliss informed Members that he was the representative for 11 households close to Canonteign Manor. He stated that the application is premature and the residents would like to see the conditions and the full extent of the unilateral undertaking before the committee makes a decision. He stated that it would be impossible to serve an injunction on the owner as they are a foreign national. Mr Bayliss stated in this unprecedented time, locals have concerns with up to 17

different people staying in the Manor each week and potentially spreading Covid-19 in the local community.

Members discussed if they should have sight of the unilateral undertaking before it is signed off. The Head of Development Management stated to Members that if they are minded to grant the recommendation, they are agreeing that the Heads of Terms are acceptable and full delegation for the drafting of the unilateral undertaking would be given to the Head of Development Management with reference to legal support. Some Members stated that they had full confidence in Officers being able to conclude the unilateral undertaking. Other Members raised concerns that there were too many unanswered questions and they would prefer to see the completed unilateral undertaking before making a decision on the application.

Mr Sanders proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr McInnes.

RESOLVED: That, subject to the conditions set out below and the completion of an acceptable unilateral undertaking, permission be GRANTED.

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the site location plan and fence details document received 12 February 2020 and floor plan valid 25 November 2019.
3. The use hereby approved shall not commence until the fencing shown on the approved detail document received 12 February 2020 has been installed. At all times thereafter, the approved fencing shall be retained in the approved location.
4. The development hereby permitted shall not be used or occupied other than for the provision of short let holiday accommodation. No person, couple, family or group shall occupy or use the accommodation hereby permitted for a single period or cumulative periods exceeding 28 days in any calendar year.
5. The owners/operators of the holiday accommodation hereby approved shall maintain an up-to-date register of the names, main home addresses and dates of occupancy of all occupiers using the accommodation and shall make this information available to the Local Planning Authority on request.
6. The Staff Accommodation hereby approved shall not be used or occupied other than for the provision of accommodation to a person (together with their spouse or partner, children or dependents) solely or mainly working as a housekeeper or manager of the holiday accommodation hereby approved, and shall not at any time be used, sold or otherwise occupied as a separate dwelling.
7. The delivery and collection of goods and materials to and from Canonteign Manor, associated with the development hereby approved, shall only take place between the hours of 09:00 and 18:00.
8. The collective acoustic impact of the use of the site must not be any greater than 5dBa 5 min over the existing background noise level when measured at the boundary of the site and without tonal element. The sound shall not be greater than the background sound level when measured at the façade or boundary of the nearest noise sensitive premises. The impact of any noisy activities on neighbouring premises shall be monitored when requested to do so by the Local Planning Authority or Environmental Health Officer and appropriate action taken to reduce the noise to acceptable levels if they are found to be excessive or

distinguishable above residual sound levels at the façade or boundary of the nearest noise sensitive property.

Members took a 15 minute break and a roll call was taken when the meeting reconvened. All Members who were present at the start of the meeting rejoined the meeting.

Due to technical difficulties, the Chairman informed Members Item 4 would be dealt with before Item 3.

Mr Harper and Mrs Pannell disconnected from the meeting.

Item 4 - 0184/20 – Installation of 25m lattice with two antennas, two 0.6m dishes, three equipment cabinets, electrical meter cabinet and temporary generator with fenced compound (Full Planning Permission), Burrator Reservoir, Sheepstor

Speaker: Mr Gillan – Savills, on behalf of the applicant.

The Case Officer stated that the application is for a 25m lattice tower, with 2 dishes, three equipment cabinets and an electrical meter cabinet to support the Emergency Service Network (ESN). The proposed site is in a heavily forested area of Yennadon Plantation, above the south west periphery of the reservoir. It is adjacent to the Devonport Leat and the abandoned railway which is now a popular footpath and cycleway, both the leat and the railway are non-designated heritage assets. There are existing low height utilitarian structures associated with the leat.

The lattice tower would be painted black and the proposal includes ground based cabinets and equipment painted in fir green. The compound would have a footprint of 4.5x9m with a 1.8m high close board timber fence. The tower needs to be 25m tall to allow for reasonable clearance above the tree line and to provide a direct line of sight with the mast at North Hessary Tor.

