

APPLICATION REPORT – 20/00936/FUL

Validation Date: 7 September 2020

Ward: Eccleston And Mawdesley

Type of Application: Full Planning

Proposal: Erection of 3no. detached dwellinghouses, including 2no access points to Gorsey Lane, following the demolition of the existing dwellinghouse.

Location: Whitegates 75 Gorsey Lane Mawdesley Ormskirk L40 3TE

Case Officer: Amy Aspinall

Applicant: Mr Paul Bennett

Agent: Mr Chris Weetman, CW Planning Solutions Ltd

Consultation expiry: 8 October 2020

Decision due by: 11 December 2020 (Extension of time agreed)

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that the application is refused.

SITE DESCRIPTION

2. The application site is located wholly within the Green Belt, as defined by the Chorley Local Plan Policies Map and is comprised of a detached bungalow, associated garden and access.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

3. The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 3no. detached dwellinghouses, including 2no access points to Gorsey Lane. The existing bungalow would be demolished.

REPRESENTATIONS

4. No representations have been received.

CONSULTATIONS

5. Mawdesley Parish Council: Have commented that:

The additional homes are in the Green Belt. The policy aims to prevent the urban sprawl which is reducing quality of life in rural villages. This unsustainable form of development swallows up farmland and wildlife habitats while increasing air pollution, flood risk and car dependency.

The fill in development in the village is risen to such an extent there were plans for eleven new houses at this month's Parish Council Meeting. There is already 56 new houses being developed down Gorsey Lane and a planning application in for a further three at South View Back Lane adjacent to the land. There is no justification for three additional large houses which have a volume 50% larger than the original dwelling.

The size and physical scale of the buildings means they will have a visual impact on the local environment. They are so large they will be out of keeping and change the character of the village.

A large development just down the road from this has already impacted the sewerage and drainage systems in the village there is no capacity for further development.

Please confirm that planning have checked the road infrastructure and have sufficient evidence it can take the increased volume of traffic.

The Parish Council would ask Planning to carefully review allowing people to build new houses in the Green Belt

6. CIL Officers: Advise that the development is subject to the CIL Charge for Dwelling Houses as listed in Chorley Council' CIL Charging Schedule.

7. Lancashire County Council Highway Services: Final comments have not been received at the time of report preparation, but initial comments requested that sightlines are demonstrated and that if the garage at plot 2 is to be classed as a parking space it would need to measure 3 metres by 6 metres internally.

8. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit: Advise that the ecological survey is out-of-date. Further surveys are required in relation to bats. Risk to Great Crested Newts can controlled by condition (Reasonable avoidance measures RAMS)

9. United Utilities: Recommend that the site should be drained on a separate system with foul water draining to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of the development

10. Planning permission has previously been granted for the following on this site:

- infill development for 1no dwelling between the existing bungalow of Whitegates 75 Gorse Lane and neighbouring dwelling 71 Gorse Lane (ref: 18/01212/OUT)
- replacement dwellinghouse of Whitegates 75 Gorse Lane (ref: 19/00726/FUL)

These permissions are extant and, collectively, permit two dwellings at the application site. The application now proposes 3no. detached dwellings.

11. The application site is located within the Green Belt, as defined by the Chorley Local Plan Policies Map. Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework confirms that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

12. Development will only be permitted within the Green Belt, in accordance with the Framework, if it is considered appropriate development or where very special circumstances can be demonstrated. The Framework confirms that 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

13. Paragraph 145 of the Framework states that a Local Planning Authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. There are a number of exceptions to this, which are set out below:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;

- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e) limited infilling in villages;
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

14. Whilst it is recognised that elements of the proposal may satisfy different exceptions, the development is to be considered as a whole. This is explored in more detail below.

a) buildings for agriculture and forestry

Not applicable.

b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it

Not applicable.

c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building

Not applicable.

d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces

One of the dwellings proposed is the same design as the replacement dwellinghouse as approved under planning permission 19/00726/FUL, although it would be located further eastwards closer to the site boundary. A replacement dwellinghouse remains acceptable in principle, however, this exception only applies to one of the dwellings proposed, and there are three in total.

e) limited infilling in villages

There is no definition of what constitutes a ‘village’ within the Framework, however, the site lies adjacent to the village inset in the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 and on the ground is viewed as a continuation of the settlement of Mawdesley. This is defined as ‘other places’ in policy 1 (Locating Growth) of the adopted Central Lancashire Core Strategy. The site is, therefore, considered to fall within the village for the purposes of planning policy.

