

<b>2.3 REFERENCE NO - 20/501838/PNQCLA</b>			
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>			
<p>Prior notification for the change of use of a building and land within its curtilage from agricultural workshop and storage barn to 2 no dwellinghouses and associated operation development. For it's prior approval to: - Transport and Highways impacts of the development. - Contamination risks on the site. - Flooding risks on the site. - Noise impacts of the development.</p> <p>- Whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the use of the building to change as proposed. - Design and external appearance impacts on the building.</p>			
<b>ADDRESS</b> Meadow Farm Pond Farm Road Borden Sittingbourne Kent ME9 8LJ			
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b> - Prior Approval Granted			
<b>REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE</b>			
Local objections and it is also considered that this application raises unusual /difficult issues which warrant members consideration			
<b>WARD</b> Borden And Grove Park	<b>PARISH/TOWN</b> Borden	<b>COUNCIL</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b> Bloomfields <b>AGENT</b> Bloomfields
<b>DECISION DUE DATE</b> 30/07/20		<b>PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE</b> 09/06/20	

## 1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.1 The agricultural building in question here is an isolated, simply designed, portal framed building with external blockwork and fibre cement sheeting. There is currently an extension (to be removed) to the front elevation of the building that is clad in green metal sheeting. The building has been used for storage of equipment associated with agriculture, and more recently used as a mess room used by workers associated with lambing.
- 1.2 The application building is currently accessed via Duvards Place, which is a very narrow unmade track leading from Pond Farm Road (a Local Plan designated rural lane) to the south of Borden village. The track provides access to a converted oast house and a row of eight terraced cottages. The track passes very close to the properties on Duvards Place, where the terraced cottages front the track. Whilst the properties do have rear gardens, the access track actually runs between the properties and their front gardens/parking spaces, and the application building and surrounding land is accessed via a gate at the far end of the track. Access from the track onto Pond Farm Road is difficult, with high hedges and very poor visibility to either side; and the junction sits on the inside of a bend in the road, exacerbating the lack of visibility.
- 1.3 The application building itself does not lie directly behind the cottages in Duvards Place, but beyond them, amongst open agricultural land to the west. It sits at a distance of almost 50m from the closest cottage, and approximately 30m from the nearest part of any Duvards Place garden. The building does sit adjacent to the very end of another

very large garden of a property fronting Pond Farm Road, but it is over 100m from the property itself.

- 1.4 There is an alternative access track to the building further south which appears to have normally been the main way to access this building over many years, but this is not proposed for access to the conversion now proposed.

## 2. PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This is an application submitted under the Prior Approval procedure for the conversion of an agricultural building to form two single storey dwellinghouses, along with necessary building works. Members should note that because this is a Prior Approval application, planning permission is already granted for the proposed change of use by Class Q of Part 3 of Schedule 2 to The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order (2015) (as amended) (the GPDO). This grants a general planning permission (subject to a number of criteria being met) for up to five dwellings to be converted from agricultural buildings on a single agricultural holding, provided the building(s) in question is not enlarged, and the curtilages to be provided do not exceed the floorspace of the dwelling(s) created.

- 2.2 The resultant dwellinghouses are subject to restrictions on normal rights for further extensions and alterations, but Class Q of the GPDO does mean that the principle of new homes being created from agricultural buildings in rural locations (except in locations including conservation areas and AONBs) is approved in principle; even where Local Plan policies might otherwise restrict such conversions. The GPDO requires that all such conversions are subject to a Prior Approval process, and the current application is for Prior Approval in relation to the following required matters:

(a) transport and highways impacts of the development,

(b) noise impacts of the development,

(c) contamination risks on the site,

(d) flooding risks on the site,

(e) whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the building to change from agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order, and

(f) the design or external appearance of the building,

There is also a further new criterion – but this takes effect from the 1<sup>st</sup> August 2020 only.

(g) the provision of adequate natural light in all habitable rooms of the dwellinghouses,

- 2.3 This Prior Approval process is intended to be a straightforward technical assessment of the practicalities of the proposed conversion to determine if the building(s) is suitable for residential use, and not a subjective assessment of the planning merits of the development. Parish Council and neighbour notification is not required, but a site notice is required, and I have gone beyond this minimum measure by also consulting nearby residents directly.