The Case Officer stated that the 25m lattice tower is considered to introduce an incongruous vertical form with an adverse impact on the setting of the non-designated heritage assets. Alternative locations and design options have been explored by the applicant, they have stated that a mock telegraph pole or artificial tree solution would not be possible in this location.

The Authority's Trees and Landscape Officer has stated that the tower will be mostly hidden from view and it would not be visible from the common land or from the road below. It would have a minimal impact on the character of the area due to the numerous modern structures and features throughout the landscape.

The Case Officer informed Members that DMD 20 in the Local Plan aims to permit telecommunications equipment where the siting and external appearance would not damage the landscape character. He stated that the impact of this proposal is considered to be significant to the immediate area and be harmful to both the heritage and landscape and therefore it is recommended for refusal.

Mr Gillan informed Members that he is the ESN planning lead for EE, who have the contract to improve ESN connectivity, the Home Office require coverage around

Burrator Reservoir. He highlighted the importance for connectivity for the emergency services and the need to improve general coverage. The new mast needs to be able to see the roads and therefore has to be seen. He stated that if this application is refused, there will be more applications in the future as it is a Government requirement for this to be installed. The site was selected due to the existing industrial items in the area. The installation would have minimal impact on the area, as stated by the Trees and Landscapes Officer, and would no widespread excavation would be required. It would be highly beneficial to the public in this busy part of the park.

A Member queried the application for “a temporary generator”, Mr Gillan stated that this would be in case of power loss, otherwise there is mains electricity available.

Members discussed the importance of the non-designated heritage assets and the impact the proposed mast would have on the area.

A Member highlighted that the coverage from the mast would not reach the nearest village and would only give intermittent coverage on the road adjacent to the reservoir.

Mr Sanders proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr McInnes.

Members discussed the need for the increased coverage in an area of the park which has a large footfall and the need for increased connectivity for the ESN network. The benefits to the public were acknowledged.

The Head of Development Management stated that a wooded site was encouraged but not the lattice design, a more subtle design would be preferred. He highlighted that this tower would be just for the ENS initially, so would not improve signal coverage for the mobile telephone network at the outset. He stated he would prefer to see similar designs to those erected in Widecombe-in-the-Moor and North Bovey, which are very discrete.

RESOLVED: That permission be REFUSED due to the following reasons:

1. The proposed 25m tower, ground cabinets and compound, by reason of their size, appearance and siting, would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of this part of the Dartmoor National Park. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies COR1, COR3, COR5, DMD1a, DMD1b, DMD3, DMD4, DMD7, DMD8 and DMD20 of the Dartmoor National Park Development Plan and the advice contained in the Dartmoor National Park Design Guide, the English National Parks and the Broads UK Government Vision and Circular 2010 and National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
2. The proposed 25m tower, ground cabinets and compound, by reason of their size appearance and siting, would have a detrimental impact on the setting and appearance of two non-designated heritage assets. The development is therefore considered contrary to policies COR3, COR5, DMD7 and DMD8 of the Dartmoor National Park Development Plan and the advice contained in the Dartmoor National Park Design Guide, the English National Parks and the Broads UK Government Vision and Circular 2010 and National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Mr Harper and Mrs Hill reconnected to the meeting and took part in the following items

Item 3 - 0152/20 – Erection of office (Full Planning Permission), The Old Fire Station, Manor Road, Chagford.

Speakers: Mrs Stanbury – Chagford Parish Council
Mr Deacon - Objector
Mr O'Connor - Applicant

The Case Officer stated to Member that the application is for an office building in the centre of Chagford on a grassy bank adjacent to the conservation area. The Case Officer informed Members that this is a resubmission of 0561/18 which was dismissed at appeal on the grounds on the effect on the character of the area, the loss of distant views and the strength of local objection.

The revised submission is for a single storey office building, with west side facing windows. It would nestle in to the site. The proposed size of the building has been reduced by 9sqm and the ridge height reduced by 1.58m. The floor plan indicates a modest 57msq lobby, meeting room and four work stations, WC and kitchen area. The roof would be planted and have roof lights. Steps would lead down to the pavement.

