

**HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

Date 12th August 2019

Application No:	HPK/2019/0239	
Location	Land Off Simmondley Lane, Simmondley, Glossop, Derbyshire,	
Proposal	Variation of condition 23 in relation to HPK/2017/0692	
Applicant	Mellor Homes	
Agent	Simon Jones, S J Design Ltd	
Parish/ward	Glossop/Simmondley	Date registered 06/06/2019
If you have a question about this report please contact: Jane Colley - Email jane.colley@highpeak.gov.uk ; Tel: 01298 28400 Ext: 4981		

This application has been brought before the Development Control Committee, due to the consideration of the previous planning applications by the Committee and for consistency.

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

Approve

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The site is located on a piece of land accessed from, and to the west of, Simmondley Lane. There are residential properties beyond the northern boundary (a development known as 'The Green') which sit at a lower level than the application site and fall within the built up area boundary. To the west of the site is Spring Rise, which is part of a larger housing estate. A stream/brook is located west of the western boundary of the site. Beyond the southern boundary there are a few stone properties which are positioned at a higher level than the application site. Access to/from the site is taken from Simmondley Lane. The site generally slopes down from the south-eastern corner of the site in a north-westerly direction.

2.2 Works are currently commencing on site pursuant to planning consent HPK/2017/0692. All three houses, at the time of the officers site visit had the foundations laid and partially constructed ground floor walls.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

3.1 This application seeks to vary condition 23 imposed on HPK/2017/0692, which relates to landscaping, boundary treatment and levels, amongst a number of

criteria. The application was submitted following an investigation by the enforcement team into the construction of a rear boundary retaining wall.

3.2 Condition 23 of HPK/2017/0692 states:

23. No development shall commence on site until a scheme of hard and soft landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the details of which shall include:

- (a) indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land;*
- (b) details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development;*
- (c) all species, planting sizes and planting densities, spread of all trees and hedgerows within or overhanging the site, in relation to the proposed buildings and other works;*
- (d) finished levels and contours;*
- (e) means of enclosure;*
- (f) car parking layout;*
- (g) vehicle and pedestrian access;*
- (h) hard surfacing materials;*

Reason:- To ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for the development and the protection of existing important landscape features, in the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with Policies S1 and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan 2016 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3.3 The detail for the above condition was agreed in February 2019. However since this time a new retaining wall has been erected along the western boundary of the site and a small area along the northern boundary. A second much smaller area of retaining wall adjacent to the boundary with 5 The Green has been constructed to support the access road. The construction of these walls and the consequential land level changes are a breach of condition 23, therefore the applicant has sought to amend this condition, through the submission of this application and a new set of plans.

3.5 The plans show the new retaining wall, albeit at a lower height than currently constructed on site, cross sections showing existing and final levels, existing and proposed landscaping, car parking and hard surfacing materials. The height of the wall currently varies between 1.5m and 0.8m with the highest section towards the north western corner of the site. It is proposed to lower the wall between 0.5m and 0.75m, with the greatest reduction towards the north western part of the site.

3.6 Revised plans have been submitted which now show the erection of a 1.8m fence above the retaining wall and cross sectional details of the proposed boundary treatment between plots 2a and 2b. Between the houses it is proposed to have a 0.78m high wall with a 1.5m close boarded fence above. Local residents have not been consulted on the plans, as they do not propose any further changes to the height of the retaining wall, merely provide further clarification on the development proposals.

