

3.2 REFERENCE NO - 22/504818/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Change of use of land for the storage of shipping containers for storage use, together with associated landscaping and ecology enhancements (part retrospective).		
ADDRESS Warehouse Chesley Storage Chesley Farm Bull Lane Newington Kent ME9 7SJ		
RECOMMENDATION that planning permission is Refused		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR REFUSAL The development represents a significant expansion of the existing business with a resultant unacceptable form of encroachment into the countryside, and appears unsympathetic and incongruous in this rural setting.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE The application has been referred to committee by Cllr Palmer		
WARD Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN Newington	COUNCIL APPLICANT Mr L Jones AGENT DHA Planning
DECISION DUE DATE 20/12/22	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 05/12/22	CASE OFFICER Megan Harris

Planning History

22/500944/LDCEX

Lawful Development Certificate (Existing) for use of land for external storage of shipping containers, highways signage, barriers and vehicles and placement of containers on the land for rental of storage space.

Permitted Decision Date: 29.04.2022

SW/08/0550

Application for deletion of condition (i) of application SW/05/0646, to allow use of building for B8 storage and distribution and ancillary office accommodation without restrictions relating to occupier or type of B8 use.

Grant of Conditional PP Decision Date: 11.07.2008

SW/07/0864

Change of use from agriculture former cold stores to storage or workshop.

Grant of Conditional PP Decision Date: 18.04.2008

SW/07/0035

Application for certificate of lawful existing uses for use of barn as storage.

Refused Decision Date: 20.03.2007

SW/05/0646

Warehousing for fastener stockists and ancillary office accommodation.

Grant of Conditional PP Decision Date: 26.07.2005

SW/99/1172

Renewal of Temporary Planning Permission SW/94/0625 for Change of Use of Packhouse to Warehousing.

Grant of Conditional PP Decision Date: 12.01.2000

SW/94/0625

Change of use of packhouse to warehousing

Grant of Conditional PP Decision Date: 19.09.1994

SW/89/1110

Change of Use from Agricultural to Industrial Class B1.

Refused Decision Date: 28.11.1989

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.1 The site forms part of the land and buildings at Chesley Farm, which is located approximately 0.8km to the south of Newington in the open countryside. The former farm grouping comprises a former oast building, now converted to six dwellings, and three modern former farm buildings that have been converted into storage and distribution uses and workshops with the benefit of planning permission, as shown in the planning history above. Whilst these uses as permitted were for the buildings and included conditions to restrict external storage on associated land, a parcel of land to the rear of the two smaller buildings to the southwest of the site access has also been used for the storage of shipping containers. A Lawful Development Certificate was granted earlier this year to confirm that such use had continued for a period in excess of ten years and is now immune from enforcement action. The storage containers are laid out in rows and the site is operated as a 'self-storage' site, with containers being rented out on a weekly/monthly basis for storage.
- 1.2 The application site relates to two parcels of land to the rear of the area of land that benefits from the lawful development certificate. These parcels have been developed and used in a similar manner to the land which benefits from the lawful development certificate as an extension to this business, and are comprised of areas of hardstanding with a number of dark green single storey storage containers stationed on the land in rows. The application form sets out that the use of these specific land parcels commenced in March 2016, and as such this use is not lawful through the passage of time and requires the benefit of planning permission. It is evident from aerial photographs in 2015 that both parcels of land were previously part of the farmland associated with Chesley Farm.
- 1.3 The surrounding area has a strong rural character and predominantly comprises undulating countryside and agricultural fields with rural dwellings and farm complexes pepper-potted around. The land is classed as Grade 1 Agricultural Land with Bull Lane being a designated rural lane.

2. PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application seeks part retrospective planning permission for the change of use of land for the storage of shipping containers for storage use, together with associated landscaping and ecology enhancements. The hardstanding and shipping containers are in place at the site, but the landscaping and ecology enhancements have not yet taken place.
- 2.2 The expansion of the site has taken place towards the end of the access road which runs through the site, and is comprised of two areas of hardstanding, which have a total area of roughly 1,290m². Dark green storage containers are located on the hardstanding, which are all of the same size, measuring 2.4m in width, 2.55m in height and 6.02m in length.