- 2.4 This scheme seeks to take down the green clad extension and convert the remainder of the building into two similar single storey 2 bed residential dwellings. This will be done through internal alterations, the insertion of new doors and windows, and installation of a new roof covering and some wall cladding. There are no plans to extend the building beyond its existing walls or roof, and all new windows would be at ground floor level. The curtilage is shown to the same size as the converted part of the building, as required by the regulations.
- 2.5 The application is supported by a Planning Statement that sets out how the proposal accords with all the basic requirements of Class Q of the GPDO, and the applicant addresses the Prior Approval criteria as summarised below:
- (a) Transport and highway impacts: The proposed use as two dwelling-houses would not amount to any material increase in traffic numbers. The proposal could not reasonably be said to give rise to any significantly greater number of movements than the current use of the building for agricultural purposes.
  - (b) Noise impacts: The current access runs immediately adjacent to the existing row of terraced houses situated perpendicular to the highway, such that the passage of commercial and agricultural vehicles would clearly have a discernible impact upon occupants of those properties. The use of this access by domestic vehicles would therefore be bound to improve or lessen the likelihood of noise impacts at those properties.
  - (c) Contamination risks: There is not known to have been any inappropriate spreading of materials such as sludges or any contamination being moved from its original source. The area is not known to be affected by the natural or background occurrence of potentially hazardous substances, such as radon, methane or elevated concentrations of metallic elements. It is therefore submitted that there would not be any unacceptable risks from pollution and the development would be appropriate to its location.
  - (d) Flooding risks: The site is not located within any designated Flood Zone and does not have critical drainage problems that have been notified to the Local Planning Authority by the Environment Agency.
  - (e) Whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable: It is clear that the nature of the surrounding uses which this prior approval matter is intended to safeguard against are not present at this site. It is strongly submitted that the nature of the uses surrounding the application building are not such that they should be considered sufficient to give rise to any undesirable impact
  - (f) The design or external appearance of the building: The proposal aims to retain the character of the existing building as much as possible. The position of openings aims to reflect those within the existing building where this can be achieved. In terms of the visual impact of the proposed external works, the proposed changes to the fabric of the building have been carefully thought-out to ensure that they would result in only minimal changes which are reasonably necessary to convert the building. Modern

materials would be used to ensure an attractive finish, however, the design subtly highlights the agricultural character, for example, by the use of the existing portal frame will retain the barn like structure.

2.6 The applicant has also responded to the objections on traffic grounds (see below) with an addendum to his Planning Statement. Here, he seeks to provide additional information in relation to the transport and highway impacts of the development, and I have summarised his addendum in relation to transport and highway impacts as follows (although he does address other objections which I have not summarised):

- The works required to convert the building involve removal of the lean-to extension, the insertion and replacement of doors, and replacement cladding
- Paragraph 109 of the NPPF says “*development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe*” (his emphasis).
- In this case there is actually two made accesses to the building. One of which is now actively used via a track that traverses close to the cottages aligning Duwards Place. The second is a made access which runs in parallel further to the south and adjacent to a property called Amberfield (sic).
- The building was originally constructed to provide a storage space for agricultural machinery but has in recent years been used for the storage of hay which has been grown on the land, the storage of equipment connected with the rearing of lambs, and other purposes ancillary to the agricultural use of this holding.
- In recent years the building has served as a mess room of worker’s employed at the holding, mainly in connection with the lambing of the sheep. The main part of the building is for storage requirements and a farm workshop. The building also contains a toilet/washroom and refuge area for workers, together with a small farm office.
- It is understood that vehicle movements have been generated with respect to each of the component elements to which the building has been used, including the applicant travelling to the site every single day before 9am in order to feed the sheep. Additionally, the owner would usually visit the site in the evening in order to check on the welfare of the sheep and the security of the fencing etc. During a normal day, the site would also be accessed by one or two other friends / associates that assist with the rearing of the sheep / maintenance of the land.
- The site is also jointly owned by the applicant’s sister who regularly visits the site 3-4 times per week to tend to the sheep and generally enjoy being in the countryside. Deliveries of feed take place around once per month. This takes place by LGV. Bedding is delivered to the site during the lambing season usually by HGV.
- Traffic related to raising sheep, including a vet and a sheep shearer also visits the site.

