

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 4 DECEMBER 2008

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

**Ford Place South Road South Ockendon
Planning Application 08/00988/TTGFUL**

CONSULTATIONS

PUBLICITY: The application has been publicised by way of a newspaper advertisement, site notice and direct neighbour notification where required. The expiry date for the notices has yet to elapse.

NEIGHBOURS: One letter has been received and signed by twelve occupiers of seven properties, the details of which are summarised below:

- The development would be detrimental to the environment in the vicinity and the increase in human habitation would result in occupational abuse, damage and invite youth crime
- The development is seen as a profiteering overbuild and the commitment to build houses should not leave other principals in its wake.
- The development will cause disadvantage to existing residents by increasing traffic to this entrance/exit, cause additional traffic at the nearby road junction and increase even further noise in the area.
- A restoration project for the house and Gardener's Cottage alone would be a good for the Boroughs heritage.

Members are advised to check for additional letters of representation in the 'letters book'.

ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL ARCHAEOLOGIST

The Historic Environment Record shows the proposed development to be located in a highly sensitive area comprising both the house and walled garden of Ford Place (HER 35360, 35362). Ford Place comprises a large country house which is derelict following an extensive fire in 1987. Core of the building dates to 1590 comprising a brick house, originally half "H" plan, altered and extended in approximately 1655 in the Artisan Mannerist Style with Georgian west front constructed in 1747. To the rear of the property lies the listed walled garden which is shown on the 18th century maps as containing probable farm buildings associated with the house. These have the potential to be significantly earlier than the 18th century and would require excavation prior to any development.

Recommends "No development or groundworks of any kind shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation.

A recognised professional team of archaeologists should undertake any archaeological work. The archaeological work would consist of detailed building recording on the remains of the standing structure tied into further desktop

assessment of the site. Trial trenching followed by open area excavation would be required on the garden walled area.

ENGLISH HERITAGE

The established framework to assess proposals for enabling development (i.e. development contrary to planning policy) is English Heritage's guidance, reissued this year as *Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places*. This provides an approach against which planning authorities can test such proposals.

In this case it must first be asked whether Ford Place is of sufficient significance to justify the use of enabling development to fund its repair. Before its partial destruction by fire in 1987 the house was a building of the highest architectural and historic interest, and accordingly was listed at Grade I. Its interest was reviewed after the fire, and it is now listed at grade II. The revision to its status reflects both the loss of interiors of very high quality and the fact that the fragmented building that survives is of architectural and historic interest.

From this preliminary consideration of the interest of the house, English Heritage then turn to the seven criteria that form the policy at the heart of the guidance. Proposals for enabling development should be considered unacceptable unless they meet all of these criteria. It should also be noted that the applicants have not assessed their own proposals against these criteria in their submission.

a it (the enabling development) will not materially harm the heritage values of the place or its setting

English Heritage consider that what is proposed would detract from the house's setting and compromise the "heritage values" related to it.

Ford Place is a country house, with dependencies, notably in the form of the walled gardens, set in a larger landscape, albeit one now in part developed. The construction of eleven houses in the walled garden compartment immediately to the east of the house would inevitably compromise the relationship between the house and its landscape.

The applicants have argued that there were buildings here from as early as the 18th century, and also point to previous planning permission for extensive development on the site. While it may be true that there were buildings here historically, there is a fundamental difference in character between ancillary buildings to a country house and a group of modern houses. English Heritage considers one of the 'puzzling' aspects of the submission is that little thought seems to have been given to making the proposed new buildings conform to the spirit of the house and its setting.

b it avoids detrimental fragmentation of management of the place

The submission does not appear to provide information to demonstrate that the scheme would meet this criterion.

c it will secure the long-term future of the place and, where applicable, its continued use for a sympathetic purpose

This criterion presupposes that the development would first have secured the short-term future of the place, something which in this case has not been demonstrated. It is evident that Ford Place survives only as a ruin, and that the condition of that ruin may be considered poor given that it is twenty-one years since the house was partially destroyed. In theory the remains of the house are substantial and could be repaired, but it is incumbent on the applicants to demonstrate what the “repair and restoration” of the house would entail. How much of the existing fabric could be consolidated, repaired and incorporated in the rebuilt house? How much would have to be taken down and rebuilt?