- 2.3 Proposed landscaping includes the sowing of 0.2 Ha wildflower meadow to the northeast of the hardstanding. A native hedgerow is also proposed within this area, to limit views of the development from the countryside to the east. The development also proposes the planting of native trees and hedgerow to re-gap the existing landscaping that surrounds the applicant's land to the north and east of the development site, again to try and limit views of the development. These areas fall outside of the red line edge of the site.
- 2.4 The planning statement sets out that the use will operate and be open for business from 8:00am to 6:00pm Monday to Fridays and 8:00am to 2:00pm on Saturdays. The premises will be closed on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

3. PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.1 Designated Countryside
- 3.2 Agricultural Land Grade 1

4. POLICY AND CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 The following chapters of the National Planning Policy Framework, July 2021 are relevant:

Chapter 2 Sustainable development

Chapter 6 Building a strong, competitive economy

Chapter 9 Promoting sustainable transport

Chapter 11 Making effective use of land

Chapter 12 Achieving well-designed places

Chapter 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Chapter 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

- 4.2 National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

- 4.3 The development plan consists of the adopted Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017. The policies within the Local Plan that this proposal would be assessed against include the following:

Policy ST1 Achieving sustainable development in Swale

Policy ST3 The Swale settlement strategy

Policy ST5 The Sittingbourne area strategy

Policy CP1 Building a strong economy

Policy CP2 Promoting sustainable transport

Policy CP4 Requiring good design

Policy DM3 The rural economy

Policy DM6 Managing transport demand and impact

Policy DM7 Vehicle parking

Policy DM14 General development criteria

Policy DM19 Sustainable design and construction

Policy DM24 Landscape

Policy DM28 Biodiversity and geological conservation

Policy DM31 Agricultural land

- 4.4 SBC Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2020
- 4.5 Swale landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal 2011

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 Letters were sent to neighbouring occupiers and a site notice was posted within the vicinity of the application site. In response to this, six letters of support were received. Their contents are summarised below:

- The site is well maintained, clean, landscaped and is not visually intrusive.
- Proposed landscaping will enhance the area considerably.
- Having people around will offer much needed security to the area.
- The facility is only accessible during working hours and does not impact neighbours.
- There is plenty of parking available at the site.
- I have lived opposite the site for the past 30 years. The use of the premises and land have during that time attracted a variety of purposes , some of I have not been comfortable with, however the current and proposed use are not causing me any concern and I support the application.

5.2 Cllr Richard Palmer has called the application to Planning Committee, stating that if the officer was minded to recommend approval of the application, he would likely withdraw the call in.

6. CONSULTATIONS

6.1 **Newington Parish Council** – No objection to the proposal subject to *an undertaking* being undertaken to ensure that no vehicle larger than a van should access the site from the village centre

6.2 **KCC Highways** – No objection to the proposal because the vehicle trips associated with the individual containers are limited and will be accessed by users infrequently. Even if they were accessed daily they would not generate enough traffic to be problematic. The existing access is adequate to cater for the vehicle movements associated with the proposal and on-site parking is adequate.

6.3 **KCC Ecology** – As the ecology report concludes, it is unknown if protected species were harmed/displaced in the unauthorised development at this site. However, what can be established is that grassland and trees were lost to facilitate the development Not only has this lowered the site's ecosystem service value (as referenced in paragraph 174 of the NPPF 2021) but the replacement of green space with hardstanding and buildings contravenes section 40 of the NERC Act (2006), paragraph 174 of the NPPF (2021) and the Environment Act (2021) in the absence of compensation. The trees and grassland would have supported biodiversity, whereas the newly installed hardstanding and buildings do not. In order to compensate for this loss, it is proposed that reinforcing existing hedgerows and creation of a new native hedgerow/wildflower 'plugs' in an adjacent field will be enacted.

