

ITEM 5.3

Application: 2022/429

Location: 101 Whyteleafe Road, Caterham, Surrey, CR3 5EJ

Proposal: Demolition of existing rear single storey rear element and outbuilding. Erection of single storey side and rear extension, and erection of two storey rear extension. Erection of mansard dormer roof extension to rear roof slope with 2 x dormer windows. Erection of extension to existing basement. (Amended plans, description and arboricultural impact assessment)

Ward: Portley

Constraints – Urban, AWood500, Gaspipeline175, Gas High Pressure pipeline in 175m, Risk of Surface Water Flooding 1 in 1000, TPO 65/C&W, TPO10, Biggin Hill Safeguarding, Source Protection Zone 2 & 3

RECOMMENDATION: **PERMIT subject to conditions**

1. This application is reported to Committee following a Member 'call in' on grounds that this application hasn't addressed the issues raised on previous refusal.

Summary

2. The application site is in the urban area of Caterham which is a Category 1 settlement where the principle of development is considered acceptable.
3. The proposal, whilst seeking a number of enlargements to the dwelling, and proposing a variety of roof types would provide some symmetry across the east elevation of the dwelling and taking into account the current varied form of the host building is not considered out of character with the area.
4. The Principal Tree Officer is satisfied of the principle that the retained trees could be protected during construction. Further detailed construction management and tree protection details will be required by condition.
5. The proposed additions are not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light or being overbearing. Subject to a condition to control the installation of obscure glazing and non-opening first and second floor windows to the north elevation the proposal is also not considered to have significant impact on the privacy of the adjacent neighbours.
6. Consequently it is considered that the proposal would accord with the requirements of the NPPF and with the policies contained in the Development Plan. Accordingly it is recommended that permission is granted subject to conditions as outlined.

Site Description

7. The site comprises a two-storey semi detached dwelling located on the north west corner of the junction of Whyteleafe Road and Matlock Road. The dwelling is set away from the boundary with the highway with mature vegetation on the public facing boundaries. The site is flat.

8. The site lies within the urban confines of Caterham. Residential properties border the site to the north and the west. A Tree Preservation Order covers a number of trees adjacent to the northern boundary of the site.

Relevant History and Key Issues

9. The site has a limited planning history. No previous extensions or alterations having been formally approved for the property however there have been single storey additions added to the property and an outbuilding, likely under permitted development.
10. Planning permission was sought under application reference 2021/572 for the demolition of existing rear single storey rear element and outbuilding. Erection of single storey side and rear extension, two storey rear extension and mansard dormer roof extension with 2 x dormer windows. Erection of extension to existing basement. (Amended plans, description and arboricultural impact assessment). That scheme was amended during that application process to match the current proposal however was subsequently withdrawn to address concerns raised regarding the trees which needed further survey works undertaken.

Key Issues

11. The key issues for this application are the principle of development, acceptability in terms of character and appearance, impact on neighbouring amenity and whether there would be an impact on the adjacent protected trees. Each of these will be addressed in the report below.

Proposal

12. This application seeks approval for the demolition of the existing single storey rear additions to the dwelling and an adjacent outbuilding. It is proposed to erect a single storey side and rear extension and erection of two storey rear extension. Alterations are also proposed to the roof to erect a mansard dormer roof extension to rear roof slope with 2no pitched roof dormer windows. The proposal also includes the extension to the existing basement.
13. The two-storey extension is proposed to extend 3m beyond the rear wall of the dwelling and is to be a total of 6.45m wide. This extension will include a corner bay window to mirror the corner bay on the south-east corner of the property. The extension will match the eaves height of the existing dwelling.
14. The single storey extension is to be L-shaped in form. It will project 9.63m from the original rear wall of the dwelling at its furthest point and is to be a total of 8.66m wide. It is to propose a hipped roof with flat top measuring 2.7m in height to the eaves and 3.2m to the flat top. A basement is proposed below the single storey extension.
15. In addition to the above a mansard roof extension is proposed. This will project beyond the rear roof slope to sit above the existing flat roof of the existing dwelling. This roof enlargement will include 2no dormer windows to the rear north facing roof slope.
16. No changes are proposed to the parking or access arrangements to the site.

