

Report to:	Planning Committee
Date of Meeting:	14 December 2010
Report by:	Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)

Application No	HM/10/0391
Planning Proposal:	Erection of Two Storey Side/Rear Extension

1 Summary Application Information

- Application Type : Detailed Planning Application
- Applicant : Mr Ali
- Location : 6 Covanburn Avenue
Hamilton
ML3 7PX

2 Recommendation(s)

2.1 The Committee is asked to approve the following recommendation(s):-

- (1) Grant Detailed Planning Permission - Subject to Conditions (Based on the Conditions Attached)

2.2 Other Actions/Notes

- (1) The Planning Committee has delegated powers to determine this application.

3 Other Information

- ◆ Applicant's Agent: Mr Ian Reid
- ◆ Council Area/Ward: 19 Hamilton South
- ◆ Policy Reference(s): **Adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan**
Policy RES6 - Residential Areas
Policy DM1 - Development Management
Policy DM4 - House Extensions and Alterations

- ◆ Representation(s):
 - ▶ 15 Objection Letters
 - ▶ 0 Support Letters
 - ▶ 1 Comment Letter

- ◆ Consultation(s):

Roads & Transportation Services H.Q. (Flooding)

Scottish Water

Planning Application Report

1 Application Site

- 1.1 The application site comprises an existing detached two storey villa at 6 Covanburn Avenue, Hamilton. The application site covers an extensive area of approximately 1311 square metres with the rear garden area extending approximately 1021 square metres or thereby with the footprint of the existing property being 84 square metres. The rear garden has a free standing double garage which is positioned six metres from the house and positioned parallel with the mutual boundary with No. 8 and the rear garden is screened along the rear and side boundaries by 1.8m high close boarded timber fencing. In addition a driveway runs along the side (east) of the property between the applicant's property and No.8 Covanburn Avenue.
- 1.2 The area is characterised by large 1960/70 built villa properties in with generous feus similar to the application site. Over the years, a number of these properties have been enlarged with side and rear extensions. The properties are usually set well back from the road with deep front gardens and lengthy side driveways.
- 1.3 A Scottish Water pipe of 600 mm diameter runs through the site below the existing driveway/rear garden and is approximately 3 metres below ground level.

2 Proposal(s)

- 2.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of a two storey side/rear extension with pitched roof. The extension will extend along the existing side elevation of the property and out beyond its rear elevation by 6700 mm. It has been designed so that the ridge of the pitched roof will be below that of the existing house with the eaves aligning with the existing property. In general terms the 'front' of the extension (a single storey utility room) will be positioned approximately 3.2m behind the existing front elevation. It will be off set from the common boundary with No. 8 by 3600 mm at its nearest point and will be positioned in such a manner that vehicular access will still be available to the existing double garage.
- 2.2 The extension's footprint will be approximately 54 square metres. It will provide a sitting room, bathroom and utility room on the ground floor and a store room, bedroom with en suite on the upper floor.
- 2.3 The proposal originally included a front window in the upper floor of the extension. This however has been removed and replaced by roof lights. The extension has also been repositioned slightly further back along the side elevation so as to be further away from the underground Scottish Water pipe.

3 Background

3.1 Local Plan Status

- 3.1.1 Within the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan the site is affected by Policy RES6 'Residential Land Use', Policy DM1 'Development Management' and Policy DM4 'House Extensions and Alterations'.
- 3.1.2 In general terms policy RES6 highlights that the Council will oppose the loss of houses to other uses and will resist any development that will be detrimental to the amenity of those areas. Policy RES6 also notes that developments must relate satisfactorily to neighbouring properties in terms of scale, materials and massing. Development should also be of a good quality design.

3.1.3 Policy DM 1 amongst other matters requires all planning applications to take account of the local context and built form and the development should be compatible with adjacent buildings and surrounding streetscape in terms of scale, massing, design, external materials and impact on amenity.

3.1.4 Policy DM4 provides specific criteria with respect to house extensions and alterations. In particular it is emphasized that the size, scale and height of developments should be in proportion with the existing property and not dominate or overwhelm the existing or neighbouring dwellinghouse. In addition, extensions should not adversely affect neighbouring properties in terms of privacy, sunlight or daylight, and that adequate off street car parking and useable garden ground should also be retained.