Given the condition of the building and the centrality of its repair to the scheme of development for which approval is now sought English Heritage consider it is ‘astonishing’ that there is no report from an engineer with extensive experience of the repair of historic buildings to demonstrate that the surviving fabric is capable of repair. The report entitled “Restoration of Ford Place, North Stifford” and subtitled “Document showing the current state of the building and the fabric to be repaired and incorporated in the restoration” is considered no substitute for such a report.

Were it established that Ford Place could be repaired (and that the result justified enabling development) then it could be assumed that the use of the restored building as a number of apartments would provide a reasonably secure long-term future for the building.

d it is necessary to resolve problems arising from the inherent needs of the place, rather than the circumstances of the present owner, or the purchase price paid

English Heritage consider this is a matter for the Local Planning Authority to consider when assessing the financial justification for the scheme.

e sufficient funding is not available from any other source

It is unlikely that funding for this work could be obtained from elsewhere. The repair of the building would not be eligible for grant aid from English Heritage.

f it is demonstrated that the amount of enabling development is the minimum necessary to secure the future of the place, and that its form minimises harm to other public interests

This criterion raises a number of separate matters. It is not for English Heritage, in this case at least, to comment on the effect of what is proposed on public interests other than that of the conservation of the historic environment.

The financial appraisal may be divided into two parts: that relating to the cost of works and that relating to the value of the restored property. In respect of the former English Heritage note the costs have been estimated by a specialist builder but without – apparently – any detailed specification, and without an engineer’s report. The builders themselves make clear the provisional nature of many of the items in

their estimate. There is no quantified schedule of works, of the type recommended in the guidance.

Although it is for the Local Planning Authority to carry out an appraisal of what has been submitted English Heritage consider it doubtful that the information submitted is adequate.

g the public benefit of securing the future of the significant place through such enabling development decisively outweighs the disbenefits of breaching other public policies

This criterion requires English Heritage to return to the question of the significance of Ford Place. The surviving parts of the house are substantial and of interest. If they could be consolidated, repaired and incorporated in the restored house the result would undoubtedly be of historic and architectural value. The mid-17th century brickwork of the east elevation, with its distinctive classical enrichment, is of particular interest. If it were possible to restore Ford Place in this way, a sympathetic and limited scheme of enabling development could be justified, provided that any harm to other public interests was not disproportionate to the surviving significance of the place.

As yet, however, the submitted information provides insufficient reason to believe that Ford Place could or would be repaired in an appropriate way, nor does the proposed enabling development appear sympathetic. It will be for the Local Planning Authority to weigh benefit and harm, but given the preceding comments it follows that English Heritage does not believe that there is presently any secure benefit to consider.

The foregoing analysis does not form a comprehensive appraisal of the proposed scheme against the criteria set out in English Heritage's guidance on enabling development. It does, however, provide English Heritage's broad advice in response to this scheme. It is a flawed scheme in a number of ways, but above all in the failure of the applicants to demonstrate that Ford Place can be consolidated, repaired and restored in such a way as to preserve its architectural and historic interest. In conclusion, the scheme fails to meet the policy tests set out in English Heritage's guidance. It is therefore that both planning permission and listed building consent be refused.

CONSERVATION AND LISTED BUILDINGS

The new buildings

Any new buildings would have an impact on the setting of all of the listed structures and any value related to the former walled garden. It is noted that there are bases of former inappropriate industrial buildings located here.

The proposed residential development would entail the demolition of a brick garden or store structure located on the north side. However, apart from delineating the extent of the north side of the garden this appears to be of minor architectural importance.

The character of the proposed buildings would introduce speculative residential estate house and garage forms, which although of a vernacular character and perhaps appropriate elsewhere would not be in the character of a walled garden. The size of this development would dominate the garden and would be taller than the listed wall, which would enclose it.

There are other planning considerations, which are also of concern. The proposal would be within a related historic garden, which is of some importance to the setting of the listed building. There is a TPO, which refers to at least 85 trees.

Conclusions

The extent and retention of the listed structures are not clear or specific, there remains considerable doubt as to the extent of retention unaltered or insitu of actual historic fabric which may be realistic or possible.

The character of the proposed extension to the remaining mansion would not be inappropriate.

The extension of the former gardeners cottage to the east is not supported.