Development Plan Policy

17. Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008– Policies CSP1 and CSP18
18. Tandridge Local Plan Part 2 Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014 – Policies DP1, DP7
19. Caterham Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Development Plan 2021- Policies- CCW4 and CCW5
20. Woldingham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016 – not applicable
21. Limpsfield Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019 – not applicable
22. Emerging Tandridge Local Plan 2033 - Policies TLP01, TLP18

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPGs) and non-statutory guidance

23. Tandridge parking standards SPD (2012)
24. Tandridge Trees and Soft Landscaping SPD (2017)

National Advice

25. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)
26. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

Statutory Consultation Responses

27. County Highway Authority – As it is not considered that the likely net additional traffic generation, access arrangements and parking would have a material impact on the safety and operation of the public highway, the highway authority were not consulted on this application.
28. Caterham on the Hill Parish Council – Caterham on the Hill Parish Council comments on application 2022/429: 101 Whyteleafe Road as follows:
29. The Parish Council's submission on the previous application (2021/572) reflected concerns raised by neighbours regarding privacy and amenity. These were the possible impact of the extensions on the root areas of the adjacent trees and conifer hedging, and potential overlooking from the two roof-level dormer windows.
30. Regarding the trees we note that the footprint of the extension has been reduced and as a result the applicant's arboriculturist concludes that there is no impact on the recommended root protection areas. However, it is essential that TDC's Tree Officer examines that matter and if necessary, makes a site visit. Regarding the dormers in the rear elevation with the velux type sloping roof lights set at a height to avoid any overlooking (as per the front elevation) but this has not been done.

TDC advice

31. Principal Tree Officer- This current application is different in an arboricultural sense from the previous application, as the extension has been drawn slightly away from the boundary. There are also changes in circumstances in terms of the trees.
33. The site has been visited and it was observed that trenches had been excavated by air spade, and the roots found within. The airspade trench is helpful as it clearly shows the presence or otherwise of roots, whereas the BS5837 root protection calculation is rudimentary at best. That said it is always unhelpful when stem diameters of offsite trees are estimated rather than measured as is the case here. I note for example that the consultant previously employed for 2021/572 estimated the stem of T6 (T1 of his report) to be 350mm, whilst the latest survey estimates it at 310mm giving it a reduced RPA. For the purposes of Table D.1 of BS5837 this results in a difference in root protection radius of 0.3m, which is not a vast amount, but still may be important if there is a mass of fibrous roots within that area.
34. The most important difference between the surveys is the BS5837 categorisation, however. The previous survey gave T5 and T6 a 'B' category (moderate quality) with minimum 20 years life expectancy, whereas the last survey gives both trees a 'C' category (low quality) with a minimum 10 years life expectancy. For my part I would disagree with both and categorise T6 as a 'B' category and T5 as a 'C' category. In my opinion T4 is a 'U' category ash, which is suffering from significant ash dieback symptoms. It has been given a 'C' category, but is recommended for removal due to its impaired condition, with a life expectancy fewer than 10 years, making it a definite 'U' category tree. This is a significant decline from its condition only 6 months ago and demonstrates that the ash dieback is progressing very quickly. I agree with the assessment in that respect.
35. What all this means is that with the repositioning of the extension I am satisfied that the higher quality tree (T6) can be retained without significant harm. T4 should be removed irrespective of development before it becomes too hazardous to climb. It is therefore no longer considered as a constraint. T5 is a 'C' category tree, which generally would not pose a very significant constraint on development even if it was shown to be removed, which of course it is not, as it is off-site. What I can say about its retention is that there will certainly be severance of important roots for the basement construction, as demonstrated by the trench excavation, and that this may result in some physiological harm, but if the tree was not protected by TPO then the property owners could have pruned the roots under common law rights in any case (taking reasonable care of course). Which leads me to the question of whether or not the Council would approve root pruning works of this nature, or indeed the removal of the tree in other circumstances. My view here is that as the tree is relatively low quality, and very modest amenity or landscape value, particularly considering the large number of high quality trees growing nearby, that should such an application be separately received it would likely gain consent. It is for this reason that to refuse the planning application on this basis alone (harm to T5) would be difficult to justify or sustain at appeal.
36. Having been on site I am now satisfied of the principle that the remaining retained trees could be protected during construction as set out within the arboricultural report, but I am of the view that further detailed construction management and tree protection details should be required under condition should the Council be minded to grant consent.

37. Accordingly, the Tree Officer raises no objections

Third Party Comments

Amenity + privacy

- Rear Dormer Windows- unobstructed view directly into some of neighbours upstairs bedroom windows compromising privacy.
- Multiple windows facing neighbours
- Loss of trees could cause impact on privacy.