Policy 1 of the Core Strategy states that in smaller villages, substantially built up frontages and Major Development Sites – development will typically be small scale and limited to appropriate infilling, conversion of buildings and proposals to meet local need, unless there are exceptional reasons for larger scale development.

The application site is comprised of an existing dwellinghouse and its associated garden. The status of garden land is addressed in the Framework at Annex 2 (Glossary) which provides that land in built up areas such as private residential gardens is excluded from the definition of previously developed land. There is no definition of ‘built up area’, however as set out above the site is considered to fall within the village of Mawdesley and provides a functional and visual

continuation of its built form. Accordingly, it is considered that the land forms part of the built up area of the village, albeit at the edge of the village. In this context, the garden falls to be considered as greenfield and not previously developed land. Policy HS7 (Rural Infilling) is, therefore, engaged. The policy sets out more detailed criteria of what constitutes infill in applying exception (e) of paragraph 145 of the Framework.

The application now proposes 3no dwellings and seeks to demolish the existing dwellinghouse.

For proposals to be considered infill, they must accord with criteria as set out in policy HS7 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 - 2026. This provides the following:

Within smaller villages limited infilling for housing will be permitted providing the applicant can demonstrate that the following criteria are met:

- b) The existing buildings form a clearly identifiable built-up frontage;*
 - c) The site lies within the frontage, with buildings on either side, and its development does not extend the frontage;*
 - c) The proposal would complement the character and setting of the existing buildings.*
- Infill is the filling of a small gap in an otherwise built-up street frontage, e.g. typically a gap which could be filled by one or possibly two houses of a type in keeping with the character of the street frontage.*

When assessing applications for rural infill sites, the Council will also have regard to site sustainability, including access to public transport, schools, businesses and local services and facilities.

The application seeks to justify the proposal based on the development falling within two parts – a replacement dwellinghouse and then infill for 2no dwellings.

Infill development relates to an existing situation where an opportunity to infill a gap currently exists. Local Plan policy HS7 is clear in its criteria that the existing buildings form a clearly identifiable built-up frontage; and the site lies within the frontage, with buildings on either side. It is also stipulates, among other things, that the development should not extend the frontage. Infill is defined in the policy as ‘the filling of a small gap in an otherwise built-up street frontage’.

When considering the existing situation on site, the existing dwellinghouse and the neighbouring property number 71 Gorse Lane, forms a clearly identifiable built up frontage, and this offers a small infill gap with buildings either side. Indeed, planning permission has previously been granted in this existing infill gap for 1no. detached dwellinghouse (ref: 18/01212/OUT).

However, the application does not seek to infill the gap between the existing dwellinghouse and neighbouring property 71 Gorse Lane. Instead it seeks to demolish the existing dwelling and to erect 3no. detached dwellings. Even if the proposed dwellinghouse situated furthest to the east of the site fell to be considered as a replacement dwelling in isolation, the other two dwellings cannot be considered as infill, as this scenario specifically creates a larger gap to accommodate two additional dwellings and also extends the frontage in order to do so. It would not represent the infilling of a small gap in an otherwise built up frontage with buildings on either side.

The proposal does not constitute infill in a village and, therefore, fails exception (f).

f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites)

Not applicable.

g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
– not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or – not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

It is not considered that the application site falls within the definition of previously developed land, having regard to the definition contained within The Frameworks at Annex A Glossary. Notwithstanding this, the proposed development of 3no. detached dwellings spread across the site, all at two storeys in height, with significantly larger combined volumes, would undoubtedly have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development which is a modest bungalow positioned centrally within the site.

The proposal does not meet either provision of exception (g).

15. The proposed development fails to satisfy any of the exceptions set out in paragraph 145 of the Framework. It is, therefore, inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Impact on the openness of the Green Belt

16. Whether harm is caused to openness depends on a variety of factors such as the scale of the development, its locational context and its spatial and/or visual implication. Whilst the existing dwelling already has an impact on openness, it is a modest bungalow of single storey height and occupies a more or less central position in a large vegetated garden. The proposed development of three detached dwellings would be spread across the site, all being two storeys in height, with significantly larger combined volumes than the existing bungalow, including associated driveways, parking and subsequent domestic paraphernalia. This would undoubtedly harm the openness of the Green Belt.

