

[WP/19/00415/OUT](#)

Erection of up to 6.no holiday units with associated landscaping
Land East of, 61 Bowleaze Coveaway, Weymouth

Applicant name – Mr Eiles- Clarke

Case Officer – Emma Telford

Ward Member(s) –Cllr Ferrari & Cllr O’Leary

Taking account of the comments made by the Parish Council, Ward Member and the Chair and Vice Chair of Planning Committee, the Head of Service considers that under provisions of Dorset Council’s constitution this application should be determined by the Area Planning Committee.

1.0 Summary of Recommendation:

1.1 Grant, subject to conditions.

2.0 Reason for the recommendation:

- Para of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that permission should be granted for sustainable development unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate otherwise.
- The location is considered to be sustainable and comply with local plan policy ECON 6.
- At this in principle stage the proposal is considered acceptable in its general visual impact.
- At this in principle stage the proposal is not considered to result in any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity.
- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.

3.0 Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	Site is located just outside of the Weymouth DDB. Complies with Local Plan policy ECON 6.
Visual Amenity	At this ‘in principle stage’ it is considered that the development of up to 6 holiday units could be achieved that would not be unduly prominent in terms of the neighbouring properties, the local character and the wider landscape.
Residential Amenity	Nothing to suggest at this outline stage that

	the proposal would result in adverse impacts on neighbours.
Land Instability	Acceptable if restricted to holiday accommodation and a temporary period.
Biodiversity	Acceptable as the ecological corridor to be maintained on half of the site.
Highway Safety	Acceptable in principle.
Drainage	Acceptable subject to drainage condition.
Archaeology	Archaeology is not a constraint.
Affordable Housing	Not required.
Community Infrastructure Levy	Not CIL liable.

4.0 Description of Site

4.1 The application site is located on land adjacent to no. 61 Bowleaze Coveway, Weymouth. The site is roughly rectangular shaped and comprises overgrown open land accessed via a wooden gate off Bowleaze Coveway. The sites slopes from the west down to the east. The surrounding area comprises residential land to the west, open land to the north and east and Bowleaze Coveway to the south.

4.2 The application site is located just outside of the defined development boundary (DDB) and is also located within an area vulnerable to coastal erosion.

5.0 Description of Proposal

5.1 The proposed development is for the erection of up to six holiday units. The applicant seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved.

6.0 Relevant Planning History

6.1 No relevant planning history on the site.

7.0 Relevant Constraints

Outside settlement limit

Area Vulnerable to Coastal Erosion

8.0 Consultations

8.1 Natural England – *Natural England consider the loss of this exceptionally important ecological corridor bottleneck through narrowing at its most constrained point to be wholly unacceptable on policy and legislative grounds stated above. We are of the opinion that if the applicant were to retain at least half of the redline boundary north to south, divided by an ecological barrier (such as a hedgerow) that separates the corridor from the amenity grassland, managed under an ecological management plan that significantly enhanced the overall connectivity and security of the site then it may be argued that there is no net-loss to the environment and biodiversity. This would involve a reduction in parking, re-arrangement of the access and units. To date such a scheme has not been forthcoming.*

Should the applicant be unable to secure an approval certificate and mitigate for the significant impacts proposed, Natural England recommend that the application is refused pending consideration of an Appropriate Assessment. Should the applicant secure an approval certificate and mitigate for the significant impacts expected, Natural England would have no objection to the development.

8.2 In response to the comments from Natural England and the Natural Environment Team a revised BMEP was submitted which included the retention of an ecological corridor along the eastern boundary. NET issued a certificate of approval thus removing the objection from Natural England and NET.