- In summary, the existing use of the building is considered to generate vehicle movements of around up to 10 trips per day. It is noted that a neighbour has commented that the site is accessed by about 2-3 vehicles per day (or 4-6 vehicle 'trips' per day), which is understood to be reasonable on some days, but slightly lower than actual vehicle numbers most days.
- The nature of the existing use of the building must also be considered in light of the fact that the existing access to the site is also served by nine residential properties. Each one of these could reasonably be expected to generate five vehicle trips per day.
- The proposed use is for two dwellings. Each dwelling is understood to generate on average about five vehicles 'trips' per day. Bearing in mind that a vehicle trip represents one movement to or from the site, it is considered that the proposed use as two dwellings would not result in any material increase in vehicle movements. During peak lambing times, the existing use of the site is understood to generate vehicle trips that notably exceed that amount. It is therefore considered that the proposed use as two relatively modest dwellings should not be prevented or refused on highway grounds.
- At worst, the impact on the number of vehicle movements can be considered negligible in planning terms, as there is no material indications to indicate that any change to vehicle numbers will be discernible. In this context, it would be neither positive or pragmatic to consider that prior approval may be required, in the context of an existing access already serving nine residential properties.
- This proposal for converting the existing building will naturally change the 'character' of vehicles accessing the site which could improve amenity at these properties. There is also minimal attention to the fact that this building is also served by a second made access which runs parallel to the south, adjacent to the property which fronts Pond Farm Road, called Amberfield (sic).
- The Council is asked to consider what happens to this building should it be determined that prior approval is not granted for the conversion of the building. In such a scenario, an agricultural use of the site will intensify and/or a commercial/agricultural tenant be found for the building. This alternative would lead to a far less neighbourly arrangement than currently proposed.
- It is acknowledged that the existing track was designed at a time when there was a lot less traffic with smaller vehicles. It is considered that the proposed use would also result in a return to the use of the track by smaller domestic vehicles, which would be far more appropriate.
- One neighbour has commented that 2-3 vehicles access the farm per day. This is considered to be slightly below average, according to the owner's account of the nature of the use of the existing site. Though even at this frequency, movements are

comparable to that which would be expected in relation to the proposed residential use.

- 2.7 The addendum report also encloses three further letters of support for the application, but these essentially echo points made above, and in the two letters of support referred to below.
- 2.8 Finally, the applicant has most recently provided an amended site layout plan to show that vehicle parking provision for the proposed conversion, two spaces for each new dwellinghouse, will be provided within the defined new curtilage.

### **3. PLANNING CONSTRAINTS**

- 3.1 None.

### **4. POLICY AND CONSIDERATIONS**

- 4.1 In this case policy considerations are only relevant so far as relevant to the subject matter of the prior approval, as if the application were a planning application. The applicant has provided the following note regarding the relevance of planning policies:

*‘To this end it is relevant to note the Ministerial Statement on Local Planning by Nick Boles published in advance of the changes to legislation which permit the proposed change of use, which in itself is considered to carry a degree of weight as a material consideration. It was said that “we expect local planning authorities to take a positive and proactive approach to sustainable development, balancing the protection of the landscape with the social and economic wellbeing of the area...other protected areas are living communities whose young people and families need access to housing if their communities are to grow and prosper”.’*

### **5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

- 5.1 Nine letters of objection from local residents have been received and can be summarised as follows, where relevant to the matters being considered:
- In the last 25 years there was a vehicle recovery business being run from the premises in contravention of planning regulations at the time. A non-agricultural business was operating from this very site before being used for very light agricultural use
  - Not enough evidence has been provided that the building was used for agricultural purposes on or before 20<sup>th</sup> March 2013. The dates provided for the sheep are from 2015
  - Because the building is directly behind our property, we will be overlooked by the main windows of the dwellings
  - Trees to replace the tall evergreen trees on our boundary should be required
  - Suitable provision or retention of boundary fences should be required, and details of any trees to be removed or altered
  - If approval is granted conditions should be included so the proposed rear patio doors do not overlook ours and our neighbours rear garden