3.6 The application and details attached to it - including the plans, supporting documents, representations and responses from consultees - can be found on the Council's website at:-

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=232711>

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 HPK/2017/0692 – 3 No. new build houses – Approved 11.09.2018

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=221270>

4.2 HPK/2016/0010 – Proposed erection of 2 No. dwellings. Approved, 07.03.2016

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=204788>

4.3 HPK/2014/0225 – New dwelling. Refused, 11.07.2014. Allowed on appeal 20.05.2015 (APP/H1033/W/14/3002035).

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=165464>

4.4 HPK/2013/0276 - Proposed new dwelling on land off Simmondley Lane. Withdrawn.

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=145484>

5. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

Adopted High Peak Local Plan 2016

- S1 Sustainable Development Principles
- S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- S2 Settlement Hierarchy
- S3 Strategic Housing Development
- S5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy
- EQ1 Climate Change
- EQ2 Landscape Character
- EQ3 Rural Development
- EQ5 Biodiversity
- EQ6 Design and Place Making
- EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
- EQ9 Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows
- EQ10 Pollution Control and Unstable Land
- EQ11 Flood Risk Management

- H1 Location of Housing Development
- H2 Housing Allocations
- H3 New Housing Development
- H4 Affordable Housing
- CF3 Local Infrastructure Provision
- CF4 Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities
- CF6 Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Documents

- Residential Design
- Landscape Character
- Housing Needs Survey
- Planning Obligations
- Simmondley Conservation Area Character Appraisal
- Design Guide 2018

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

National Planning Practice Guidance

6. CONSULTATIONS

Site notice	Expiry date for comments: 19.07.2019
Press notice	Expiry date for comments: N/A
Neighbours	Expiry date for comments: 4.07.2019

Neighbours/Local Interest Groups

6.1 Ten emails have been received objecting to the development and raising the following concerns:

- The wall causes a loss of privacy.
- The plans to reduce the height of the wall by 0.5m are still unacceptable, the new garden will complete overlook adjoining residents gardens
- Even if a fence or shrubs are planted, you cannot guarantee that house buyers will not have them removed.
- The wall should be removed and the land returned to natural ground levels.
- I find it disconcerting that the case officer has been advising the contractor. This gives the impression that permission has already been agreed in principle.
- The only reason for the wall is to make the gardens more aesthetically pleasing.
- The plans do not show what the resultant height of the wall would be.
- Risk of flooding to properties in Spring Rise.
- As a result of the wall there is approx. 0.6m between the wall and the neighbours' rear garden fences.

- Numbers 3,5 7, 9, 11 and 13 Spring Rise had severe flooding 3 years ago, if further flooding is caused, who will pay for the damage?
- Numbers 3, 5 7 and 9 Spring Rise is on the Governments Long Term Flood Risk Portal for being at high risk of surface water flooding. The wall with its concrete foundations will enhance this risk unnecessarily. There is no drainage in situ to prevent to the adjacent gardens.
- Visually poor and is out of character.
- Loss of sunlight to the area of garden adjacent to the elevated area.
- The wall has been backfilled with earth, which will prevent retained water from draining out via the drain holes.
- As recommended in various journals including Local Authority Building Control, the wall has not been back-filled with aggregate to keep water away from the wall itself and help with drainage. Neither has the retaining side of the wall been waterproofed as per the recommendations. This will dramatically shorten the life of the wall as damage from ice and frost will occur.
- Wildlife could be trapped in the channel and will endanger future occupants and their pets. A physical barrier should be provided.
- Insufficient space to maintain the wall. Himalayan balsam is taking root between the wall and the neighbour's fence.
- The wall is an afterthought by the developer to enhance the saleability of the houses, with no consideration to the effect on surrounding properties.
- This proposal was part of a 1997 study which highlighted and provided a comprehensive green space document.
- The site is in a flood plain, what will happen to the embankment on High Land Farm and the 21 Spring Rise boundary wall?
- Which ever planner signs this off, the first death on the access road.... hope you go to court and prison.