8.3 Wessex Water – *There must be no surface water connections into the foul sewer network.*

8.4 Flood Risk Management Team – *The current Outline application under consideration does not appear to be supported by a site specific Drainage Strategy or to include relevant information within other supporting documents, namely the Design & Access Statement (ref: Spase – 1100-DAS, dated 21/05/2019). Section 12 of the supporting application form specifies the intended discharge of surface water to a main sewer, although the supporting layout drawing (ref: Spase – Proposed Site Plan & Massing / PL-1100-01, dated May 2019) fails to show how this would be achieved. Mindful of the response provided by Wessex Water, dated 03/06/2019, and their comment that the proposed management of surface water is not currently acceptable, we would conclude that a viable & deliverable strategy has not been provided.*

Based upon the limited supporting documents and assumption/s made with regard to the discharge of surface water we (DC/FRM) recommend that a precautionary approach be adopted and request that a (Holding) Objection be applied, pending the subsequent supply & acceptance of a conceptual strategy of surface water management that is both viable & deliverable.

8.5 In response to other concerns raised the scheme was reduced from 10 to 6 units. The Flood Risk Management Team commented that the proposals do not qualify as major development and therefore does not require their formal input as a statutory

consultee and are obliged to defer to others in this matter. In response to the comments of both the Flood Risk Management Team and Wessex Water a plan was submitted showing proposed connection points for four and surface water. A discretionary comment was received from the Flood Risk Management Team:

'The proposed surface water (sw) drainage strategy proposes a regulated discharge of 1.5l/s to an existing sw sewer, via a new connection and necessary requisition. To this end, the in-principle agreement of both Wessex Water and DC Highways should be secured'

8.6 Wessex Water were re-consulted on the application and made the following further comment.

8.7 Further Wessex Water - *We can accept a surface water connection to the public surface water sewer at a restricted discharge rate of 1.5 l/s. A developer can requisition Wessex Water to lay a sewer to serve a site if there is no access to a public sewer.*

8.8 Highways – *The Highway Authority has no objection subject to conditions for vehicle access construction, turning and parking construction as submitted and surface water drainage.*

8.9 Environmental Health – No comments received at the time of report preparation.

8.10 Archaeologist – *The Roman cemetery appears to be concentrated on the same hilltop as Jordan Hill Roman temple, and archaeological work on the south-east side of that hill has not found anything. The most relevant work in this regard was a watching brief carried out in 1999 that found nothing of archaeological significance. The work is recorded as taking place at no. 57 Bowleaze Coveway, although it might have been on the construction of no. 61 itself. Hence, my advice is that archaeology is not a constraint that needs to be taken into account when this application is determined.*

8.11 Technical Services – *With regards to this application I wish to comment as follows. The site falls within SMP2 policy unit 5g14: Furzy Cliff which has a policy statement of "No Active Intervention" for the next 100 years. This means that there is no expectation for constructing any coastal protection measures along this section of coast over this period. As a consequence, predicted coastal recession zones within the Coastal Risk Planning Guidance (CRPG) indicate that there is a 5% chance the site could be affected in the medium-term i.e. 20-50 years and additionally there is a 5% chance the highway (Bowleaze Coveway) fronting the site could be threatened in the shorter term i.e. 0-20 years. The implications of this are that access to the site would be threatened should Bowleaze Coveway be affected by future recession of Furzy Cliff before the site itself. The applicant should be fully aware of the risk implications in carrying out development at this location. The CRPG states that no permanent development should occur in the area at risk of erosion along the cliff top or the coastal slope seawards of the defined*

erosion bands, however, given the 'temporary' beach hut nature of the proposals, a time-limited planning consent may be appropriate given the expected timing of future risks. Any development should demonstrate how it will adapt to future coastal change risks, including how it can be safely removed in advance of its loss to coastal change. In this regard, the CRPG suggests short term holiday lets or camping/caravan sites or facilities associated with tourism and leisure can be considered acceptable in some instances. There does not appear to be any obvious sign of ground instability at the site and from my understanding of the proposals, I would not expect them to exacerbate any ground instability. I would advise that any collected surface water is discharged to a piped drainage system and not to soakaway at this location.