- The development would use an inadequate access. Duvards Place is a single track, unmade, private road with no pavement or lighting. It is unsafe for additional vehicles, especially during construction
- Deliveries have to be made by small vehicles as larger ones cannot turn round and have to reverse out
- The junction onto Pond Farm Road is single track and visibility is limited in both directions – it is also used as a 'rat run' with traffic travelling at inappropriate speeds
- Large construction vehicles would not be able to safely access Duvards Place
- The residents of Duvards Place are responsible for the upkeep of the road and extra traffic involved with construction and new residents accessing properties will result in an increase of maintenance costs
- The applicant had a perfectly good access road was wider and tarmacked access leading straight to this building which the family sold 18 months ago
- The land at the end of Duvards Place was only latterly added to the holding and the gate to Duvards Place was fenced off for over 25 years. The gate at the end of Duvards Place is relatively new and was not needed until the other access was sold off
- Evidence of the limited former use of Duvards Place was shown recently when a hay delivery by tractor and trailer to the farm became wedged in the garden hedge of The Oast and narrowly avoided damaging the water main
- The delivery driver had to abandon the trailer in Pond Farm Road causing a significant blockage to road users and property access
- Damage caused by the tractor had to be repaired by ourselves
- The owners of The Oast and the other cottages own half the width of the track leading to Duvards Place and Meadow Farm and our deeds say that there is only suitable access for bullocks and a traction engine, therefore oversized vehicles delivering building and plant materials is not appropriate
- The applicant currently uses Duvards Place daily but building multiple dwellings will increase traffic and footfall along the existing fragile track; an alternative access point should be considered
- The cottages in Duvards Place are nineteenth century, with access only designed for horses and farm vehicles. They step straight onto the track as there is no pavement
- There is no indication whether any works will be required to electricity lines which would impact Aberfield nearby, which could disrupt our property
- Traffic will not decrease as there is still a vast amount of agricultural land still owned by the applicant that will likely still be accessed for agricultural purposes
- A site visit should be undertaken to understand residents' concerns over the access
- The cottages were built some time ago and have no foundations and therefore heavy traffic is not suitable
- Gardens are across the track and hosepipes and electric cables need to be run across the track to do the gardening – greater use of the track would be dangerous

5.2 Two comments in support of the application were submitted from people who have used the applicant's agricultural services, and these can be summarised as follows:

- I have had a lamb supply from the applicant for the last 10 years as I run a public house

- I have visited the farm and believe the change of use would be a good idea as it would lead to less heavy machinery using the roads, reducing the danger and noise levels in the area
- I have known the applicant for over 5 years now and have used them for minor agricultural services
- As a local resident in Oad Street I fully support the conversion as it will improve the character of the site and perhaps reduce the vehicle activity currently generated by the agricultural business

## 6. CONSULTATIONS

- 6.1 The GPDO Prior Approval procedure does not grant planning permission, and does not require consultation with the Parish Council. No comments have been submitted from the Parish Council.
- 6.2 Kent Highways and Transportation initially responded to say that it was a non protocol matter and did not require their involvement. However, due to the nature of some objections which refer to suitability of the access, and with which I have considerable sympathy, I went back to Kent Highways and sought further advice. Kent Highways have not felt it appropriate to provide formal advice, but they have sent me the following informal advice on the highway aspect of the proposal:

*“It’s the case that we won’t provide formal comments on non-protocol applications, but we can offer advice in order to assist you in your assessment. As such, I would offer the following advice that you can refer to if needed:*

*It is widely accepted that per square metre, an agricultural building would typically generate more vehicle movements than the equivalent residential floorspace, which is partly why the change of use was made easier under planning legislation with the introduction of the Prior Notification process for this type of development. It is not relevant how the current user of the building operates, and what level of activity they may have at present, it’s the worst-case potential of the building being used for agricultural or other permitted operations that matter. For example, buildings could be used to store numerous items of farm machinery or plant that may be needed on a daily basis and will attract many vehicle movements throughout the day. There are probably many other legitimate operations typically associated with an agricultural building that would also generate a lot of activity, and with larger vehicles than expected with residential use.*