Whilst it is unclear if the compensation proposals can adequately compensate for the loss, it is advised that all the proposals are implemented (if planning permission is granted) in an attempt to offset the loss. If planning permission is granted, we advise that a condition is attached to demonstrate evidence of the planting (along with a planting schedule) and delineation/creation of wildflower grassland (with appropriate management techniques).

If external lighting is to be included this will need to be established prior to determination as this could impact biodiversity.

6.4 **KCC Minerals and Waste** – No objection to this application.

6.5 **Environmental Health** – No objection subject to a condition restricting the hours of operation.

7. **BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS**

7.1 Plans and documents provided as part of application 22/504818/FULL.

8. **APPRAISAL**

9. The main considerations in the determination of this application are: -

- Principle
- Character and appearance
- Living conditions
- Highway safety
- Landscaping and biodiversity

Principle

9.1 Paragraph 84 a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports a) the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings; and b) the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. Paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. The NPPF states that in these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable. The use of previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist. Notwithstanding, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

9.2 In this case, the application site is located outside of any built-up area boundary, in a rural location, in the designated countryside and therefore subject to countryside restraint policies in the adopted Local Plan.

9.3 Policy ST3 of the Local Plan states that *'At locations in the open countryside, outside the built-up area boundaries shown on the Proposals Map, development will not be permitted, unless supported by national planning policy and able to demonstrate that it would contribute to protecting and, where appropriate, enhancing the intrinsic value, landscape setting, tranquillity and beauty of the countryside, its buildings and the vitality of rural communities'*.

- 9.4 Policy DM3 of the Local Plan specifically relates to the rural economy and states that permission will be granted for the sustainable growth and expansion of business and enterprise in the rural area. For all proposals, the policy states (inter-alia):
- *(1a) that larger scales of development are directed towards rural service centres and urban areas:*
 - *(1.b) for all proposals, firstly consider the appropriate re-use of existing buildings or the development of other previously developed land, unless such sites are not available or it is demonstrated that a particular location is necessary to support the needs of rural communities or the active and sustainable management in the countryside:*
 - *(1.d), that design and layout is sympathetic to the rural location and appropriate to its context:*
 - *(1.e), that no significant harm would occur to the historical, architectural, biodiversity, landscape or rural character of the area and*
 - *(1.f) that the scale of traffic is not incompatible with the rural area.*
- 9.5 The supporting text to policy DM3 sets out that the aim of the policy is to highlight the needs of specific sectors and the protection and expansion of rural services, whilst balancing support for the sustainable growth and expansion of business and enterprise with limiting and managing adverse impacts upon the wider countryside.
- 9.6 In the case of 1.b, the proposal does not relate to development within a settlement, or on what was previously developed land, or involve the conversion of existing buildings. In addition, I do not consider the site to be easily accessible, being in a remote location divorced from any settlement boundary and accessed via a narrow country lane. Whilst the development has taken place as an expansion to an existing business, I note that the lawful extent of the site is within an area of approximately 1250 sqm and accommodates approximately 45 containers, whilst the expanded area (excluding the landscaped area) contains approximately 54 containers within an additional site area of approximately 1290 sqm. This would represent a significant expansion of the business in a location that I do not consider to be sustainable or easily accessible. There appears to be no compelling reason why the nature of the business demands a rural location or how the expansion supports the needs of rural communities. In my opinion, the divorced and remote location of the site together with the scale of the expansion does not support the objectives of sustainable development or the aims of the local plan settlement strategy under policy ST3 and supporting policies under DM3 and CP2 to minimise the need for travel and to steer larger rural business towards urban areas and other defined settlements. Whilst the benefit of bringing redundant rural buildings back into use for business purposes can sometimes outweigh accessibility issues, this does not apply in this instance where the proposed use is an open land use.
- 9.7 I note that paragraph 85 of the NPPF recognises that sites to meet business needs in rural areas may need to be found beyond existing settlements and in locations not well served by public transport. However this is subject to development being sympathetic to its surroundings and where it can exploit opportunities to make a location more sustainable, which is not the case in this instance.
- 9.8 Taking this into account the proposal is considered to conflict with policies ST3 and DM3 of the Local Plan 2017 and the NPPF.