Consultees

Consultee	Comment	Officer response
DCC Highways	No apparent highway related issues.	7.31
Conservation Officer	The works to increase land levels relate to the west of the application site and furthest away from the Conservation Area boundary. The increased levels will be viewed in conjunction with suburban housing to the west and will have no detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.	7.13-7.17
County Archaeological Officer	I have had no further correspondence on this site since approving the WSI in February, so I'm not aware whether the archaeological monitoring has taken place on the works to date. Looking at the photos and site sections it would appear that some ground impacts are involved so I would expect this work (where involving a cut) to be archeologically	7.18- 7.19

	<p>monitored. I suggest asking the applicant to provide an update on the archaeological work to date i.e. what has been monitored/not monitored and a brief statement of results.</p> <p>Further comments:</p> <p>Following the receipt of the WSI monitoring works report, it suggests that some works had taken place before monitoring commenced. They seem to have watched the access road works and preparation of house plots without any significant archaeological findings.</p> <p>It isn't particularly clear about the retaining wall works – i.e. whether these were monitored or not, or whether they happened before or after the archaeological involvement. It might be worth asking the applicant when these works took place and whether they were archaeologically monitored.</p>	
Arboricultural Officer	No objection as this does not affect the existing trees.	7.23-7.26
Environmental Health Officer	No observations to make.	
United Utilities	Awaiting comments.	
Waste Services	No objection.	
Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA)	<p>Due to the nature and scale of the application we have no comments to make. However in response to a number of questions posed by the case officer, the LLFA have responded as follows:</p> <p>The pipes at the bottom of the retaining walls are weep holes. Weep holes are to prevent the build-up of hydrostatic pressure behind the retaining walls. Given that the groundwater level from the ground investigation is approx. 2.5m below ground level, I wouldn't expect there to be a constant flow of water from the weep holes, and even in winter when the groundwater conditions will be at their highest, there will probably only be a trickle, and therefore any risk from these weep holes in relation to increasing the flood risk to properties would be minimal. However, I would have expected that the developer to put some kind of filter drain/trench in front of the retaining wall, to prevent any run-off onto adjacent land. I would expect the Developer to provide some kind of assurances to confirm what I have outlined above.</p>	7.27-7.29

	<p><u>Filter trench</u> This could either be a filter trench on the land between the wall and the neighbours, or a perforated pipe surrounded by a filter medium at the bottom of the wall on the garden side. This is a 'belt and braces' approach to ensure no water discharges onto neighbouring land. If there is no filter trench, it is unknown whether this would cause a problem, but any water discharging from the weep holes is likely to be a trickle.</p>	
--	---	--

7. POLICY AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS AND PLANNING BALANCE

Policy Context

7.1 The determination of a planning application is to be made pursuant to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which is to be read in conjunction with section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

7.2 Section 38(6) requires the Local Planning Authority to determine planning applications in accordance with the development plan, unless there are material considerations which 'indicate otherwise'. Section 70(2) provides that in determining applications the Local Planning Authority "*shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the application and to any other material considerations.*" The Development Plan currently consists of the High Peak Local Plan Policies Adopted April 2016.

7.3 Paragraph 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) explains that at the heart of the Framework is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision makers this means that when considering development proposals which accord with the development plan they should be approved without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, grant planning permission unless:-

- i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
- ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole. (Para 11 NPPF July 2018).*

7.4 Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies the three dimensions to sustainable development as economic, social and environmental.

7.5 Local Plan policy S1a establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development as contained within the NPPF.

7.6 Section 5 of the NPPF seeks to deliver a sufficient supply of homes. The Council is considered to have a five year housing land supply and therefore housing supply policies are up-to-date.

7.7 The policies contained in the Framework are supplemented by the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), which is also a material consideration in the determination of applications.

7.8 A list of key policies, guidance and other material considerations is provided above (section 5).

Principle of development

7.9 The site is located mainly within the countryside and partly (i.e. the access track) within the built up area boundary. It is also adjacent to the Simmondley Conservation Area along the southern boundary of the access track and the eastern boundary of the site; the Conservation Area is also located beyond the southern boundary of the site. A Historic Environment Record (HER 3640) falls within the south-western corner of the site (the route of an old Roman Road).