8.12 Planning Obligations Manager – *On the understanding that there will be an occupancy restriction on the units I have no other requirement from a planning obligations perspective.*

8.13 Weymouth Town Council - *The Council objects on the grounds of policy Wey14 in the 2015 Local Plan which states that the development should be restricted to a certain area detailed in map 3.1, impact on the countryside, concerns around overlooking and loss of privacy, inappropriate development along a residential street scene, coastal erosion and refusal of previous planning applications. The site is also an important local gap between residential properties and holiday sites.*

9.0 Representations

9.1 The application was originally submitted for the erection of 10 holiday units, it was then reduced to 6 units and the application was re-consulted on. The following comments were made in response to both consultations. In response to the consultations 8 third party comments were received objecting to the proposal, the comments are summarised below:

- Distribution of roman cemetery
- Already high volume of traffic on Bowleaze Coveaway Road
- Area saturated to full capacity with overnight accommodation with Waterside Holiday Park and the Riviera Hotel
- No justification for holiday lodges
- Attract anti-social behaviour with no on-site management for security issues and noise disturbance
- Out of character with Bowleaze Coveaway
- Increased fire risk
- Small parking area with no serviceable turning or loading area
- No bin and recycling area
- On street parking is already challenging
- Area at risk from coastal erosion

- Wessex Water has rejected the proposed surface water drainage due to the risk of sewer flooding and pollution
- Impact on biodiversity
- Prominent eyesore from coastal footpaths
- Loss of residential visual amenity
- Loss of privacy and disturbance to residents
- Noise, pollution and dust
- Concerns they will be used as dwellings
- Loss of green/open space
- Request for a restriction of 5 months occupancy
- Encroachment on land that acts as a natural divide between residential homes and commercial zone
- Road safety and pedestrian access concerns
- Area of historic importance along the Jurassic Coast
- Harm to the landscape character
- Overlooking of adjacent neighbour, impact on peaceful surroundings and enjoyment of garden
- Proposed height would be overbearing and visually intrusive
- All other residential properties enjoy large gardens on large plots of land conflicts with planning grain of its locality
- Outside of the defined development boundary
- Significantly alter the fabric of the area
- Overdevelopment
- Parked cars opposite the proposed access
- Encroachment into the open land forming an important gap
- Not in keeping with the surrounding houses
- Emergency vehicles not able to carry out duties due to the increased parking and traffic

9.2 Concerns were also raised regarding the impact of the proposal on property prices however this is not considered to be a material planning consideration and therefore won't be considered as part of this application.

10.0 Relevant Policies

West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan

ENV 1 – Landscape, Seascape and Sites of Geological Interest
 ENV 2 – Wildlife and Habitats
 ENV 3 – Green Infrastructure Network
 ENV 4 – Heritage Assets
 ENV 5 – Flood Risk
 ENV 7 – Coastal Erosion and Land Instability
 ENV 10 – The Landscape and Townscape Setting
 ENV 11 – The Pattern of Streets and Spaces

ENV 12 – The Design and Positioning of Buildings
ENV 15 – Efficient and Appropriate Use of Land
ENV 16 – Amenity
SUS 2 – Distribution of Development
ECON 6 – Built Tourist Accommodation
HOUS 1 – Affordable Housing
COM 7 – Creating a Safe and Efficient Transport Network
COM 9 – Parking Standards in New Development
COM 10 – The Provision of Utilities Service Infrastructure

National Planning Policy Framework

2. Achieving sustainable development
6. Building a strong, competitive economy
11. Making effective use of land
12. Achieving well-designed places
14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Other material considerations

Urban Design SPG
DCC Parking Standards Guidance
Managing Coastal Change: Coastal Planning Guidance for West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland

11.0 Human rights

Article 6 - Right to a fair trial.
Article 8 - Right to respect for private and family life and home.
The first protocol of Article 1 Protection of property

This Recommendation is based on adopted Development Plan policies, the application of which does not prejudice the Human Rights of the applicant or any third party.

12.0 Public Sector Equalities Duty

As set out in the Equalities Act 2010, all public bodies, in discharging their functions must have “due regard” to this duty. There are 3 main aims:-

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people
- Encouraging people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where participation is disproportionately low.

Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage the Duty is to have “regard to” and remove OR minimise disadvantage and in considering the merits of this planning application the planning authority has taken into consideration the requirements of the PSED.