Character and appearance

- 9.9 Parg.127 of the NPPF sets out developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive, sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built form of development. Policy DM14 of the Local Plan 2017 supports development that is *'... well sited and of a scale, design, appearance and detail that is sympathetic and appropriate to the location'*.
- 9.10 Policy CP4 of the Swale Local Plan 2017 promotes and encourages high-quality design and states that the scale, height, materials, detailing, mass, bulk, articulation and site coverage of any new proposed development should be appropriate and reflect the character of the area. Policy DM3 states that buildings should be sympathetic to the rural location and appropriate to their context.

In this instance the site is located in an area with a strong rural character and appearance, divorced from any built settlement. Whilst there is sporadic built form in the area, this does not detract from the prevailing rural character. The storage containers are utilitarian in form and not of sympathetic rural design and represent an open land use that has the potential to cause harm to the countryside and landscape. The development has extended the built form within the site to the northwest and has clearly visually encroached into the rural countryside. Although the containers have a relatively low visual presence with a height of 2.55m, they are of a utilitarian and industrial design, and not visually sympathetic to this rural setting. This visual harm is exacerbated by the extended access road and hardstandings. I acknowledge that storage containers are located on land to the southeast of the application site which are lawful through the storage use being in situ for over 10 continuous years, however the presence of these adjacent containers do not justify the further significant expansion of the site as proposed into formerly undeveloped countryside.

- 9.11 The expansion of the business into the parcels of land subject to this application has more than doubled the size of the site. In addition, whilst the lawful open storage use is somewhat contained by the existing former farm buildings to the south and east, the expanded areas have extended the business operation to the north into open countryside in a sprawling manner and form. In my opinion, both the open utilitarian form of the development and the large sprawling expansion of the site is alien to the key characteristics of the countryside and fails to represent a design and layout that is sympathetic to its rural location. Whilst the site is not widely visible and largely screened from Bull Lane by the existing former farm buildings, I do not consider that the development preserves or enhances the intrinsic character or beauty of the countryside.
- 9.12 The site is not within a designated landscape. The Council's Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal SPD identifies the site as being within the Newington Fruit Belt with a moderate condition and low sensitivity. The SPD recognises that the expansion of Hartlip and development along the A2 corridor has diminished this landscape character, but also states that it contains a strong landscape structure with an undulating landscape with a traditional function, distinct character and strong sense of place in parts.
- 9.13 I acknowledge that additional landscaping is proposed to the east of the site, and also re-gapping of the surrounding hedgerow also owned by the applicant is proposed. The additional landscaping to the east will soften the appearance of the containers and hardstanding to some degree when viewed from the applicant's land to the east. However, this does not make the large sprawling encroachment of the business into the countryside acceptable in my opinion, and follows a contrived boundary that is not part of the established or organic landscape structure.

- 9.14 I note the comments of support received which set that the site is well maintained and tidy. Whilst the site may be well run and maintained, this is not a matter that forms a material consideration in the determination of this application.
- 9.15 In my opinion, the introduction of storage containers and hardstanding represents a significant, sprawling, and unacceptable form of encroachment into the countryside, and is unsympathetic and incongruous in this rural setting to a degree that would be harmful and directly in conflict with the aims of policies ST3, DM3, DM14 & CP4 of the of the Local Plan (2017).