17. At paragraph 143 the Framework is clear that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances

18. At paragraph 144 the Framework states that when considering any planning application, Local Planning Authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

19. The proposed development is harmful to the Green Belt, by definition, and harms the openness of the Green Belt. Substantial weight is given to these harms.

20. Very special circumstances have not been demonstrated by the applicant. However, it is necessary to consider if this harm is outweighed by other considerations.

21. The history of the site is such that there are two extant planning permissions, which combined, allow for 2no. dwellings on this site, although the proposed development would be a net gain of 1no. dwelling. This is by way of an infill plot between the existing bungalow (Wingates 75 Gorsey Lane) and neighbouring property 71 Gorsey Lane, and then a subsequent replacement dwelling of the existing bungalow with a two storey dwelling. Whilst policy HS7 allows infill with one or possibly two dwellings, it has not been demonstrated that two dwellings could be satisfactorily accommodated within this existing gap. In addition, it is not considered that this is a fall-back position to be afford much weight given that it would rely on planning permission being granted in any case.

22. The proposed development would also be more harmful to the openness of the Green Belt, over and above the planning permissions 18/01212/OUT and 19/00726/FUL.

23. The fall-back position, as granted under planning permissions 18/01212/OUT and 19/00726/FUL does not justify the current proposal of 3no dwellings on this site.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

24. *Policy BNE1 (Design Criteria for New Development) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 -2026 stipulates that planning permission will be granted for new development, including extensions, conversions and free standing structures, provided the proposal does not have a significantly detrimental impact on the surrounding area by virtue of its density, siting, layout, building to plot*

ratio, height, scale and massing, design, orientation and use of materials; and that the layout, design and landscaping of all elements of the proposal, including any internal roads, car parking, footpaths and open spaces, are of a high quality and respect the character of the site and local area.

25.The proposed development would be accessed with two separate access points, one solely serving plot 3 and one being shared by plot 1 and plot 2. The conifer hedge to the front of the site has been removed and the site would have a more open frontage, with driveways and parking predominantly to the front of the site. Parcels of soft landscaping to the frontage, and an appropriate landscaping scheme could secure enhancement of this area and mitigate the level of hardstanding. The proposed parking arrangements are not necessarily uncommon along Gorsey Lane.

26.The design of the proposed dwelling on Plot 3 has been accepted on this site previously and this remains acceptable. The proposed dwellings on Plots 1 and 2 would have a more narrow elevation to the frontage, but would be elongated within the site. The proposed style of these plots is more arts and crafts which contrasts with the farmhouse cottage style of plot 1. The siting of the proposed dwellings is a continuation of the general building line of this immediate side of the road. In terms of the building to plot ratios, there is a wide variation in the immediate locality, and the layout would not necessarily undermine the pattern of development or character of Gorsey Lane.

27.Gorsey Lane itself is comprised of bungalows and two storey dwellinghouses, with a variation of styles and appearance, such that there is no real distinctive character. Whilst a more comprehensive design approach to the dwellings would be more preferable, it is not considered that the contrasting style and appearance of the proposed dwellings of plots 1 and 2 would be harmful to the streetscene to warrant refusal on design grounds.

28.Materials, landscaping and boundary treatments could be conditioned accordingly.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

29.Policy BNE1 (Design Criteria for New Development) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 -2026 stipulates that planning permission will be granted for new development, including extensions, conversions and free standing structures, provided that, where relevant to the development the proposal would not cause harm to any neighbouring property by virtue of overlooking, overshadowing, or by creating an overbearing impact; and that the proposal would not cause an unacceptable degree of noise disturbance to surrounding land uses.

30.The nearest affected property is no.71 Gorsey Lane which is a semi-detached dwellinghouse. Plot 1 would be sited approximately 3 metres from the common boundary with no.71, with the proposed dwelling being two storeys in height. The 45-degree guideline is a long standing way to assess proposals and to ensure that a satisfactory relationship between existing buildings and proposed development is maintained. Plot 1 would not breach the 45 degree line when measured at the nearest ground floor habitable window of 71 Gorsey Lane and, therefore, it is not considered that there would be adverse overbearing impacts or loss of sunlight to this neighbour.

31.The site is situated opposite nos.64, 66 and 68 Gorsey Lane which are residential properties. A separation distance in excess of 21 metres would be achieved between these existing properties and the proposed development, which is an acceptable distance to ensure that the amenity afforded to these neighbouring dwellings would not be adversely affected.