In the context of the above PSED, the application is outline all matters reserved so details shown are indicative at this stage and therefore PSED will have to be considered further at the reserved matters stage. However the indicative plans do show two parking spaces on the site in close proximity to the proposed holiday units.

13.0 Financial benefits

Benefits of the proposed development	
Increased spending in the local area by visitors	Not known.

14.0 Climate Implications

14.1 The application site is located in walking distance of the beach at Bowleaze Coveaway and the facilities of the leisure complex which will mean that visitors will not be reliant on the car. There is also a bus services that runs daily from the Waterside Holiday Park (which is in walking distance) to Weymouth Seafront which would give access to all the facilities of Weymouth Town Centre.

15.0 Planning Assessment

15.1 Principle of Development

The application site is located outside the defined development boundary (DDB) however it is located in close proximity to the DDB. Local Plan policy SUS 2 of sets out that *outside defined development boundaries, development will be strictly controlled, having regard to the need for the protection of the countryside and environmental constraint, and be restricted to:*

- *New employment, tourism, educational/training, recreational or leisure related development*

The proposal is for the erection of up to 6 no. holiday units. As the proposal is for holiday accommodation it can be considered acceptable outside of the DDB subject to compliance with other policies of the local plan. The proposed holiday units are not considered to fall under the definition of a ‘caravan’ as they would have a mezzanine floor and would not fall under the size dimensions. Therefore the proposal will be considered against the Local Plan policy ECON 6, Built Tourist Accommodation. The proposal is new built tourist accommodation and is considered to comply with ECON 6 as it is located adjacent to the DDB for Weymouth.

15.2 Visual Amenity

The application is for the erection of up to 6 holiday units, it is an outline application with all matters reserved. Any reserved matters applications would need to consider the visual impact in terms of scale and design but at this 'in principle stage' it is considered that the development of up to 6 holiday units could be achieved that would not be unduly prominent in terms of the neighbouring properties and the local character.

Concerns have been raised regarding the loss of the open field site that provides separation between the residential properties of Bowleaze Coveaway and the Holiday Park. The application site only forms part of the field providing that separation and the retention of the ecological corridor on the site means that only the western half of the site would be developed. The site plan is indicative but it does show parking towards the front of the site which would be reflective of existing plots on Bowleaze Coveaway. This arrangement would also mean when approaching the site from the direction of Weymouth Town Centre the units would not be highly visible as they would be positioned behind the existing residential properties of the street. Then when viewed in closer proximity the holiday park would also be visible to the eye. The application site would not extend out further than the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties maintaining that line to the rear. When approached from the Holiday Park end of Bowleaze Coveaway the units would be visible with the residential properties of Bowleaze Coveaway behind.

15.3 Residential Amenity

The proposed development is for the erection of up to 6 holiday units. To the east of the site and directly to the north of the site is open field. To the west of the site is the neighbouring residential property no. 61 Bowleaze Coveaway. The application site is separated from no. 61 by the driveway of no. 59 which sits to the rear of no. 61. The application is for outline permission all matters reserved. The indicative site plan shows 6 units set back slightly from the western boundary of the site with large bi-fold doors facing away from the neighbouring properties. The application site slopes away from the neighbouring property no. 61 and therefore the proposed units would be located on lower ground and would be separated by the existing driveway. Concerns have also been raised that the plans do not show a bin or recycling area however this would be considered at reserved matters stage and the submitted site plan is only indicative. At reserved matters stage the number of units, scale of the units and positioning of windows would have to be considered. However there is nothing to suggest at this outline stage that the proposal would result in adverse impacts on neighbours and policy ENV 16 is met.