3.2 **Relevant Government Advice Policy**

3.2.1 Given the scale and nature of the proposal Government guidance or advice is not relevant.

3.3 **Planning History**

3.4 A previous application was received for a similar extension in 2009 (application reference: HM/09/0639) but this was withdrawn in March 2010.

4 **Consultation(s)**

4.1 **Roads and Transportation HQ (Flooding):** Have no objection to the proposed development. Notwithstanding the fact that the pipe is Scottish Water's responsibility with regard to its maintenance, the Flood Prevention Unit recommend that the proposed construction works are carried out in such a manner as not to have an adverse effect on the structural integrity of the pipe. They have advised that both Scottish Water and the Building Standards be consulted with a view to ensuring the necessary construction measures are undertaken during the building of the proposed extension in order to protect the pipe thereby ensuring there is no increased risk of future flooding as a result.

Response: Noted. The merits of the proposed extension has been the subject of detailed discussions with all interested parties and it has been acknowledged that as long as the foundations of the extension are designed in satisfactory terms there is no technical objection from a flooding perspective to the development proceeding. In this regard appropriate design considerations/criteria/requirements have been provided by Scottish Water and these have been forwarded to the agent. Consequently as long as all work is undertaken in a due diligent manner there is no reason why the integrity of the pipe will be affected. In addition whilst no building warrant submission has been lodged, Building Standards have also been informed of the situation and due consideration will be given to the issue during the processing of any building warrant lodged.

4.2 **Scottish Water:** Given the issues raised by this application, Scottish Water commissioned a CCTV survey of the underground pipe. They have confirmed that the survey showed the pipe is in a sound condition. They are satisfied that the proposed extension will not compromise the integrity of the pipe, providing the foundations are designed and constructed in such a way that no 'loads' are transferred onto the existing pipe. They have stated that the applicant must consult them before starting work, requesting permission to build over, or close to their apparatus, and that an indemnity form will have to be signed as part of the agreement process. Overall they have no objections to the proposal.

Response: Noted. If planning consent is granted for the proposals a further CCTV survey will be carried out by the applicant after any works are completed to confirm the integrity of the pipe. A planning condition can be attached to ensure that the survey is carried out however any issues identified at that time will be a matter for Scottish Water.

5 Representation(s)

5.1 Statutory neighbour notification was undertaken and fifteen letters of objection were received along with one letter which provided general comments.

5.2 The grounds of objection can be summarised as follows: -

- (a) **The purpose of the proposed extension has not been stated and a design statement has not been submitted along with the application. The scale and design suggests other uses. The design, size and front entrances suggest future internal alterations and could result in the creation of separate houses.**

Response: The proposal relates to an existing house and is for domestic purposes. Given the scale, nature and location of the development a design statement is not required. Finally, subdivision of a house represents a material change of use and would require planning consent. The internal arrangement does not indicate that the extension will function as a separate unit as the upper floor accommodation can only be accessed from the existing stair case.

- (b) **The description does not indicate that the extension will also extend out into the rear garden area.**

Response: Noted. The description has been amended to reflect that the extension projects into the rear garden area.

- (c) **The proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policy ENV30 and DM4 in design and scale. It will dominate the existing house and will increase the property's original footprint in excess of 70%. It is also larger than other two storey extensions along the street and when completed will result in the property being out of proportion with the surrounding properties.**

Response: It is acknowledged that the proposed extension is large, however it will not over dominate the existing property. The proposed extension reflects local plan guidance in that it is set down from the existing roof ridge and set back from the front elevation and will therefore appear subservient to the main dwellinghouse. It will also extend 4m (approximately) from the side elevation and therefore be relatively narrow when viewed alongside the existing property from the street. It is also acknowledged that the extension is larger than other two storey extensions along Covanburn Avenue; however, the application site is larger than neighbouring plots and due to its considerable size, can easily accommodate the extension without cramping the site or negativity affecting the character of the street. The extension will also not be overly exposed to public view as the dwellinghouse is positioned in such a way that it sits at an angle and only faces onto the rear gardens and gable ends of the properties opposite. It also has no direct properties facing it along the rear and is to be set considerably back from the front, principle elevation of the house.