The proposed new 11 dwellings would be out of character with all the listed buildings or structures.

The tree and garden design should be left appropriate to the setting of a property of this status.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Schools: Somers Heath Primary School and The Ockendon Secondary School

Both Schools are at full capacity. Somers Heath Primary School is a one form of entry school which is usually always at full capacity. There are alternative primary schools within walking distance to Somers Heath Primary School. For that reason no education contribution sought at primary level.

The Ockendon Secondary School is very popular and is currently over-subscribed and at full capacity. An education contribution is sought at Secondary level.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Recommends a condition limiting the hours of construction/demolition to standard hours for noisy works.

The site is adjacent to a known landfill site (Hill Farm). The information indicates that some biodegradable material was permitted on site. The site boundary of the former landfill is close to the proposed development. The contaminated land officer advises that gas monitoring at the site boundary should take place to assess the risk of landfill gas migration.

TREES

The application raises some areas of concern in regard to protected trees. The site of the 'enabling' development appears to affect trees T.12, T.14, T.72 and T.75 of TPO 3/87, as well as the landscape setting generally. A full tree survey is needed to ascertain the impact of the proposed development.

LANDSCAPING

This site forms a very significant landscape feature that would benefit from a carefully considered restoration and management scheme.

The site is in a very prominent position with views over the Mardyke Valley into the site and is located close to a busy junction on the edge of South Ockendon. The broad aim of the landscape strategy to try to restore key elements of the original landscape features are acceptable. The re-creation of a traditional orchard (an Essex Biodiversity Action Plan habitat) would be a suitable use of the garden at the eastern end of the site, which could be augmented with wildflowers etc. However given the ecological significance of some of the areas more consideration should be given to species choice and where planting takes place.

There are a number of points that will need to be taken into account. The area of rough grassland off South Road appears to have potentially significant ecological value. It contains a number of fine grasses and large ant-hills that are often found in unimproved grassland. This is a habitat that has been largely lost in the past few decades. There also appears to be an active badger sett in the centre of this field with signs of tracks and foraging throughout the field. There are a number of dead trees with holes etc present. These combined with the proximity to the adjacent lake means that it is probable that bats will be roosting in some of these. As a result of this, a detailed ecological survey, considering flora, mammals and invertebrates, should be carried out that establishes the value of these features prior to any works on site commencing.

Overall the broad aims of the landscape scheme are satisfactory, however conditions requiring a detailed restoration and management plan informed by the ecological surveys should be provided prior to the commencement of work, in part to prevent damage to habitat and roosts of protected species.

HIGHWAYS

The proposed development would result in further vehicles using this part of South Road. The Highways Officer notes that there is an in principle objection to the intensification of use of South Road although this objection could be overcome by the applicant agreeing to transfer land to the Council and implement junction improvement in this location. If permission were to be granted this could be covered by a Section 106 Agreement. Without an agreement it is considered that the proposals as submitted are unacceptable and would be prejudicial to the safe and free flow of traffic in this location.

Furthermore, it is considered that the internal layout of the site is impractical and awkward and would result in difficulty and danger for service vehicles manoeuvring within the site to the detriment of the safety of occupiers of the residential properties.

Other matters relating to access improvements and site splays could be suitably covered by suitably worded conditions.

REFUSE COLLECTION TEAM

Set out the standards concerning bin sizes and accessibility.

ANGLIAN WATER

No comments concerning the planning aspects of the proposal

Appraisal

In the past the Gardener's Cottage would have shared a relationship with the main dwelling, as a subservient feature to the manor emphasising the historical relationship between the landowner and workers. It is considered that the extension to the cottage would result in the dwelling appearing unduly large and out of character with its original purposes, with the associated loss of the historic value.

Furthermore the cottage is located to the northeastern corner of the first garden area, with the boundary between the two garden areas forming one of the side walls of the cottage. It is considered that the encroachment of the proposed extended dwelling into the second part of the walled garden would be detrimental to the historical integrity of the cottage and the formal layout of the garden areas as a whole, which is considered to be detrimental to the character, integrity and setting of the listed buildings.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed extension of the cottage would be detrimental to the character and historic fabric of the existing building, that the extension would result in the dwelling appearing out of character with its existing form with a resultant loss of historic value and that the encroachment of the extension into the second walled garden would be detrimental to the character and setting of the listed buildings and the historic value of the site.