15.4 Land Instability

The application site is located within SMP2 policy unit 5g14: Furzy Cliff which has a policy statement of "No Active Intervention" for the next 100 years. Technical Services were consulted on the application and set out that as *a consequence, predicted coastal*

recession zones within the Coastal Risk Planning Guidance (CRPG) indicate that there is a 5% chance the site could be affected in the medium-term i.e. 20-50 years and additionally there is a 5% chance the highway (Bowlaze Coveaway) fronting the site could be threatened in the shorter term i.e. 0-20 years. The implications of this are that access to the site would be threatened should Bowlaze Coveaway be affected by future recession of Furzy Cliff before the site itself. Technical Services commented that the CRPG states that no permanent development should occur in the area at risk of erosion along the cliff top or the coastal slope seawards of the defined erosion bands, however, given the 'temporary' beach hut nature of the proposals, a time-limited planning consent may be appropriate given the expected timing of future risks. In this regard, the CRPG suggests short term holiday lets or camping/caravan sites or facilities associated with tourism and leisure can be considered acceptable in some instances. There does not appear to be any obvious sign of ground instability at the site and from my understanding of the proposals, I would not expect them to exacerbate any ground instability. Therefore in line with the Technical Services comments if the application were approved a time limit condition would be placed on the approval for a period of 10 years and the holiday accommodation conditions.

15.5 Biodiversity

The application site is located within a bottleneck ecological corridor which connects to the wider countryside. Natural England were consulted on the application and considered that the loss of this exceptionally important ecological corridor bottleneck through narrowing at its most constrained point to be wholly unacceptable. Natural England were of the opinion that if the applicant were to retain at least half of the redline boundary north to south, divided by an ecological barrier, managed under an ecological management plan then it may be argued that there is no net-loss to the environment and biodiversity. In response to these comments a revised Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP) and site plan were submitted showing the retention of the ecological corridor on half of the site. Conditions would be placed on any approval for the ecological corridor to be maintained and the development to be carried out in accordance with the BMEP. The Appropriate Assessment for the proposed development in accordance with Regulation 63(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) has been carried and agreed by Natural England.

15.6 Highway Safety

The proposal is for the erection of up to 6 holiday units. The application is outline with all matters reserved and therefore the submitted site plan showing the access and parking arrangements is indicative at this stage and would be a consideration at the reserved matters stage. However, Highways were consulted on the application and raised no objections to the proposal subject to conditions for the vehicle access construction, turning and parking construction and surface water drainage. The requested condition for the turning and parking construction would not be placed on any approval at this stage as those details are indicative and would be put on at the reserved matters stage. Highways did advise that the proposed access arrangements could be improved if the

access was swapped with the proposed parking as currently shown on the indicative site plan so this will be added as an informative.

15.7 Drainage

The application site falls entirely within Flood Zone one. The Flood Risk Management Team were consulted on the application and commented that it is unlikely that infiltration rates would support the use of soakaways within the proposed scheme. The site is not considered to be at risk of flooding but it has the potential to exacerbate the prevailing risk to adjacent properties and infrastructure if surface water runoff from impermeable surfaces is not adequately managed. The Flood Risk Management Team placed a holding objection on the proposal as the application was not supported by a site specific Drainage Strategy. Wessex Water were consulted on the application and commented that there must be no surface water connections into the foul sewer network. In response to other concerns raised on the proposal the scheme was reduced from 10 units to up to 6 holiday units which meant the proposal was no longer considered 'major' development. A plan was also submitted showing the proposed connection points for foul and surface water. Wessex Water commented on the further information and commented that *'we can accept a surface water connection to the public surface water sewer at a restricted discharge rate of 1.5 l/s*. The reduction in the number of units meant the scheme no longer qualifies as major development requiring the input of the Flood Risk Management Team as a statutory consultee. A condition would be placed on any approval for the submission of a drainage scheme.

15.8 Archaeology

The application site is located in an area of archaeological importance, concern has also been raised by a third party that the proposal would result in the distribution of a roman cemetery. The Senior Archaeologist was consulted on the application and considered that the Roman cemetery appears to be concentrated on the same hilltop as Jordan Hill Roman temple, and archaeological work on the south-east of that hill has not found anything and advised that archaeology is not a constraint that needs to be taken into account when this application is determined.

15.9 Affordable Housing

An affordable housing contribution is not required in this case as the proposal is for holiday accommodation.