- (d) **The proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policy ENV30 and DM4 in that the proposed development has two front doors giving the impression of a**

semi-detached property. If allowed it may be repeated by other residents in future and thereby create a terraced affect along the street. This is not characteristic of Covanburn Avenue. Other extensions erected by neighbouring residents have also not been designed in this way.

Response: It is accepted that policy guidance opposes development which would cause a terraced affect. This advice however is relevant primarily to extensions that project up to side mutual boundaries. The proposed extension at 6 Covanburn Avenue is set considerably back from the front elevation of the existing dwellinghouse and set off from the side boundary by approximately 3.6m at its closest point. It is also off set from the neighbouring property's side elevation (No.8) by approximately 6m. In light of this it is not considered that the proposal would be close enough to create a visual terraced effect. Furthermore, although such an extension does not exist in neighbouring properties along Covanburn Avenue, doors on front elevations are not unusual features of extensions.

- (e) The proposed extension is only 5m away from No.8 and its sheer physical presence and its elevated position will dominate our property.**

Response: While it is noted that the application site sits slightly higher than that of No.8 it is not significant or to such a degree that the extension would adversely dominate or overwhelm the site or property so as to affect the occupants amenity. The extension will be positioned in such a manner that the distance between it and the common boundary increases towards the rear of the extension thereby reducing the impact of the structure. A minimum distance of 6 metres will be retained between the extension and the side elevation of No.8 and therefore I do not consider that the extension would visually dominate No.8 when viewed from the street or within the site of No.8. Indeed the separation distance between the extension and neighbouring house is greater than the separation distance between some houses in the neighbourhood.

- (f) The proposal will adversely affect the amenity of No.8 Covanburn Avenue through depleting their degree of privacy. The existing upper and lower side windows within No.8 Covanburn Avenue will be overlooked by the proposed upper window. Furthermore the existing side lower window of No.8 will be overlooked by the proposed lower bathroom window and front door unless obscure glazing is used and the 1.8m high fence retained. The upper side window in the proposal although indicated as a bathroom could, depending on glazing and window opening design, result in extensive overlooking of every aspect of our rear garden and patio area.**

Response: The proposed upper windows in the front elevation of the extension have now been removed by the applicant and replaced by roof lights. Consequently there will be no direct overlooking into the side upper window of No.8. The application site is within a built-up residential area adjacent to other properties where most properties and their gardens are over looked to some degree. Furthermore, the provision of bathroom/hallway windows in side elevations is not unusual in residential estates. Indeed a side kitchen door with glazing is already present along this side elevation. With regards to the concerns raised, the lower and upper floor side windows relate to non-habitable rooms and will not to a significant extent cause an unacceptable degree of overlooking. It is also normal standard for bathroom windows to use obscure glazing. A condition can also be imposed on consent requiring the retention of the existing 1.8m high boundary fence.

- (g) **The proposal will adversely affect the amenity of No.35 Chatelherault Crescent though depleting their degree of privacy.**

Response: The proposed upper floor windows in the extension will look primarily into Chatelherault Country Park and will face south-east. The property at no. 35 Chatelherault Crescent sits at a right angle to the application site facing south-west. The rear elevation of No.35 is also approximately 43m away from the proposed extension and their rear garden boundary 10.75m away. Collectively these aspects mean that any overlooking or impact on privacy will not, from a planning point of view, be to an unacceptable degree or extent. Furthermore, the application site is within a built-up residential area adjacent to other properties where it is inevitable that gardens and properties will be over looked to some degree.

- (h) **The position and size of the extension will cause adverse overshadowing on No.8 resulting in a loss of light and sunlight into the property and garden area. The reduction in natural light into the side rooms will force us to supplement with artificial lighting during daylight hours, thus impacting on fuel use to meet our physical needs.**

Response: While the objector's concerns are noted and it is accepted that practically all forms of development cast a shadow, it is considered that no excessive degree of overshadowing will be created by the extension. Clearly the extension will have an impact but the increase in shadowing is unlikely to be to a material extent especially in the summer months when the sun is at its highest in the sky. The extension is angled away and back from off No.8 and still maintains a good amount of open area between it and the application site (approximately 6m between both the side elevations) and is therefore designed in such a manner that its physical presence will be minimized beside the objector's rear garden and side windows. As a result this will help reduce the impact of the extension as any overshadowing is likely to affect only a small area of the objector's garden ground in the late evening and unlikely to affect their side windows; this is not considered to be of such an extent to justify refusal of the proposal.