The Case officer stated that the merits of the scheme are that it is compatible to residential use, it is walking distance in to the town centre and the design respects the neighbours. The design is of a high quality and mixes well with the other buildings. It would not be overbearing and the neighbouring properties should not experience any loss of light and there are no parking or highways issues. The company have been based in Chagford for 30 years. Should the Members be minded to grant permission, there would be 11 conditions.

Mr Townsend stated that the views of the Highway Authority are detailed in the report. The previous application was not refused on highway safety. The visibility splay over the footway is adequate for approaching vehicles to have a good line of sight.

Mrs Stanbury stated to Members that historically the old fire station and adjacent field were under one ownership, now the site is not under one ownership and straddles the wall and the top of the grassy slope by approximately 2m. The old fire station was actually located further up the hill, the footings of the building can still be seen. The original permission for the “three houses with highway access and the demolition of the existing fire station” was granted permission on the basis that the old fire station was demolished, the new highway access point was made and the grassy slope acted as a visibility splay and be landscaped. The Parish Council believes those conditions should remain.

Mrs Stanbury stated that very little had changed with the design of the building since the Appeal to the Planning Inspectorate last year. The over intensification and the lack of visibility still apply. This application continues to contravene the following National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs and policies. Paragraph 172 – this application would have “an adverse impact on the interrelationship between the settlement and the landscape and scenic beauty of the park”. Paragraph 196 – There are no public benefits for this building in this location.

DMD1 – construction would not enhance this area. DMD5 – this development would not enhance the area as you approach Chagford. COR 4 – The scale and layout of this building would not be appropriate for the site or the surroundings. It would not enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the built environment and local landscape.

Mr Deacon stated to Members that over 70 local people have objected to this application, and similar applications have been refused 6 times. The site, surrounding area and policies have not changed. The scale and massing of the building are inappropriate for the location and the size of the building has only been marginally reduced from the previous application. The reasons given by the Planning Inspectorate have not changed. The site lies on the edge of the conservation area and the development would have an adverse impact. The building is not essential for the business and there are other buildings available in the town. It is an incongruous design in a residential area. The conditions on a previous application states that this area should stay landscaped and undeveloped.

Mr O'Connor informed Members that this resubmission of application 0561/18 has addressed the issues raised by the Planning Inspectorate and are detailed in the design and access statement to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. He stated that the site is a highly suitable position within the settlement boundary of Chagford and is outside the conservation area. The office would be used by a local architectural practice that has been based in Chagford for over 30 years. The practice employs local people, one person was born and bred in Chagford, and they need additional space to deal with the increase in workload and equipment. The practice is currently based in the basement of Mr O'Connor's dwelling. Mr O'Connor stated that there are currently no offices available on the market in Chagford that are sufficient in size or layout. It makes good sense to use the land that they own and provide an office that can evolve with future needs. The offices would have very low energy consumption and the green roof would provide for an increase in wildlife habitat. The Planning Inspectorate stated that the level of parking proposed would be acceptable and the Highways Officer has raised no objections.

Members questioned the stepped access indicated on the plans, Mr O'Connor stated that it would not be stepped and it would be a slightly sloped path, the plans had been misinterpreted. The toilets inside the offices would also be suitable for disabled access.

In response to a Members question, Mr O'Connor stated that he had invited the Parish Council to come and look at a model design and discuss the application and only one person turned up.

In response to questions from Members, the Case Officer stated that the condition for the green area to be landscaped, does not prevent future planning applications. The questions regarding the visibility splay had already been answered by the Highways Officer. The Case Officer informed Members that this is a different proposal to the previous applications and must be looked at on its merits.

Mr Sanders proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr McInnes. This vote was NOT CARRIED.

Mrs Pannell proposed that the application be Refused, which was seconded by Mrs Morgan.

Mrs Pannell stated that her reasons for refusal were:

- The harm on the character and appearance of the immediate setting and conservation area.
- The character of the wider National Park
- Incongruent scale and design
- The green area and break in street scene are of importance and worthy of keeping and therefore development on the site will not enhance the area.

The Members were advised by the Head of Development Management that it would be appropriate to defer a decision to allow for proper consideration of any reasons for refusal to ensure that a sound decision could be reached.

RESOLVED: Members agreed to DEFER a decision on the application to allow for the full consideration of any reasons for refusal at a future meeting.