32.To the east of the site is a private equestrian development and it is not considered that there would be detrimental issues with regard to the amenity of future occupiers, and is a typical rural activity found within such areas. There is a planning application on this neighbouring site for housing, however at the time of report preparation this is still pending.

33.Each plot would benefit from an adequately sized private garden area for future occupiers to carry out day-to-day domestic activities and the proposed dwellings would afford acceptable

living conditions. A bedroom window in the proposed dwelling on plot 2 would, however, overlook the rear garden of the proposed dwelling on plot 3, but as this is a secondary window to the bedroom, it is considered that this could be mitigated through obscure glazing and a non-opening window, which could be controlled by way of condition.

Ecology

34. *Policy BNE9 (Biodiversity and Nature Conservation) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 stipulates that Biodiversity and Ecological Network resources will be protected, conserved, restored and enhanced; and that priority will be given to, among other things, protecting, safeguarding and enhancing habitats for European, nationally and locally important species. In addition, the policy states that development must adhere to the provisions which include: Where there is reason to suspect that there may be protected habitats/species on or close to a proposed development site, the developer will be expected to carry out all necessary surveys in the first instance; planning applications must then be accompanied by a survey assessing the presence of such habitats/species and, where appropriate, make provision for their needs.*

35. *Policy BNE11 (Species Protection) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 stipulates that planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an adverse effect on a priority species unless the benefits of the development outweigh the need to maintain the population of the species in situ. Should development be permitted that might have an effect on a priority species planning conditions or agreements will be used to:*

- a) *Facilitate the survival of the individual species affected;*
- b) *Reduce the disturbance to a minimum; and*
- c) *Provide adequate alternative habitats to sustain the viability of the local population of that species.*

36. The application and accompanying ecological survey has been assessed by the Council's appointed ecologist at Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU). The submitted survey is, however, dated 30 September 2018.

37. The submitted ecological survey considers that the existing building has moderate potential to support roosting bats, and dusk emergence surveys were also carried out. No bats were evidenced, and a low level of bat activity by common pipistrelle was recorded on site during both surveys. GMEU consider this to be out-of-date and that potential changes may have occurred.

38. The presence, or otherwise, of bats in the building and the extent to which they might be affected by the proposed development, has not been established by way of an up-to-date assessment or survey effort.

39. The submitted ecological survey provides a DNA survey for great crested newts (GCNs) for the pond, and there is a known presence of GCNs in the area. The DNA survey returned a negative result and precautionary measures for GCNs are also provided. Under planning application 19/00726/FUL (replacement dwelling) reasonable avoidance measures (RAMS) were conditioned. Whilst GMEU acknowledge that the survey is out-of-date, they do advise these RAMS would be adequate to reduce the risk to great crested newts to low. The RAMS could be conditioned accordingly.

40. The presence, or otherwise, of bats has not been established as the surveys are out-of-date. Therefore, the impacts of the proposed development cannot be fully assessed prior to determination of the application. The proposal does not, therefore, accord with policies BNE9 and BNE11Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026.

Public open space

41. *Policy HS4 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 requires public open space contributions for new dwellings to be provided in order to overcome the harm of developments being implemented without facilities being provided.*

42.Until recently the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) previously set out a threshold for tariff-style contributions, stating that planning obligations should not be sought from developments of 10 or less dwellings and which have a maximum combined floorspace of no more than 1000 square metres. This guidance has been removed from the latest NPPG and has been replaced with a requirement that planning obligations for affordable housing should only be sought for residential developments that are major developments.

43.Specifically, the guidance as of last year was derived from the order of the Court of Appeal dated 13 May 2016, which gave legal effect to the policy set out in the Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014 which has not been withdrawn and which should, therefore, clearly still be taken into account as a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications.

44.To this end whilst it would normally be inappropriate to require any affordable housing or social infrastructure contributions on sites below the thresholds stated, local circumstances may justify lower (or no) thresholds as an exception to the national policy. It would then be a matter for the decision-maker to decide how much weight to give to lower thresholds justified by local circumstances.

45.Consequently, the Council must determine what lower thresholds are appropriate based on local circumstances as an exception to national policies and how much weight to give to the benefit of requiring a payment for 10, or fewer, dwellings. The Council has agreed to only seek contributions towards provision for children/young people on developments of 10 dwellings or less.

46.There is, however, currently a surplus of provision in Eccleston and Mawdesley in relation to this standard, therefore, a contribution towards new provision in the ward cannot be required from this development.