- (i) **The previous garage conversion has already resulted in the loss of a car parking space and the extension will further reduce on site parking by 2 vehicle spaces; this will result in the applicants and their visitors using the street for parking. If street parking is used it will create access/garaging use problems for the property on the opposite side of the street. On street parking also presents safety issues for drivers entering and leaving Covanburn Avenue and thereby pedestrians too. This is especially made worse given the bend on the road where the property is situated and where street parking will take place by the applicant's. Such parking problems already exist through the number of vehicles used by the family and their relative to store and sell vehicles on site.**

Response: Roads and Transportation Services usually require a maximum of three off street car parking spaces for dwelling houses. In this respect the existing driveway (approximately 20.73m in length) and hard standing area in front of the former (now converted) integral garage provides sufficient off street parking on site for the existing property and the proposed additional accommodation. It should also be noted that space will still be available between the proposed extension and site boundary (there is 3.6m between the extension and site boundary at its closest point) to allow the applicant to park a car in the garage and sit along the full length of the driveway. In

addition Covanburn Avenue is a public road and parking is unrestricted. If congestion and safety issues arise this would be a matter for the Police. In addition, there have been no previous suggestions of a business operating from the property i.e. car sales and during various site visits there has been no evidence to suggest any unauthorized use.

- (j) **There is no major difference in the extension proposed under this application and the previously proposed extension applied for in 2009.**

Response: It is accepted that the proposal was similar to the extension submitted in 2009 albeit that the upper floor rear side windows were omitted; however, since this application was originally lodged the front upper floor windows have been removed and replaced with roof lights.

- (k) **There will be a detrimental effect on the surrounding natural environment which is a habitat for many species. Disturbance, damage or failure to maintain the underground pipe will have serious consequences for surrounding land and associated drainage systems. This subsequently could result in waterlogged soil that could then result in the loss of amenity as grass areas remain uncut and others flooded.**

Response: Off site issues relating to flooding are out with the influence of this planning application and therefore this aspect should not unduly influence the decision of the application to the detriment of the proposal. In any event the integrity of the underground pipe should not be compromised or adversely affected by the extension.

- (l) **The existing driveway is unsupported. Soil collapse has had to be addressed by No.8 so as to stop movement of the driveway into the garden as the applicants have failed to construct a low retaining wall. Soil erosion into No.8 from this edge is common after heavy rain fall. The weight of the construction vehicles and equipment will further break the edges and dislodge soil. We feel that the extension puts the property at No.8 at risk if the edge gives way or vehicles come off.**

Response: It is acknowledged that there is a slight change in the level between the applicant's mono blocked driveway and the garden ground of No.8. A condition regarding this, requiring the erection of a low retaining wall can be imposed to address this concern.

- (m) **The excessive development from a mid-sized family home into a very large unit may financially remove or put beyond reach, housing stock for younger families or through size be no longer viable for those wishing a smaller property. This reduces choice and the ability to move between property levels which are essential to meet the needs of a changing community.**

Response: It is accepted that the proposal represents a significant investment in the property. The issue raised however is not relevant to the consideration of a domestic extension.

- (n) **Construction of the proposal near the underground pipe may damage or compromise its integrity and thereby increase the risk of further flooding in the future. The extension will also obstruct the work and access for mechanical excavations for maintenance and repair of the pipe.**

Response: Extensive discussions and meetings have taken place with a representative of Scottish Water who have offered no objections to the proposal providing the foundations are designed and constructed in such a

way that no loads are transferred onto the existing sewer. Scottish Water has advised of the requirements/specifications for building near the apparatus and this has been forwarded to the agent. In addition it would be prudent and good practice to impose appropriate conditions to ensure that the neighbour's concerns regarding the integrity of the pipe are respected and taken account of.

These letters have been copied and are available for inspection in the usual manner and on the Councils Planning Portal.