Impact of proposed enabling development on the listed structures

One of the elements, which is key to the proposals, and indicated by the applicants fundamental to the restoration of the manor house, the enabling development would have a significant impact on the listed buildings and structures.

English Heritage have some serious concerns that the proposed development would detract from the heritage value of the site, the proposed houses would compromise the relationship between the house and the gardens and there seems to have been little thought given to the making the buildings conform to the spirit of the existing development. The Listed Building Officer shares some similar concerns that the

proposals would impact on the setting of all the listed structures and the value of the former walled garden and that the proposed development would dominate the garden due to it covering such a larger area and being in excess of the height of the listed wall.

Whilst the proposed buildings may not have a physical link to the listed structures on the site, in listed building terms it is just as important to consider the character and setting of the listed structures and the effect any development may have on the historic value of the place.

As previously indicated part of the historic value of Ford Place is its layout within a landscaped setting and with the historic walled gardens to the rear. The space around the building, in many ways is as important as the building itself.

Whilst some parts of the proposed dwellings may reflect elements of the main building it is considered that overall the proposed dwellings taken as a whole are unnecessarily over complicated and over designed in relation to the relatively simple form of the existing manor and Gardener's Cottage. Furthermore, the proposed dwellings by reason of their size and form are considered to be excessively large in relation to the manor house and the Gardener's Cottage to the extent that they would swamp these forms of development. The layout of the dwellings is considered to be unduly urban and cramped in relation to the current open nature of the site.

Notwithstanding the above, there is a far more fundamental concern that the utilisation of the first garden area for the proposed dwellings would be seriously detrimental to the character and setting of the existing listed buildings and structures on the site and would detract from the historical value of the manor house such that it could be argued that the historic setting would be lost.

The Green Belt and Very Special Circumstances

The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt wherein strict controls over development apply. Permission for new development, unless it is for purposes associated with farming, forestry and (depending on criteria) outdoor sport and recreation is considered to be inappropriate and permission will only be granted for inappropriate development where Very Special Circumstances which overcome the harm caused by the reason of inappropriateness is outweighed by some other factors. Furthermore there is an expectation under the English Heritage advice that the public benefit of securing the listed building outweighs the disbenefits of breaching other public policies, in this case Green Belt policy.

Principle of conversion of manor house to residential use

Policy GB11 allows for the re-use and adaptation of buildings in the Green Belt for residential, leisure or community use provided certain criteria are met:

- (i) The building cannot be dismantled and reused elsewhere and it has not been constructed recently. This criterion is considered to be met.
- (ii) The building is not of substantial construction and does require significant rebuilding before it can be put to its proposed use. The proposal is considered to be contrary to this criterion.

- (iii) The manor house has previously existed on the site in the past. It is therefore considered it would be difficult to argue that the building would detract from the character or appearance of the area if it was to be rebuilt and converted. This criterion is therefore considered to be met.
- (iv) The use for residential purposes will utilise only the footprint and mass of the existing manor house. The existing garden area would be utilised for the amenity space for the units. This criterion is therefore considered to be met.
- (v) Car parking is proposed to the front of the site, on part of what would be considered to be lawn area. While there are reservations about the proposed layout, it should be possible to devise a layout that would detract from the appearance of the area.
- (vi) The use of the manor as residential would not generate visual or environmental pollution once completed. This criterion is considered to be met.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposals fail to comply with Policy GB11 and the conversion of the manor house constitutes inappropriate development. It is therefore for the applicant to demonstrate Very Special Circumstances to warrant a departure from policy being made.

Impact of works to the manor house on the Green Belt

With respect to the manor house, a large property has existed on the site since the 16th Century, with various additions being made over time, albeit before Green Belt policy criteria was introduced. The house is at present largely derelict; and surrounding vegetation has been allowed to grow unhindered for a substantial period of time. At present therefore, from public viewpoints the house is relatively inconspicuous within the Green Belt from public vantage points. The proposed restoration and clearance/management of the site would clearly introduce a more regulated form of development and the manor house itself would become more obvious. However, given that a structure of the same size and dimensions has existed on the site in the past, it is considered that it might be difficult to argue against the restoration and conversion of the manor house if this alone was to secure the future of the listed buildings as it would put the features to be found on the site back into context.