7.10 The principle of development has already been established by the grant of planning permission for a detached dwelling and a pair of semi detached houses pursuant to HPK/2017/0692. Since this time works have commenced on site, although a new retaining wall along the western part of the site has been constructed. This is in breach of the plans approved pursuant to condition 23, therefore this application seeks to amend condition 23 and the retention and lowering of the new wall.

7.11 The principle of a raised retaining wall is considered to be acceptable. Within the wider area, there are numerous examples of retaining walls or raised patio areas, including along the access road into the site and within the rear garden of properties in Spring Rise to the west. This is in part due to the changes ground levels throughout the area, whereby properties to the south east sit on higher ground level to the application site, whereas properties to the north east sit on lower ground level. Within Spring Rise, properties are arranged in a staggered manner reflecting the topography of the land. Accordingly given the surrounding context, the principle of a retaining wall is acceptable.

7.12 Whilst the general principle of development is considered to be acceptable, this is subject to other relevant policies relating to the adjacent conservation area, residential amenity, flooding and archaeological matters.

Design/impact on the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the Conservation Area

7.13 The NPPF highlights that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and creating better places in which to live and work (Paragraph 124). Section 15 of the NPPF seeks to protect and enhance the natural and local environment. Local Plan Policies S1, EQ2 and EQ6 seek to protect, enhance and

restore the landscape character of the area for its intrinsic beauty and its economic, social and environmental benefits and to secure high quality design in all developments. Developments are required to respond positively to the environment and contribute to local distinctiveness and sense of place by taking account of the distinct character, townscape and setting of the area.

7.14 In accordance with the provisions of Section 16 of the NPPF and Policy EQ7 of the Local Plan, proposals are also required to protect any designated heritage assets and their settings. In this case, it is important to consider the impact on the setting of the Simmondley Conservation Area, which lies to the south of the access road and forms the boundary to the east of the site.

7.15 The retaining wall is located close to the rear garden boundary of a number of properties in Spring Rise and at the furthest point from the conservation area. At the present time the wall sits just below the height of the close boarded fence which forms the rear garden boundary to numbers 9 and 11 Spring Rise. The proposed lowering of the wall and accompanying 1.8m close boarded fence above would be seen in the context of surrounding development, including the residential estate to the west and properties in Spring Rise. Accordingly, the location of the retaining wall and its relationship to the boundary of the conservation area is at a sufficient distance to ensure that the character and the appearance of the conservation area is sustained. The retention of the retaining wall would not harm those elements which contribute to the setting of the conservation area and its significance

7.16 Although the site lies within countryside, its visual character is one which relates to the surrounding suburban form. Views into the site from Simmondley Lane are limited by the presence of existing buildings and walls which form, in part, the boundary with the road. With the retaining wall and proposed fence being set below that of the houses, it would not form a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Moreover, it is proposed to install a wall and close boarded fence in between the semi detached dwellings, which again would not be readily visible from the wider area.

7.17 The wall itself would not be visible from properties in Spring Rise, although the close boarded fence above it would be apparent. However, close boarded fences are a common feature particularly within garden areas in Spring Rise and The Green. Therefore the addition of the wall and fence would not visually appear out of keeping with the character of the area.

7.17 It is therefore considered that siting, height, scale, design and use of materials of the development would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, the setting of the Conservation Area and the local landscape. The proposal relates well to the built up area boundary and would not result in an intrusion into the countryside. As such, the proposed development accords with Local Plan policies S1, EQ2, EQ3, EQ6 and EQ7 and sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

Archaeological Matters

7.18 Policy EQ7 requires new development proposals to be informed by a level of archaeological evidence to understand the potential impact of a proposal. An Historic Environment Record (HER) lies partly within the site, which relates to the route of an old Roman Road. Consequently, it was previously concluded that there was the possibility of archaeological remains of the road surviving. Under the terms of condition 7 of HPK/2017/0692 the County archaeologist required the submission of a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI). This WSI was approved by the County Archaeologist and a report submitted which concluded that there were no archaeological features, structures or deposits present at the site. In response to this application, the County Archaeologist requested confirmation that an archaeologist was present during the construction works to assess any ground excavations works. The applicant has subsequently confirmed that an archaeologist was present, and therefore the County Archaeologist has raised no objection to this application.