6 Assessment and Conclusions

- 6.1 This application relates to the erection of a relatively large two storey side and rear extension at a two storey villa style dwellinghouse. The extension will extend along the existing side elevation of the property and out beyond its rear elevation into the rear garden. The extension is to be set down from the ridge of the existing dwellinghouse, will align with the eaves of the property and is to be set half way back (approximately 3.2m) from the front elevation. It is to be positioned along part of the existing side driveway; however, vehicular access will still be available into the garage.
- 6.2 The site is within an established residential area of Hamilton. The main determining factors in assessing the application relate to its ability to comply with local plan policy, the impact upon the amenity of surrounding area and properties and any infrastructure implications.
- 6.3 In terms of Local Plan Policy, Policies DM1 and DM4 require extensions to relate satisfactory to other properties in the area in terms of scale, materials and mass. They also require properties to take account of the local context and state that extensions should be in proportion to the existing house.
- 6.4 While the extension is relatively large it is not considered that it will over dominate the existing property or adversely affect the appearance or character of the area. The proposal is set down from the existing roof ridge and set back from the front elevation and will therefore appear relatively subservient to the main dwellinghouse. It will extend 4m (approximately) from the side elevation and therefore be relatively narrow and proportionate with the existing house when viewed from the street. I also acknowledge that the extension is larger than other two storey extensions along the street; however, the application site is larger than neighboring plots and due to this, the site can easily accommodate the extension without 'cramping' or overdeveloping the site or negativity affecting the character of the street. Extensive garden ground will also remain after construction of the extension. The extension will also not command a prominent public view as the dwellinghouse is positioned in such a manner that it sits at an angle, against persons entering Covanburn Avenue, and only directly faces onto the rear garden and gable ends of two properties opposite. There are also no properties directly facing it along the rear and is set considerably back from the front (approximately 3.2m) principle elevation of the existing house. As there are also no significant overlooking or privacy issues, the proposals comply with the terms of Policies DM1 and DM4.
- 6.4 With regards to infrastructure considerations, Roads and Transportation Services have raised no objections to the proposals. A long driveway (20.73m) runs along the side (east) of the property between the applicant's property and No.8 Covanburn Avenue. A further driveway has also been constructed along the adjacent (west) part of the front garden. Space will still be available between the proposed extension and

site boundary (there is 3.6m between the extension and site boundary at its closest point) to allow a car into the applicant's garage and park along the full length of the driveway. Given this situation there is sufficient off street parking provided on site for the existing property and proposed additional accommodation.

- 6.5 Further infrastructure considerations relate to potential damage to the integrity of Scottish Waters pipe near the extension and the possibility of further flooding. These matters have however been the subject of detail discussions, including representatives of the local community. In this regard Scottish Water undertook a CCTV survey of the pipe and has confirmed that the survey showed the pipe to be in sound condition. They have therefore offered no objections to the proposal providing the foundations are designed and constructed in such a way that no loads are transferred onto the existing sewer. They have further advised of the requirements/specifications for building near the apparatus and this has been forwarded to the agent. In light of this it would be prudent and good practice to impose appropriate conditions to ensure that the neighbour's concerns regarding the integrity of the pipe are respected and acted upon.
- 6.6 Fifteen letters of objection were received the points of which have been summarised in Section 3 of this report. I am satisfied that the concerns raised are not of sufficient weight or merit, either individually or collectively, to merit refusal.
- 6.7 Overall I am satisfied that the proposal complies with adopted Local Plan policy and I therefore recommend that planning permission be granted subject to appropriate conditions.

7 Reasons for Decision

- 7.1 The proposal has no adverse impact on the amenity of the area and complies with Policies RES 6, DM1 and DM4 of the South Lanarkshire Local Plan. There are also no infrastructure implications.

Colin McDowall
Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)

1 December 2010

Previous References

- ◆ HM/09/0639

List of Background Papers

- ▶ Application Form
- ▶ Application Plans
- ▶ Neighbour notification dated 13/8/2010
- ▶ Adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan
- ▶ Previous Application: HM/09/0639
- ▶ CCTV Pipe Survey Report by Enviro-Clean Scotland Ltd
- ▶ CCTV Survey Report by Underground Inspection Services (commissioned by Scottish Water)
- ▶ E-mails, various dates, to/from Scottish Water and other interested parties

► Consultations

Scottish Water	09/09/2010
Roads & Transportation Services H.Q. (Flooding)	24/08/2010