Item 5 – 0550/19 – Erection of new Community Hall, associated new access point, parking and break-out space (Full Planning Permission), Hayes Field, Widecombe-in-the-Moor

Speaker – Mr Elliot – On behalf of Widecombe Community Hall Charitable Incorporated Organisation.

The Case Officer stated the application is for a new community hall just off the centre of the village. The proposal was first muted in 2016 and various sites have been explored, a feasibility study was conducted and community engagement sessions carried out. A new access point would be required and there would be new trees planted to increase the screening of the site. Some parking is included on the application but there is also suitable parking within the village centre. Drainage from the site would be through pipe work into the existing leat and a stone bridge would be constructed over the culvert. Widecombe has a wide catchment area and the hall would enable better social interaction and would be a great improvement on the existing hall.

Mr Elliot informed Members that over the last 50 years, a proposal to build a new village hall has been put forward, but for one reason or another it has not been possible to proceed. The existing hall is well used but was not purpose built and therefore hard to adapt, with the age of the building and the National Trust ownership it is impossible to meet modern standards for accessibility and comfort. Details of the project are available on the committees website, but he detailed that the feasibility study, site selection report and the setup of the charity are complete, local fundraising is 50% complete and the construction is dependent on successful fundraising. The major fundraising will commence once planning permission is finalised. Mr Elliot stated that £25k has been raised from general fundraising within the parish and a further £100k available from a benefactor and Public Works Board Loan. £25k has been secured from grant giving organisations for work to date.

Ms Woods lost connection and therefore would not be able to vote.

Mr Nutley stated he should have declared a pecuniary interest in this item due to being involved with the community funding and disconnected from the meeting.

Members stated they were pleased to see the electric car charge points on the plans, and agreed that there is enough parking allocated and for less able bodied people. There is plenty of alternative parking in the village.

A Member suggested that an archaeological watching brief should be a condition, should the Members be minded to grant permission, due to the nearby archaeological dig and findings in a location close to the proposed site. The Head of Development Management stated that the Authority's Archaeologist has already had an extensive look at the field, a full survey has already been carried out and, as a consequence, he is content that a watching brief is not required. There would need to be strong justification to condition a watching brief on the planning permission.

Mr Sanders proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr McInnes.

Members expressed their support for the scheme.

Mrs Oakley lost connection and therefore would not be able to vote.

Ms Woods lost connection and therefore would not be able to vote.

Mrs Hill lost connection and therefore would not be able to vote

RESOLVED: That, subject to the conditions set out below, permission be GRANTED.

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing: site location plan 204-WCH-00, 200-WCH-01, 201-WCH-02, 202-WCH-02, 203-WCH-04, 211-WCH-00, WCH-210-R02, WCH-222-R03, C-GA-100 Rev P2 and C-GA-105 Rev P1
3. No groundworks shall start until a Method of Construction Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This statement shall include details of:
 - i) Parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
 - ii) Loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - iii) Storage of plant and materials
 - iv) Programme of works (including measures for traffic management)
 - v) Hours of operation and deliveries to siteThe works shall only proceed in accordance with the agreed details
4. No development shall take place until a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) and Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) are submitted and approved in writing, and carried out in accordance with a timetable for implementation as approved. The scheme shall include the recommendations of the ecological appraisal (Devon Wildlife Consultants,

- November 2019) and include a lighting plan and surface water management plan. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
5. No works to construct the hall shall be commenced until the access, visibility splays, turning area and access drainage have been provided in accordance with the approved drawings.
 6. Details of the proposed landscaping and planning scheme shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping and planting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme within twelve months of the commencement of the development, or such longer period as the Local Planning Authority shall specify in writing. The landscaping and planting shall be maintained for a period of five years from the date of the commencement of the development, such maintenance shall include the replacement of any trees or shrubs that die or are removed.
 7. A detailed schedule of the materials and finished to be used on the approved building and its surroundings shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the construction of the access, bridge, driveway, car park and hall. This shall include samples of the room material, cladding, details of render finishes, stone cladding, window/external door units, verge/soffit details, rainwater goods, photo voltaic panels, boundary fence design, driveway/car park surface materials, kerbs and proposed exterior lighting units.
 8. The approved lighting scheme shall only be operated when the hall is in use and at no other time.