*In terms of highway assessment, the general consideration is whether the site can accommodate the associated parking demand for residential use so that it is not likely to overspill onto the public highway. If no land was available around the building, this could lead to vehicles parking on-street and potentially cause obstructions or hazards. Similarly, a safety issue could be created in the conversion of a building directly alongside the carriageway if it proposed the introduction of an opening onto it. Clearly in that case, pedestrians could emerge straight out into the path of traffic, and that would not be acceptable.*

*Where a building is on land remote from the highway and using an existing access route, there would generally be space available for residential parking to be*



*accommodated on-plot, and no new physical features would be introduced to create a safety issue to interfere with the public highway.*

*Of course, we cannot comment on the legitimacy of an access route used to serve a site, and any dispute over their rights to use it will be a private legal matter between those interested parties”.*

- 6.2 The Council's Environmental Health Manager has no objection to the application subject to a standard contaminated land condition.

## **7. BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS**

- 7.1 All plans and documents relating to 20/501838/PNQCLA.

## **8. APPRAISAL**

- 8.1 It is important for Members to note from the outset that this is not an application for planning permission; it is a request to determine whether or not Prior Approval is required **only** in relation to:

- Transport and Highways impacts of the development
- Contamination risks of the site
- Flooding risks on the site
- Noise impacts of the development
- Whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the use of the building to change as proposed
- Design and external appearance impacts of the building

- 8.2 This is essentially a technical assessment of the issues outlined in the GPDO, which itself grants deemed planning permission for the development, and would normally be dealt with under delegated powers. It has been referred to Members as there are a number of local objections. It is, however, important to note that the Prior Approval process automatically approves the details unless the Council refuses Prior Approval within 56 days, unless an extension of time is agreed by the applicant. In this case the applicant has agreed to an extension of time until 31 July to avoid a refusal of Prior Approval, and to allow the matter to be considered by the Planning Committee. However, if the Committee decides to defer this application I do not expect the applicant to agree a further extension of time, and so the development would be approved by default at the end of the month. It is therefore vital that a decision either way be made on this application at the meeting.

- 8.3 I am satisfied that the use of the building in question was agricultural at the relevant date (20 March 2013), and I am of the opinion that the proposal now being considered wholly complies with the conditions set out in Class Q of the GPDO 2015 (as amended). The agent has described in the Planning Statement (see above) how the proposal meets all of the requirements of Class Q and, having consulted with the necessary consultees. I now address the various Class Q criteria that are relevant to the Prior Approval procedure.

Transport and Highways Impacts of the Development

- 8.4 I have read the neighbours' objections in regards to highway safety and the suitability of Duvards Place as an access carefully. Duvards Place is a very narrow and poor quality access, leading directly across the face of the cottages, with extremely poor sightlines onto Pond Farm Road, and it appears unsuitable for additional traffic. I must say that I share many of the residents' concerns about any possibility of increased traffic, which is why I specifically went back to the applicant and Kent Highways seeking some further information and advice. The applicant's addendum to the Planning Statement is summarised above in terms of transport and highway impacts. Essentially this suggests that neighbours have underestimated the usual daily trips to the site and that the change of use to two dwellings would amount to around the same number of vehicular movements, but with smaller domestic vehicles.
- 8.5 Kent Highways have made it clear that this is a non-protocol matter on which they do not offer formal advice. However, in informal terms, Kent Highways are of the opinion that the use of this building as two dwellings would not create any further traffic or harm to the highway network and as such Prior Approval ought not be refused in this respect. I therefore have to advise Members that, whatever misgivings they might have, there is no clear case to refuse Prior Approval in relation to transport and highway matters.
- 8.6 Matters relating to ownership and rights of way over the access is a private legal matter to be agreed between the owner of the land and the applicant, and is not a material planning consideration under Class Q.

#### Noise Impacts of the Development

- 8.7 Residential use of the building would not give rise to such substantial noise or disturbance as to indicate a reason to refuse the Council's Prior Approval. A certain amount of noise is to be expected during conversion works, but this would be short-lived and is a factor of development in general. Nor do I see any case for refusal on noise grounds relating to traffic past Duvards Place in the light of my comments above, and the type of traffic and the times of day, usually associated with residential use compared to agricultural use.