Living conditions

- 9.16 Policy DM14 states that any new proposed developments should not cause significant harm to the amenities of surrounding uses or areas and due consideration will be given to the impact of the proposed development upon neighbouring properties. Any new proposed schemes should not result in significant overshadowing through a loss of daylight or sunlight, in an unreasonable loss of privacy, in an unreasonable loss of outlook or in excessive noise or odour pollution.
- 9.17 In terms of residential amenity, the site is relatively removed from residential development. The closest dwellings are located at the front of the site, roughly 53m from the extended storage areas. The proposal has intensified the use of the site through the provision of additional storage containers, although I note that the containers are of limited size and would be unlikely to result in significant trips. The applicant has operated the business from the site since 2005, and the expanded site has also been in operation for a number of years. Environmental Health have reviewed the application and note that the hours of opening are reasonable and are not considered to give rise to noise and disturbance outside of standard operational hours. This could be conditioned should an application be recommended for approval. For the above reasons I do not consider the trip generation would be likely to cause any significant amenity impacts.
- 9.18 Other residential units along Bull Lane to the south and west lie a minimum of 80m from the additional storage areas and due to this sufficient distance of separation I am satisfied that no adverse impacts occur for these residents.
- 9.19 As such, subject to hours of operation and restriction of the use class to storage only, which could reasonably be addressed with planning conditions, I consider the impact to residential amenity to be acceptable and compliant with policy DM14 of the of the Local Plan (2017).

Highways and Parking

- 9.20 Policy DM3 1.f, states proposals should *'avoid scales of traffic generation incompatible is with the rural character of the area'* and Policy DM6 details that development should consider the location, design and layout of development proposals.
- 9.21 Policy DM7 states that parking requirements in respect of any new proposed developments should be in accordance with Kent County Council vehicle parking standards.
- 9.22 SBC Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which is pursuant to Policy DM7 of the Bearing Fruits Local Plan Adopted 2017 was adopted by the Council in June 2020 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

- 9.23 Turning to issues surrounding highway impacts, KCC Highways have reviewed the Transport Statement Assessment that has been submitted alongside this application. They note that vehicle trips associated with the individual containers are limited as you would only expect users to access them infrequently. Even if this occurred daily, this would still not generate a degree of traffic that would be viewed as problematic. The application is retrospective, so the applicant has provided daily traffic generation of 20 movements (10 in and 10 out). This has been further supported by a TRICS report based on Self Storage Warehousing which estimate traffic generation of 3 trips in the AM Traffic Peak Hour (2 in and 1 out) and 3 trips in the PM peak hour (1 in and 2 out). KCC Highways acknowledge the above figures are very low and do not cause concern in relation to their impact on the wider highway network. They also consider the existing access is adequate size to cater for the limited movements associated with the proposal and on-site parking is adequate.
- 9.24 Given the comments received by KCC Highways, I am satisfied that the expansion of the storage areas has not caused harm to the surrounding road network due to the limited increase in vehicle movements. Whilst not included in the red line edge, there is a parking area to the southeast which provide adequate parking for the storage business, and I note that customers are also able to drive up to the containers to load/unload their goods.
- 9.25 Bull Lane and surrounding lanes are classed as designated rural lanes and policy DM26 applies. Given the limited increase in vehicle movements accepted by KCC and the presence of existing traffic on the lanes, I do not consider that the development would lead to traffic movements that would be harmful to the character of these lanes.
- 9.26 I acknowledge the concerns of Newington Parish Council relating to large vehicles potentially accessing the site through the village centre, but it is not possible to control the access routes of customers via condition.
- 9.27 For the reasons, set out above I am satisfied that the proposal is consistent with the aims of policies DM3 1.f, DM6 and DM7 of the Local Plan (2017) and SBC Vehicle Parking Standards 2020. For the avoidance of doubt, whilst I am satisfied that the volume of traffic would not be significant, this does not affect my assessment earlier in this report that the site is in an unsustainable location and does not promote key policy aims to place developments in locations that reduce the need to travel.