Trees

- Concerns over damage to the tree during construction (foundations, drainage, basement) and long term in term of changes to the water table.
- Basement 7m deep
- Services within RPZ- no details provided
- Impact if trees are damaged- suggested arrangement if adjacent trees die.
- Connick Tree Report provided

Other matters

- Ground water (Drainage)- issue of increased basement. No details provided.
- Ecology- impact on tree may impact wildlife (squirrels and birds)

Assessment

Location and principle of development

38. The application site lies within an Urban Area which Core Strategy Policy CSP1 identifies that development will take place in order to promote sustainable patterns of travel and in order to make the best use of previously developed land and where there is a choice of mode of transport available and where the distance to travel services is minimised. The principle of new development would be acceptable provided that it would meet the relevant criteria regarding its design and appearance as will be assessed in detail later in this report

39. Policy DP1 of the Local Plan (2014) advises that when considering development proposal, the council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. As such, there is no objection in principle to residential extension in this location under Core Strategy Policy CSP1 and Local Plan Policy DP1 in this regard.

Character and Appearance

40. Policy CSP18 of the Core Strategy 2008 requires new development to be of a high standard of design that must reflect and respect the character, setting and local context, including those features that contribute to local distinctiveness. Policy DP7 of the Local Plan 2014 provides the Council's general policy for new development and requires proposals to respect and contribute to distinctiveness of the area in which it is located and to have a complementary building design and materials.

41. The NPPF sets out that design is integral to sustainable development and that the creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and

helps make development acceptable to communities. This was bolstered by the publication of the National Design Guide in 2019.

42. Policy CCW4 of the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2021 states that, development is expected to preserve and enhance the character area in which it is located (as shown in Figure 5.1). Development proposals in the defined character areas will be supported which:

- i) exhibit design reflecting local context, character and vernacular of the area;
- ii) demonstrably enhance the quality of the built form through innovation in design;
- iii) make a positive contribution to the character area when viewed from the main highway approaches into the settlements;
- iv) do not have a significantly detrimental impact on local views as set out in Policy CCW10; and
- v) contribute to the conservation and enhancement of designated and non-designated heritage assets and respect their significance and context.

43. Policy CCW5 of the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2021 states that, development proposals, which integrate well with their surroundings, meet the needs of residents and minimise the impact on the local environment will be supported where they demonstrate a high quality of design, by:

- a. Incorporating the principles of Building for Life (12), or successor design principles which would deliver a higher quality of design. Development proposals are encouraged to achieve the 'Built for Life' quality mark.
- b. Incorporating as appropriate, the guidance contained within the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan Design Guidelines, and adopted supplementary planning documents and the Caterham Valley and Hill Town Design Statement.
- c. Meeting the requirements of 'Secure by Design' and minimise the likelihood and fear of crime.
- d. Providing off-road parking in accordance with the adopted Tandridge Parking Standards (2012).
- e. Not adversely affecting vehicular and pedestrian safety due to traffic generation, access and parking design.
- f. Providing appropriate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) on site, unless there are clear reasons why this is not possible, or necessary.
- g. Ensuring that areas requiring service and maintenance including watercourses are accessible at all times.

44. The application site forms one half of a pair of dwellings which were converted from a large single dwelling. The main ornamental detailing for the dwelling is to the south elevation and to the south-eastern corner with its corner bay window. The rear northern elevation is simpler in its form which is two storeys with a flat roof and single storey addition and garage to the north of the dwelling. The proposal will demolish the existing single storey rear addition and outbuilding. A two-storey extension is proposed to the north eastern corner of the dwelling. This

will form a matching corner bay to that on the south east corner and will have a shallow pitch roof with flat top. An L-shaped single storey extension is proposed to the north of the dwelling and sits under a hipped roof with flat top. In addition a mansard roof enlargement is proposed beyond the north roof slope of the dwelling. This will include 2no dormer windows.

45. The proposed two storey extension is modest in its nature and seeks to match the architectural style of the host dwelling providing some symmetry across the eastern elevation which would be appropriate for its character. The single storey extension would not extend further north than the existing built form and infill the area to the north of the dwelling replacing the existing garage. Whilst not insignificant in its footprint it is single storey and would maintain subservience to the host dwelling. The roof enlargement would create a mansard roof form with flat top however when viewed from the east elevation will appear as a continuation of the roof pitch and sit below the ridge of the main roof. This, whilst altering the roof form of the dwelling, would not be harmful to the character of the dwelling.
46. The works proposed under this application when taken cumulatively would result in a not insignificant increase in the built form of the dwelling. The dwelling however lies within an urban location and with the main bulk of the extensions kept in the same position as the existing built form and set away from the highway. Such an enlargement is not considered to be out of character with this urban location and would not result in a dwelling that is visually disproportionate for the area. The proposed development would result in a variety of roof types and overall forms of the addition however the dwelling as it currently sits already incorporates different styles of elements and as such an approach is not considered to be out of character or harmful to the host building.
47. For the above reasons, it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of character and appearance to comply with the provisions of Policies DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 - Detailed Policies, Policy CSP18 of the Core Strategy and Policies CCW4 and CCW5 of the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2021.