#### Contamination Risks of the Site

- 8.8 Due to agricultural buildings often being used to store chemicals it is common for the Environmental Health Manager to request a standard contaminated land condition which she has done here. The Environmental Health Manager raises no objection subject to the condition set out below.

#### Flooding Risks on the Site

- 8.9 The site is not within a Flood Zone where there is a risk of flooding, and the Council's Prior Approval should not be withheld in this regard.

#### Location or Siting

- 8.10 Local Plan policies in respect of sustainability should not be applied this type of application, as the very nature of agricultural buildings is that they are often in rural locations where Local Plan policies would normally resist new residential development. In this case the location of the building is not subject to issues that would give rise to

substandard levels of amenity for occupants of the new dwellings. As such the Council's Prior Approval should not be refused in this respect.

#### Design or External Appearance of the Building

8.11 The design suggested for the proposed dwellings, is simple, and in my opinion is acceptable. I note two local objections that the proposed patio doors will create overlooking issues, however, the building is single storey, some distance from neighbours, and not in an elevated position. Nor do I consider that the proposed appearance of the dwellings would be especially harmful to the character or appearance of the site or the wider countryside, and Prior Approval should not be refused in this regard.

#### Other Matters

8.12 As noted above, the Council has very limited powers under which it can consider these types of application, and these have been set out in detail above. Comments relating to rights of access are not material to the consideration of this proposal and do not amount to reasons to refuse Prior Approval.

### **9. CONCLUSION**

9.1 In my view this proposal meets the basic requirements of Class Q of the GPDO, and in terms of the limited and specific matters to which the Prior Approval procedure relates, it is acceptable. However, further details are required in respect of potential land contamination on the site and an appropriate condition is recommended below.

9.2 I note the local concerns about this proposal, and I am sympathetic to many of them. However, planning permission is already granted by the GPDO and this application relates only to specific matters, which I have discussed above. I do not consider that any detailed matter amounts to a reason for the Council to justifiably refuse Prior Approval under the very limited matters that can be taken into account under the terms of the Class Q Prior Approval procedure.

9.3 Therefore, I recommend that Prior Approval is granted subject to the condition set out below.

**10. RECOMMENDATION** – Prior Approval is required and granted subject to the following condition:

(1) If during construction/demolition works evidence of potential contamination is encountered, works shall cease and the site fully assessed to enable an appropriate remediation plan to be developed. Works shall not re-commence until an appropriate remediation scheme has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority and the remediation has been completed.

Upon completion of the building works, this condition shall not be discharged until a closure report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The closure report shall include details of;

a) Details of any sampling and remediation works conducted and quality assurance

certificates to show that the works have been carried out in full in accordance with the approved methodology.

- b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis to show the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included in the closure report together with the necessary documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from the site.
- c) If no contamination has been discovered during the build then evidence (e.g. photos or letters from site manager) to show that no contamination was discovered should be included.

Reason: To ensure contaminated land is adequately dealt with.

### **INFORMATIVES**

- (1) This decision relates only to the conversion of the building under Class Q of Part 3 of Schedule 2 to The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) and does not represent planning permission for rebuilding of the structure. The Council reserves the right to take enforcement action if at any time the works appear to amount to a re-building such as if the degree of removal of existing wall and roof so indicates.
- (2) Any dwelling created by virtue of this procedure will not attract usual householder Permitted Development rights for alterations such as an extension, roof alterations, garden buildings or pools, a hardstanding or other external works. Any such works will need to be submitted as a planning application to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing before any works can commence.
- (3) This Prior Approval is based on drawing PRO\_01\_103 Revision B which shows the curtilage for the dwellings. All vehicle parking associated with the use of the building as a dwelling shall be restricted to within the curtilage shown. Parking in associated with the dwelling other than within this area will represent an unauthorised use of agricultural land and would be liable to enforcement action.

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.

The conditions set out in the report may be subject to such reasonable change as is necessary to ensure accuracy and enforceability.