15.10 Community Infrastructure Levy

The adopted charging schedule only applies a levy on proposals that create a dwelling and/or a dwelling with restricted holiday use. All other development types are therefore set a £0 per square metre CIL rate.

The development proposal is not CIL liable.

16.0 Conclusion

16.1 The application is for outline permission all matters reserved for the erection of up to 6 no. holiday units. The proposed development is considered to comply with Local Plan policy ECON 6 and therefore the provision of holiday accommodation on the site is considered acceptable in principle. At this in principle stage the proposal is considered acceptable in its general visual impact and impact on neighbouring amenity. The proposal is also considered acceptable subject to conditions in relation to drainage, land instability and biodiversity.

17.0 Recommendation

GRANT, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location & Block Plan – Drawing Number S-1100-01

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2) Approval of the details of the layout, scale and appearance of the building(s), the means of access thereto and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called the Reserved Matters) shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before any development is commenced.

REASON: To ensure the satisfactory development of the site.

3) Application for approval of any 'reserved matter' must be made not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

REASON: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

4) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

REASON: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

5) This permission is limited to the period expiring on 31/01/2023 when the holiday units and any associated structures/works hereby permitted shall be removed and the land

restored in accordance with a scheme of works and to a timetable which shall first have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of ground stability.

6) The accommodation subject to this permission shall be occupied for holiday purposes only and shall not be occupied as a person's sole or main place of residence.

REASON: To ensure the accommodation is not used as permanent residential accommodation which would not be appropriate at this location.

7) A register of all persons occupying the holiday accommodation hereby approved shall be kept by, or on behalf of, the owner/ owners of the holiday accommodation. The said register shall be made available for inspection during all reasonable hours at the request of a duly authorised officer of the Local Planning Authority, for such time as the development continues to be used as holiday accommodation.

REASON: To ensure that the accommodation is used for holiday purposes only.

8) The development hereby approved shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Mitigation & Enhancement Plan signed by Laura Ashworth and dated 04/11/2019 and agreed by Natural Environment Team on 04/11/2019, unless a subsequent variation is first agreed in writing with the Council.

REASON: In the interests of biodiversity mitigation and enhancement.

9) An Ecological Corridor shall be maintained along the eastern boundary of the site as shown in the Biodiversity Mitigation & Enhancement Plan signed by Laura Ashworth and dated 04/11/2019 and no hardstanding or structures shall be erected, constructed or sited within that area.

REASON: In the interests of biodiversity mitigation and enhancement.

10) Before the development is first occupied or utilised the first 10.00 metres of the vehicle access, measured from the rear edge of the highway (excluding the vehicle crossing), must be laid out and constructed to a specification which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that a suitably surfaced and constructed access to the site is provided that prevents loose material being dragged and/or deposited onto the adjacent carriageway causing a safety hazard.

11) Before the development hereby approved is first occupied or utilised provision must be made to ensure that no surface water drains directly from the site onto the adjacent public highway.

Reason: To ensure that the site is properly drained and that surface water does not flow onto the highway.

12) No development shall take place until a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, and including clarification of how surface water is to be managed during construction and a timetable for the implementation of the scheme, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surface water scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the submitted details and timetable for implementation.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding.

Informatives:

1) NPPF Statement

2) The vehicle crossing serving this proposal (that is, the area of highway land between the nearside carriageway edge and the site's road boundary) must be constructed to the specification of the Highway Authority in order to comply with Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. The applicant should contact Dorset Highways by telephone at Dorset Direct (01305 221000), by email at dorsetdirect@dorsetcc.gov.uk, or in writing at Dorset Highways, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ, before the commencement of any works on or adjacent to the public highway.

3) Highways have advised that the access arrangement can be improved by swapping the proposed access and parking around as shown on the proposed site plan (PL-1100-01F). This will mean that the access will be separated from the neighbouring driveway.

4) It is advised that as part of the reserved matters a site section should be submitted showing the changing levels of the site and the relationship of the proposed units and the neighbouring property no. 61 Bowleaze Coveaway.