Impact of works and extension to the Gardener's Cottage on the Green Belt

Policy GB5 allows for extensions to dwellings subject to the criteria that the extensions are no larger than the floorspace formed by two reasonably sized rooms. Calculated on the existing layout of the property, two reasonably sized rooms would equate to 42.85sqm. The proposed two storey side extensions and the proposed conservatory have a habitable floorspace of 45.95sq.m. The proposal is therefore somewhat larger than would normally be allowed. Furthermore, Annex 8 of the Local Plan states that there is a presumption against extensions to dwellings that are not in permanent residential use. In this instance and given that it is a listed building it would therefore be for applicant to demonstrate the Very Special Circumstances that would warrant an exception being made in this instance.

The applicant has failed to do this, stating only that the extension to the Gardener's Cottage is to be extended to meet modern expectations. It is not considered that this satisfies the requirement for Very Special Circumstances.

If the extension provided the means to secure the future of the listed building this could constitute Very Special Circumstances but since the extension is considered harmful to the integrity of the listed building these circumstances do not exist.

Impact of the new build 'enabling development' on the Green Belt

The final issue in the consideration of the Green Belt relates to the construction of the 'enabling development' to the rear of the manor house, notwithstanding this part of the site has previously been occupied by commercial buildings during the 1960s.

The site slopes gradually down at the rear towards the Gardener's Cottage. At present, with the exception of the manor house and the Gardener's Cottage there is little built form on the site. The proposed dwellings would all be higher than the existing listed wall and would stretch, largely unabated between the manor house and the Gardener's Cottage. When viewed from outside of the site there would be a continuous set of roof forms which would appear unduly and urban and out of character with this Green Belt location. It is considered that the formation of the additional dwellings would be seriously detrimental to the character and openness of the Green Belt at this point and would be contrary to policies GB1 and GB2 of the Thurrock Local Plan. Furthermore, the layout of these properties would be out of character with the spacious layout, which currently benefits the manor house and cottage.

The new build dwellings constitute inappropriate development. The applicants accept that the new build dwellings are inappropriate development but consider that the preservation of the heritage asset of Ford Place constitutes the very special circumstances that would be required to allow both the redevelopment/conversion of the manor house and the construction of the new dwellings which would warrant a departure from policy being made in this instance. Given that the proposed works are considered harmful to the interests of the listed building, in terms of its structure and setting those circumstances do not exist.

'Enabling Development' and Very Special Circumstances Assessment

Although not government policy or guidance, the English Heritage document: *Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places* is considered to be relevant in the consideration of the application and has been supported previously by planning inspectors on appeal. The document sets out seven criteria against which any proposal should be just. English Heritage consider that unless the development meets each of these criteria, it will be considered to be unacceptable and therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

With respect to criteria (f) although figures relating to the proposed development have been included as supporting evidence it is not clear that they are necessarily accurate. For example the works do not take into account DDA compliance, do not include any works that may be required to satisfy building regulations, they presume

that where walls are to be rebuilt, existing foundations are to be used and the figures are actually indicated as being an 'estimate'. Furthermore, the guidance indicates that there should be a detailed schedule of works to accompany the application, which the applicant has failed to provide.

With respect to the end users of the site, there is no information included within the supporting documents to show how the potential value of apartments or the new properties have been valued or to show any comparison to other similar projects. It is unclear whether the agents who have provided the information have particular expertise in marketing niche properties.

Given that the financial information is based on estimates without a full structural engineers report having been carried out, it is not clear that the financial reasoning is sound in this instance. It is not therefore apparent whether the proposed enabling development is the minimum required to make such a scheme valuable. The financial

With respect to criteria (g) it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the listed structures would be secured, and the proposals are in themselves harmful.

For these and the other reasons highlighted in the consultation response from English Heritage it is considered that the development proposed is unacceptable in terms of Enabling Development.

Other Issues

Developer Contributions

The application is below the threshold which would require the provision of affordable housing as set out in Policy HOU4 of the Deposit UDP. However Policy BE10 of the Local Plan states that development will only be allowed where there is adequate infrastructure either in existence or programmed or where permission is to be subject of agreements securing appropriate contributions.