Trees

48. The application site lies directly south of an area tree preservation order reference 65/C&W. This Tree Preservation Order, confirmed in 1972 was noted at the time of granting the order to contain predominantly deciduous trees consisting of oak beech, birch and sycamore with some holly elder yew and 1 lawson cypress. The impact on these trees will need to be carefully considered.
49. Core Strategy Policy CSP 18 (Character and Design) requires that:

Development must also have regard to the topography of the site, important trees or groups of trees and other important features that need to be retained.
50. Paragraph 13 of Policy DP7 of the Local Plan states:

Where trees are present on a proposed development site, a landscaping scheme should be submitted alongside the planning application which makes provision for the retention of existing trees that are important by virtue of their significance within the local landscape. Their significance may be as a result of their size, form

and maturity, or because they are rare or unusual. Younger trees that have the potential to add significant value to the landscape character in the future should also be retained where possible. Their retention should be reflected in the proposed development layout, allowing sufficient space for new and young trees to grow to maturity, both above and below ground. Where existing trees are felled prior to permission for development being sought, the Council may require replacement planting as part of any permission granted.

51. Further guidance on the consideration of trees in relation to development is provided within the Tandridge Trees and Soft Landscaping SPD (2017).
52. The previous application submitted under application reference 2021/572 raised a number of concerns with regards to the impact on the adjacent trees. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) identified the need for Air Spade excavation to investigate where roots were present. The report also did not fully address the impact of the enlarged basement. This current application includes an updated AIA produced by SJM dated 4th March 2022. This has been produced following the results of investigation trenches dug using an air spade to 550-600mm deep. It should also be noted that the basement has been reduced since the original plans submitted under 2021/572.
53. The Tandridge Tree Officer has been formally consulted on the application and has reviewed the AIA provided. He has also had sight of the Tree development report produced by Connick as commissioned by a neighbour which was provided within the comments for application 2021/572 and reproduced in their most recent comments.
54. The Tree Officer disagrees with the categories assigned to the trees within the report and would categorise T6 as a 'B' category and T5 as a 'C' category, both previously given a B category within the SJM report. In his opinion T4 is a 'U' category ash as it is suffering from significant ash dieback symptoms. T4 is noted to be suggested to be removed in the SJM AIA which is concurred by the Tree Officer although it is noted that this tree is off site and therefore is at the digression of the owner whether or not to undertake works to that tree.
55. With that assessment in mind the tree officer's comments goes through the impact on each of the trees and provides his views on the impact. These are summarised below;
 - T6- satisfied that the higher quality tree (T6) can be retained without significant harm.
 - T4- T4 should be removed irrespective of development before it becomes too hazardous to climb and therefore recommends it should no longer be considered as a constraint.
 - T5 is a 'C' category tree, which generally would not pose a very significant constraint on development. There would certainly be the severance of important roots as a result of the basement construction, and it remains to be considered whether or not the Council would approve root pruning works of this nature. T5 is relatively low quality, and very modest amenity or landscape value, particularly considering the large number of high quality trees growing nearby. Should an application be received to prune the roots it would likely gain consent. It is for this reason that to refuse the

planning application on this basis alone (harm to T5) would be difficult to justify or sustain at appeal.

56. With the above assessment in mind the Tree Officer outlines that he is now satisfied of the principle that the remaining retained trees could be protected during construction as set out within the arboricultural report. Further detailed construction management and tree protection details should be required under condition should the Council be minded to grant consent. This can also include details relation to any services required for the building to ensure no additional harm is caused to the trees.
57. The above assessment undertaken by the Councils Tree Officer outlines that in their professional opinion there are no grounds for refusal in relation to impact to the existing trees. The above advise will be taken forward into the remainder of the report.