7.19 It is therefore considered that despite the works which have been undertaken in part, there are no archeological reasons which would prevent the grant of planning consent. Accordingly the development complies with Local Plan Policy EQ7 and section 16 of the NPPF.

Impact on neighbouring residential amenity

7.20 Policy EQ6 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that new development achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development, taking into account factors such as privacy, visual intrusion, shadowing and overlooking. This policy reflects paragraph 127 of the NPPF which equally seeks to ensure that the amenity of both existing and future residents is protected. The siting of the proposed dwellings has not changed as a result of this application.

7.21 Neighbouring properties in Spring Rise are positioned at a minimum of 30m from the location of the retaining wall. As set out in the adopted Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document, new development should achieve a 21m distance between the habitable facing windows, to protect the privacy of both parties. Although the SPD refers to a window to window interface, it is a useful guide to assess the impact of structures such as retaining walls and their relationship to neighbouring properties. The retaining wall, with a 1.8m fence above would easily achieve this privacy distance, consequently it is considered that there would be no loss of privacy to the neighbours.

7.22 The close boarded fence would however be a noticeable addition beyond the rear garden boundaries of properties in Spring Rise, and visible from within their gardens. Although it may cause some minimal loss of sunlight in the morning, given its orientation to the east of these properties, the loss of sunlight would only be at the very end of the rear gardens. It would not affect the remaining parts of the garden including the patio areas which lie immediately adjacent to the houses. It is therefore considered that the retention and alteration of the wall and fence would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of these neighbouring properties. The development accords with the residential amenity tenets of Local Plan policies S1 and EQ6 and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Arboricultural/Landscaping Matters

7.23 Local Plan policy EQ9 seeks to protect existing trees, woodland and hedgerows. Local Plan policy EQ2 seeks to protect, enhance and restore the landscape character of the Plan Area for its own intrinsic beauty requiring, inter alia, development to protect and/or enhance the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the landscape and to resist development which would be detrimental to the local or wider landscape.

7.24 Within the site there are three protected oak trees which are not affected by the position of the retaining wall. The proposed landscape plan provides for new shrubs, tree and hedge planting and is considered to be acceptable.

7.25 It is therefore considered that the development would have no greater impact on the landscape than the previously approved scheme and with landscaping details (both hard and soft), including boundary treatments secured, this will ensure that the development has a satisfactory relationship to the wider area.

7.26 Accordingly it is considered that there are no arboricultural or landscape issues arising from the proposal. As such, the proposal accords with Local Plan policies EQ2 and EQ9 and section 15 of the NPPF.

Flooding & drainage

7.27 Policy EQ11 of the Local Plan seeks to support development which avoids areas of current or future flood risk. Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk. The site is not located within an area identified as high risk, although a number of residents have commented that area of land between the site and their gardens are identified on the Governments Long Term Flood Risk portal

7.28 The Lead Local Flood Authority has been consulted on this application. The retaining wall has been constructed with pipes at the bottom of the walls, which a number of residents consider should be removed as they believe they will cause additional flooding into their gardens. The pipes at the bottom of the wall are weep holes, which are used to prevent the build-up of hydrostatic pressure behind the retaining wall. Given that the groundwater level from the ground investigation is approx. 2.5m below ground level, the LLFA have commented that they would not expect there to be a constant flow of water from the weep holes, and even in winter when the groundwater conditions will be at their highest, there will probably only be a trickle. The LLFA consider that any risk from these weep holes in relation to increasing the flood risk to properties would be minimal. The LLFA have commented that it would be normal practice to install a filter trench on the land between the wall and fence to the neighbouring properties. Whilst this is not been carried out, the LLFA consider that any water discharging from the weep holes would still be minimal.