Given that the proposal would result in the formation of a number of units that could be occupied by families, and the comments of the education officer, it is considered that an education contribution would be required in this instance.

The proposed residential units would also be likely to create extra demands on local healthcare provision and a contribution would therefore also be required towards this.

The applicant has failed to indicate that they are willing to provide a contribution with the development towards either education or healthcare provision. It is therefore considered the proposal is likely to result in intensification of use of local services without the requisite infrastructure to support this. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy BE10 of the Thurrock Local Plan.

Highways

The proposed development would result in further vehicles using this part of South Road. The Highways Officer notes that there is an in principle objection to the intensification of use of South Road although this objection could be overcome by the applicant agreeing to transfer land to the Council and implement junction improvements in this location. If permission were to be granted this could be covered by a Section 106 Agreement. However, in light of other matters with the application, which are considered to be unacceptable, it is considered that it would be unreasonable for the Local Planning Authority to seek from the applicant a legal agreement to cover the works that would be required to improve the highway at this point. Therefore, it is considered that the proposals as submitted are unacceptable and would be prejudicial to the safe and free flow of traffic in this location.

Furthermore, it is considered that the internal layout of the site is impractical and awkward and would result in difficulty and danger for service vehicles manoeuvring within the site to the detriment of the safety of occupiers of the residential properties. Although the Council's engineer believes it may technically be possible to amend the layout of the proposed houses to accommodate the maneuvering of larger vehicles this may have adverse implications for such things as gardens sizes.

Other matters relating to access improvements and site splays could be suitably covered by suitably worded conditions.

Refuse/Recycling

In respect of the comments of the refuse/recycling officer, given the location of the manor house and the proposed dwellings from South Road, a refuse vehicle would have to enter the site to service the residential units.

With respect to the houses, it is considered that adequate provision could be made within the curtilage of the properties to allow refuse/recycling to be adequately stored. In respect of the proposed flats within the manor house the area shown for bin storage is considered to be inadequate. However, the provision of a larger area could be created and covered by a condition if permission were to be granted. It is therefore considered that an objection on the grounds of refuse/recycling would be difficult to substantiate in this instance.

Landscaping and Biodiversity

In light of the comments in relation to the trees subject to the TPO it is considered that the proposal fails to fully consider the impact of the proposals on protected trees in the vicinity of the development. It is considered that a full tree survey should be required in this instance to ensure that the proposals do not have a detrimental impact on the health or vitality of the preserved trees and other landscape features in the area.

The Landscape Officer has identified that there needs to be a more substantial consideration of the proposed landscaping scheme in order that the proposal takes into account the variety of species that are present in the area.

The presence of protected species on the site, that is Bats and Badgers mean that the developers would have a duty regardless of any planning condition to ensure that the habitats of these species are not damaged in any way. Notwithstanding this duty it is considered that a full ecological survey detailing the flora, fauna, mammals and invertebrates on the site should be carried out on the site. Without this it is considered that there are some concerns with regard to the likelihood of damage to these species.

In light of the importance of the site as a whole in landscape terms it is considered that without such reports, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the local wildlife and landscape features in the area.

RECOMMENDATION

The Thurrock Thames Gateway Development Corporation be advised that Thurrock Council objects to the application on the following grounds:

1. The extension to the Gardener's Cottage would be detrimental to the structure of the building, the character and setting of the building and the Ford Place site as a whole
2. The proposed development is contrary to Green Belt policies and it is not considered that the applicant has demonstrated the Very Special Circumstances that would warrant a departure from policy being made in this instance.
3. The proposed dwellings would be detrimental to the character and setting of the listed buildings
4. The proposed development would result in an intensification of use of South Road, which would be prejudicial to the safe and free flow of traffic to the detriment of highways safety and the applicant has failed to provide any suitable agreement to mitigate this impact.
5. The internal layout of the site is impractical and awkward and would result in difficulty and danger for service vehicles manoeuvring within the site to the detriment of the safety of occupiers of the residential properties
6. The applicant has failed to provide contributions towards local education and healthcare facilities in the area.
7. The applicant has failed to provide satisfactory details to show that the proposals will not have a detrimental impact on the flora, fauna and protected species on the site (including potentially bats and badgers). Without this information the Council is

not satisfied that the proposals would not have a detrimental impact on the local wildlife and landscape features of the area.

Background Documents.