► Representations

Representation from :	Mr James McCann, 31 Chatelherault Crescent, Hamilton, ML3 7PZ, DATED 13/09/2010
Representation from :	Sheila H Hunter, 2 Covanburn Avenue, Hamilton, ML3 7PX, DATED 31/08/2010
Representation from :	Owner/Occupier, 33 Chatelherhault Crescent, Hamilton, ML3, DATED 02/09/2010
Representation from :	Mr and Mrs J Pollock, 8 Covanburn Avenue, Hamilton, ML3, DATED 02/09/2010
Representation from :	Ian and Mary Harthill, 35 Chatelherhault Crescent, Hamilton, ML3 7PR, DATED 02/09/2010
Representation from :	Kenneth and Marie Blair, 12 Covanburn Avenue, Hamilton, ML3 7PX, DATED 01/09/2010
Representation from :	Mr Frank Duffy, 10 Cavanburn Avenue, Hamilton, ML3 7PX, DATED 30/08/2010
Representation from :	Mr and Mrs J McCall, 3 Waterside Gardens, Hamilton, DATED 30/08/2010
Representation from :	Mr T S Neil, 29 Chatelherault Crescent, Hamilton, ML3 7PZ, DATED 30/08/2010
Representation from :	Mr Thomas Wallace, 1 Waterside Gardens, Hamilton, ML3 7PY, DATED 30/08/2010
Representation from :	Mr George Barr, 9 Waterside Gardens, Hamilton, ML3 7PY, DATED 19/08/2010
Representation from :	John T Howat, 8 Waterside Gardens, Hamilton, ML3 7PY, DATED 24/08/2010
Representation from :	Mr and Mrs Alan Southgate, 11 Waterside Gardens, Hamilton, MI3 7PY, DATED 24/08/2010
Representation from :	Mr Tom Wallace, 1 Waterside Gardens, Silvertonhill, Hamilton, ML3 7PY, DATED 20/09/2010
Representation from :	Owner/Occupier, 33 Chatelherault Crescent, Hamilton, ML3 7PX, DATED 24/08/2010
Representation from :	Walter Gray, 4 Covanburn Avenue, Hamilton, ML3 7PX, DATED 03/09/2010

Contact for Further Information

If you would like to inspect the background papers or want further information, please contact:-

Zara Stewart, Planning Officer, Brandon Gate, Hamilton

Ext 3138 (Tel :01698 453138)

E-mail: Enterprise.hamilton@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

CONDITIONS

- 1 This decision relates to drawing numbers: cov/01 and cov/02 Rev e.
- 2 That the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the plans hereby approved and no change to the design or external finishes shall take place without the prior written approval of the Council as Planning Authority.
- 3 That the facing materials to be used for the external walls and roof of the extension hereby approved shall match in colour and texture those of the existing dwellinghouse to the satisfaction of the Council as Planning Authority.
- 4 That prior to development starting on site, written approval shall be obtained from Scottish Water for the extension and in particular the foundation design. A copy of this consent shall then be submitted to the Council as Planning Authority.
- 5 That before the development hereby permitted is completed or brought into use, details of the boundary treatment along the common boundary with No.8 Covanburn Avenue, including details of a retaining structure for the driveway, shall be submitted for the written approval of the Council and prior to the extension being occupied the said boundary treatment shall be installed and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the said Authority.
- 6 That notwithstanding the terms of Condition No.5 above the existing 1.800mm high timber screen fence indicated A-B on the approved drawings shall be retained and maintained in perpetuity to the satisfaction of the Council as Planning Authority.
- 7 For the avoidance of doubt, no further windows shall be installed in the extension hereby approved without submission of a further planning application to the Council as Planning Authority.
- 8 That within one month of the extension hereby approved being occupied, a further CCTV survey of the existing Scottish Water pipe as it passes under the application site shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for the further consideration of Scottish Water.

REASONS

- 1 For the avoidance of doubt and to specify the drawings upon which the decision was made.
- 2 In the interests of amenity and in order to retain effective planning control.
- 3 To ensure satisfactory integration of the proposed extension with the existing building both in terms of design and materials.
- 4 In the interests of amenity and in order to retain effective planning control.
- 5 In the interests of amenity.
- 6 In the interests of amenity and in order to retain effective planning control.
- 7 In the interests of amenity and in order to retain effective planning control.
- 8 In the interests of amenity and in order to retain effective planning control.

For information only

For information only