Residential Amenity

58. Policy CSP18 of the Core Strategy advises that development must not significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion, noise, traffic and any adverse effect. Criteria 6-9 of Policy DP7 of the Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies seek also to safeguard amenity, including minimum privacy distances that will be applied to new development proposals.
59. The closest neighbours to the proposed works are the adjoining neighbour to the west at 29 Matlock Road and the neighbours to the north in Stanmore Close. The proposed two storey extension will project beyond the northern elevation of the dwelling. It will however be set back 2m from the common boundary with the attached neighbour and approximately 4m from the common boundary with the neighbour to the north. Given the separation this element of the proposal is not considered to adversely impact on the amenity of the neighbours in terms of loss of light or being overbearing. The single storey extension also projects off the northern elevation of the dwelling however is to, in part, be directly up to the western and northern boundaries of the site. This relationship however reflects the current position of the existing extension and whilst more substantial than the previous additions to be demolished is not considered to adversely impact on the amenity of the neighbours in terms of loss of light or being overbearing.
60. In terms of privacy the proposal includes a number of additional windows facing north and east. Those windows facing east would offer views over the applicant's land and towards Whyteleafe Road and is therefore not considered to result in any loss of privacy. Windows to the north elevation are proposed at ground floor level, first floor level serving a bedroom and office, and at second floor level in dormer windows serving the loft bedroom. There are current mature trees close to the boundary which would to some degree and at certain times of year reduce potential overlooking however these trees are outside the applicant's ownership and due to the potential transient nature of this screening cannot be relied upon to provide mitigation in terms of privacy in perpetuity. As set out above the ash tree (T4) is considered a category U tree and therefore cannot be considered to provide any screening. Without any screening or other mitigation any first and second floor windows facing north, at a distance of less than 25m from dwelling to dwelling, could give rise to an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of the neighbours to the north. This issue has been raised with the applicant who has agreed to a condition to require any first and second floor windows on the

northern elevation of the dwelling to be fitted with obscure glass and not opening below 1.7m above finished floor level. With such mitigation in place I would be of the view that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of the neighbours due to loss of privacy.

61. For the reasons outlined, and subject to the suggested conditions, the proposal is not considered to result in a significant impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbours in terms of loss of light, being overbearing or loss of privacy. The proposal would therefore accord with the requirements of Policy DP7 of the Local Plan (2014) and Policy CSP18 of the Core Strategy (2008).

Conclusion

62. In conclusion, the application site lies within an urban area and therefore the principal of the scale of this development is therefore considered acceptable. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of character and appearance. Subject to a condition requiring a construction management plan the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on the adjacent trees. With the inclusion of a condition requiring obscure glazed and non-opening windows to the northern facing first and second floor the proposal is not considered to result in a significant impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties. Officer recommendation is therefore that planning permission should therefore be granted.
63. The recommendation is made in light of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). It is considered that in respect of the assessment of this application significant weight has been given to policies within the Council's Core Strategy 2008 and the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014 in accordance with paragraph 218 of the NPPF. Due regard as a material consideration has been given to the NPPF and PPG in reaching this recommendation.
64. All other material considerations, including third party comments, have been considered but none are considered sufficient to change the recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMIT subject to the following conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall start not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. This decision refers to drawings numbered A3/01 Rev A, A3/02 Rev A, A3/03 Rev C, A3/04 Rev A, A3/05 Rev C, A3/06 Rev A, A3/10 Rev A and red-edged site plan received on 12th April 2022. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved drawings. There shall be no variations from these approved drawings.

Reason: To ensure that the scheme proceeds as set out in the planning application and therefore remains in accordance with the Development Plan.

3. The materials to be used on the external faces of the proposed development shall be in accordance with the details shown on the submitted application particulars.

Reason: To ensure that the new works harmonise with the existing building to accord with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014.

4. Notwithstanding the details already submitted, no development shall start until a detailed tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement, in full accordance with sections 5.5 and 6.1 of BS5837:2012 "*Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction*", to include details of all works within the root protection area, or crown spread, whichever is greater, of any retained tree, and all construction management affecting trees, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, all works shall be carried out and constructed in accordance with the approved details and shall not be varied without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent damage to trees in the interest of the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 Detailed Policies 2014

5. Prior to the first occupation of the extensions hereby approved the windows to the first and second floor north elevation shall be fitted with obscure glass and shall be non opening unless the parts of the windows which can be opened are more than 1.7m above the floor of the room in which the windows are installed and shall be permanently maintained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenities and privacy of occupiers of adjoining properties in accordance with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014.

Informatives

1. Condition 2 refers to the drawings hereby approved. Non-material amendments can be made under the provisions of Section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and you should contact the case officer to discuss whether a proposed amendment is likely to be non-material. Minor material amendments will require an application to vary condition 2 of this permission. Such an application would be made under the provisions of Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Major material amendments will require a new planning application. You should discuss whether your material amendment is minor or major with the case officer. Fees may be payable for non-material and material amendment requests. Details of the current fee can be found on the Council's web site.

The development has been assessed against Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 Policies CSP1, CSP2, CSP7, CSP12, CSP14, CSP15, CSP17, CSP18, CSP19, Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2: Detailed Policies – Policies DP1, DP5, DP7, DP8, DP9,

DP19, DP20, DP21, DP22 and material considerations, including third party representations. It has been concluded that the development, subject to the conditions imposed, would accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to justify a refusal of permission.