Landscaping and biodiversity

- 9.28 The NPPF requires new development to minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity, where possible. Local planning authorities are required to conserve and enhance biodiversity when determining planning applications and take opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments. Policy DM28 also requires that development proposals will conserve, enhance and extend biodiversity, provide for net gains in biodiversity, where possible, minimise any adverse impacts and compensate where impacts cannot be mitigated.
- 9.29 Policy DM14 requires the provision of an integrated landscape scheme that would achieve a high standard of landscaping within the development.
- 9.30 As set in the Visual Amenities section above, the application does propose some additional landscaping at the site, including the sowing of 0.2 Ha wildflower meadow to the north east of the new storage areas. A native hedgerow is also proposed within this area, which forms part of the application site. The development also proposes the

planting of native trees and hedgerow to re-gap the existing landscaping that surrounds the applicant's land to the north and east of the development site.

- 9.31 Whilst I have set out that this additional landscaping does not overcome the harm the development causes to the rural character of the surrounding area, from a biodiversity perspective, I note KCC Ecology have requested the additional planting is implemented if planning permission is granted.
- 9.32 As the submitted ecology report concludes, it is unknown if protected species were harmed/displaced in the unauthorised development at this site. However, what can be established is that grassland and trees were lost to facilitate the development. Not only has this lowered the site's ecosystem service value (as referenced in paragraph 174 of the NPPF 2021) but the replacement of green space with hardstanding and buildings contravenes section 40 of the NERC Act (2006), paragraph 174 of the NPPF (2021) and the Environment Act (2021) in the absence of compensation. The trees and grassland would have supported biodiversity, whereas the newly installed hardstanding and buildings do not.
- 9.33 In order to compensate for this loss, the application proposes that reinforcing existing hedgerows and creation of a new native hedgerow/wildflower 'plugs' in an adjacent field will be enacted. KCC Ecology set out that whilst it is unclear if the compensation proposals can adequately compensate for the loss, they advise that all the proposals are implemented (if planning permission is granted) in an attempt to offset the loss. If I were recommending planning permission is granted, I would ensure a condition is attached to demonstrate evidence of the planting (along with a planting schedule) and delineation/creation of wildflower grassland (with appropriate management techniques).
- 9.34 KCC Ecology also noted that it is also unclear if there is any external lighting associated with the development, which could potentially have adverse impacts on biodiversity. I contacted the agent for clarification on this point, and he confirmed there is no external lighting within the application site. As such, I have no concerns in this regard, and this could be controlled via a condition.
- 9.35 Taking the above into account the proposal is considered to accord with policy DM14 of the Local Plan 2017 and the NPPF.

10. CONCLUSION

- 10.1 This development is located outside of the built-up area boundary in the countryside with a strong rural character and is divorced from any settlement boundary or services and facilities. The development has resulted in a significant expansion of the business on open land to the north of the existing site, The scale and form of the expansion together with the utilitarian appearance of this open land use fails to protect or be sympathetic to rural character. The significant expansion of the business is in an unsustainable location and does not support key policy objectives to place development in locations that reduce need to travel, and no opportunities exist to make the site more sustainable from this perspective. For these reasons, I recommend planning permission is refused.

11. RECOMMENDATION – REFUSE for the following reason:

- (1) The application site lies outside of any built-up area boundary and within the open countryside. The development, by virtue of its significant and sprawling encroachment into the undeveloped rural countryside, and poor utilitarian appearance and open land use, represents an unsympathetic and incongruous form of development, which fails to protect the intrinsic value, landscape setting,

tranquility and beauty of the countryside. Furthermore, the development has significantly increased the scale and operation of the business in a location that is remote and divorced from any settlement, and fails to justify why this particular unsustainable and rural location is necessary to support the needs of rural communities. For these reasons, the proposal would be contrary to policies ST1, ST3, CP2, CP4, DM3, and DM14 of Bearing Fruits 2031 – The Swale Borough Local Plan (2017).

The Council's approach to the application

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), July 2021 the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and creative way by offering a pre-application advice service, where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome and as appropriate, updating applicants / agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the Committee and promote the application.

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.