7.29 Accordingly it is considered that the retention of the retaining wall would not cause an increase in flooding elsewhere and therefore the development meets the terms of Local Plan Policy EQ11 and section 14 of the NPPF.

Other Matters

7.30 Comments have been received that raise concern over the presence of Himalayan balsam. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that this as a result of the retaining wall and therefore it would not be reasonable to refuse this application for this reason. One objector also comments on a 1997 study, however it is not known what this relates to and no further comments have been provided.

7.31 It is not proposed to alter or amend the approved means of access into the site, therefore highway safety and the impact on the wider road network is not considered to be a constraint to the approval of this application.

8. Conclusion & Planning Balance

8.1 It is considered that the principle of development is acceptable. The siting, scale, design and use materials would not harm the visual amenities of the locality, including the setting of the Conservation Area and Landscape. There are no adverse impacts in respect of highway safety, residential amenity, protected trees, archaeological interests and flooding arising from the development.

8.2 The proposed development is considered to be a sustainable form of development that accords with Local Plan policies S1 and S1a and the concept of sustainability at the heart of the NPPF. Therefore the application should be approved.

RECOMMENDATION

A. That planning permission is APPROVED subject to the conditions and informatives outlined below.

Conditions

Condition number	Brief description	Comment
AP01	Development in accordance with approved plans	
LA10	Tree retention	
LA14	Tree Protection	
NON STANDARD	Works to be carried out in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement	
NON STANDARD	Compliance with remediation condition	
NON STANDARD	There shall be no dust emissions beyond the site. Dust shall be controlled in accordance with the Building Research Establishment Document 'Control of Dust from	

	Construction and Demolition Activities' (BR456)	
NON STANDARD	Any waste material associated with the demolition or construction shall not be burnt on site and no fires lit	
NON STANDARD	Construction working times: i. 08:00 - 18:00 hours (Monday to Friday); ii. 08:00 - 13:00 hours (Saturday) iii. No working is permitted on Sundays or Bank Holidays.	
NON STANDARD	No piling shall take place outside the hours 09:00 hours to 16:00 hours Mondays to Fridays	
NON STANDARD	Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems.	
NON STANDARD	Compliance with surface water drainage scheme.	
NON STANDARD	Compliance with approved facing materials.	
NON STANDARD	Compliance with submitted rainwater goods shown on photos Gutter black coated half round and downpipe black powder coated.	
NON STANDARD	Compliance with joinery details show on plan refs 600 and 601	
NON STANDARD	Compliance with vents and ducts details shown on Vents and ducts mark up by MPS and Boiler flue image	
LA01	Wall to be reduced in accordance with approved plans and boundary treatment to be erected prior to first occupation and thereafter retained.	
LA02	Landscaping to be carried out and maintained	
NON STANDARD	Compliance with approved details for the storage of plant and materials, site accommodation, loading, unloading and manoeuvring of goods vehicles, parking and manoeuvring of employees and visitors vehicles during construction works.	
NON STANDARD	Compliance with the approved vehicle wheel cleaning facilities.	
NON STANDARD	Before any other operations are commenced the site's existing vehicular access to Simmondley Lane shall be modified to achieve a visibility	

	sightlines.	
NON STANDARD	No dwelling shall be occupied until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with drawing No. 401A for cars to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. These facilities shall thereafter be retained for use at all times	
NON STANDARD	Compliance with the detailed scheme for the retaining wall reduction fronting Simmondley Lane.	
NON STANDARD	Compliance with details of eaves, verges, chimneys, window and door surrounds shown on Plan ref 602, 200C and 300B	

B. In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Head of Development Services has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Development Control Committee, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.

Informatives

During the course of the planning application, the Local Planning Authority sought further clarification on the development proposals, accordingly paragraph 38 of the NPPF has been adhered to.

Site Plan