47.The site is not within the accessibility catchment (800m) of any areas of provision for children/young people that are identified as being low quality and/or low value in the Open Space Study and, therefore, a contribution towards improvements cannot be required from this development.

Sustainability

48.Policy 27 of the Core Strategy requires all new dwellings to be constructed to Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes or Level 6 if they are commenced from 1st January 2016. It also requires sites of five or more dwellings to have either additional building fabric insulation measures or reduce the carbon dioxide emissions of predicted energy use by at least 15% through decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy sources. The 2015 Deregulation Bill received Royal Assent on Thursday 26th March 2015, which effectively removes Code for Sustainable Homes. The Bill does include transitional provisions which include:

49.“For the specific issue of energy performance, local planning authorities will continue to be able to set and apply policies in their Local Plans which require compliance with energy performance standards that exceed the energy requirements of Building Regulations until commencement of amendments to the Planning and Energy Act 2008 in the Deregulation Bill 2015. This is expected to happen alongside the introduction of zero carbon homes policy in late 2016. The government has stated that, from then, the energy performance requirements in Building Regulations will be set at a level equivalent to the (outgoing) Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. Until the amendment is commenced, we would expect local planning authorities to take this statement of the government’s intention into account in applying existing policies and not set conditions with requirements above a Code Level 4 equivalent.”

50.“Where there is an existing plan policy which references the Code for Sustainable Homes, authorities may continue to apply a requirement for a water efficiency standard equivalent to the new national technical standard, or in the case of energy a standard consistent with the policy set out in the earlier paragraph in this statement, concerning energy performance.”

51. Given this change, instead of meeting the code level, the dwellings should achieve a minimum dwelling emission rate of 19% above 2013 Building Regulations in accordance with the above provisions. This could be controlled by a condition.

Community Infrastructure Levy

52. The Chorley CIL Infrastructure Charging Schedule provides a specific amount for development. The CIL Charging Schedule was adopted on 16 July 2013 and charging commenced on 1 September 2013. The proposed development would be a chargeable development and the charge is subject to indexation in accordance with the Council's Charging Schedule.

Drainage

53. This could be controlled by way of condition.

Highway safety

54. Detailed comments from LCC Highways are awaited and further details will be reported on the addendum.

CONCLUSION

55. The proposed development would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenity and that of future occupiers. Whilst contrasting housing styles are proposed, it is not considered that these would be harmful to the character of the streetscene. The proposed development is, however, inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This is harmful to the Green Belt by definition and would also harm the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances are identified to outweigh these harms which are given substantial weight. Other harm is identified as the presence, or otherwise, of bats has not been established as the surveys are out-of-date and, therefore, the impacts of the proposed development on this European protected species cannot be fully assessed prior to determination of the application. At the time of report preparation highways matters are still outstanding and are to follow.

56. It is recommended that the application is refused on Green Belt grounds and insufficient information in relation to bats.

RELEVANT POLICIES: In accordance with s.38 (6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), the application is to be determined in accordance with the development plan (the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, the Adopted Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Consideration of the proposal has had regard to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the development plan. The specific policies/guidance considerations are contained within the body of the report.

RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

Ref: 08/00613/FUL **Decision:** PERFP **Decision Date:** 21 July 2008
Description: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement dwelling

Ref: 08/00952/FUL **Decision:** REFFPP **Decision Date:** 24 October 2008
Description: Erection of a detached dwelling together with the formation of new access to Gorsey Lane

Ref: 08/01132/FUL **Decision:** PERFP **Decision Date:** 2 January 2009
Description: Erection of a detached dwelling together with the formation of new access to Gorsey Lane

Ref: 11/00504/FUL **Decision:** PERFP **Decision Date:** 28 July 2011

Description: Application to extend the time limit for implementation of planning permission 08/00613/FUL (Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement dwelling)

Ref: 11/00980/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 30 April 2012

Description: Erection of a detached dwelling together with the formation of new access to Gorsey Lane (renewal of application 08/01132/FUL)

Ref: 14/00769/FUL **Decision:** WDN **Decision Date:** 10 November 2014

Description: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement dwelling

Ref: 18/01212/OUT **Decision:** PEROOPP **Decision Date:** 27 February 2019

Description: Outline application (specifying access, layout and scale) for erection of a two storey dwelling

Ref: 19/00726/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 15 November 2019

Description: Erection of a single dwelling following demolition of existing single dwelling