

## PLANNING AND BUILDING (JERSEY) LAW 2002 (AS AMENDED)

Appeal under Article 108 (2) (a) against a decision to grant planning permission

### Report to the Minister for the Environment

By Sue Bell MSc., BSc, FCIEEM, CEcol, CWEM,  
An Inspector appointed under Article 107

**Appellant:** Mrs Ruth Higgins

**Planning Permission Reference Number:** P/2019/1255

**Decision notice date:** 19 December 2019

**Location:** Le Coin, Manor Park Road, St. Helier, JE2 3GH

**Description of Development:** (Construct 1 No. two bed residential dwelling with associated landscaping.) Description Change: Construct 1 No. three bed residential dwelling with associated landscaping.

**Appeal Procedure and Date:** Hearing 4 March 2020

**Site Visit procedure and Date:** Accompanied 4 March 2020

**Date of Report:** 23 March 2020

---

### Introduction and Procedural Note

1. This is a third-party appeal by Mrs Ruth Higgins against a decision to grant planning permission for the construction of a new two-storey property within the grounds of Le Coin.
2. Permission was granted by the Planning Committee (the “Committee”) on 4 March 2020, following a recommendation for approval by the Growth, Housing and Environment Department (the “Department”). The decision was referred to the Committee owing to the number of objections received. Permission was granted subject to two standard conditions (relating to the period within which development should be commenced and a requirement that development should be in accordance with the stated plans) and eight conditions specific to the proposed development.
3. A summary of the cases presented by the appellant, the applicant, and the Department during the application and the appeal are presented below. Further details are available in the statements and other documents submitted by each party, which are available through the Planning Applications Register website.

### The appeal site and surroundings

4. The appeal site lies within the garden ground and to the east of the bungalow known as Le Coin, which is located to the west of a tight-knit built-up area known as Manor Park Road. Le Coin and its garden sit on a raised area of land, which slopes steeply downwards to the north and east. Immediately to the north and north-west of the appeal site are two properties: ‘Weelsi’ and ‘St Patrick’, which sit at a lower level

than Le Coin within the area known as Palm Grove. To the east is an area of woodland within the Vallee de Vaux, which is managed by the National Trust. To the south of the site and situated at a higher level are buildings associated with D'Auvergne school and New Gilson Hall.

### **The proposed development**

5. The proposal is to construct a new two-storey dwelling within the garden grounds of Le Coin, with associated landscaping. The plans show two-bedrooms and a play-room, hence the Department has treated this as an application for a three-bedroom dwelling.
6. The building would be contemporary in style, with a flat roof, vertical timber-style cladding and large double-glazed windows at ground and first floor level on the eastern elevation. Openings on the north elevation would be restricted to two windows at first floor level, both serving bathrooms.
7. Access would be gained via the existing parking area in front of Le Coin. This would also provide space for parking for the new dwelling.

### **Case for the appellant**

8. The appeal has been made by Mrs Ruth Higgins, who has been supported on the appeal form by Mrs Sarah Measday and Miss Delia Hardiman.
9. The following grounds of appeal have been identified by the appellant on the appeal form and are expanded upon in the statement of case:
  - Overdevelopment on cramped site;
  - Overbearing design out of context with nearby dwellings;
  - Light and noise pollution and detrimental effect on wildlife;
  - Not in accordance with Island Plan Policy GD1;
  - Design conflicts with Policy GD7;
  - Loss of privacy and adverse effect of noise and disturbance on neighbours;
  - Insignificant reduction of footprint and mass of the building;
  - Potential of serious landslide onto neighbouring property below called 'Weelsi' due to developing foundations and foul sewerage facilities;
  - The needs set out in the planning statement could be met by other means;
  - Car parking and vehicle access are severely limited on this small site.
10. The appellant considers the proposed development would be a large, dominant and overbearing structure in a cramped garden area. It would be overbearing to the neighbouring property 'Weelsi' and dominant in the skyline to the neighbouring property 'St Patrick'.
11. The mass and design of the proposed building would conflict with Policy GD7 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (revised 2014) in that it would not respond positively to the landscape and would be alien to the surrounding context. The vehicular access and parking are considered minimal. In addition, the appellant considers that the development would have a detrimental and adverse effect on immediate neighbours as a result of loss of privacy, loss of light and noise disturbance.
12. The installation of the foul sewerage would require deep excavation at the edge of a steep area of land. This area appears to be in an unstable condition and would,

result in a high risk of subsidence and landslide with serious consequences for the property 'Weelsi'.

13. Pollution by light, noise and disturbance would have a significant and detrimental effect on the wildlife and Green Zone in the area on the border of the area of Le Coin. Further investigation is required of the proposal to fell a mature, healthy Jersey Oak Tree.

#### **Case for the Department & Planning Committee**

14. The Department's analysis of the application is presented in its Report to the Planning Committee.
15. The site is located in the Built-up Area where the spatial strategies of the Island Plan direct development (Policy SP1 - Spatial Strategy and Policy SP2 - Efficient use of resources). There is a general presumption in favour of new dwellings in the Built-up Areas as explained in Policy H6 - Housing development within the Built-up Area. Policy GD3 - Density of development, requires the highest reasonable density of development to be achieved. The Island Plan at paragraph 1.8 accepts ahead of policy GD3 that "*The density of existing development in an area should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring replication of existing style and form.*"
16. A previous scheme for the site was refused. The current proposal has been amended to respond to those reasons for refusal. The footprint has been reduced from 130sqm to 96sqm and the terrace/decking removed from the scheme. As a result, the proposed dwelling has been pulled away from the boundary with the neighbouring properties to the north-west, which provide an opportunity for soft landscaping and breathing space around the proposed dwelling, Le Coin itself and the neighbouring properties.
17. Policy GD7 requires design to respond to existing buildings, settlement form and character, topography, landscape features and the wider landscape setting. The overall design takes its architectural cues from the school to the rear. The revised scheme would allow provision of a meaningful soft landscaping scheme to enable the building to sit more comfortably in the setting. The previous scheme was not refused on design grounds and the proposed scheme has not altered the design of the dwelling. In terms of consistency of decision-making it would be unreasonable not to support the scheme on design grounds. Consequently, it is considered to adequately satisfy the requirements of Policy GD7.
18. The development satisfies the Department's residential standards regarding space and amenity. The host dwelling would retain adequate space for a rear private garden. As such, the proposal is considered to satisfy the requirements of Policy H6 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (revised 2014). Likewise, the parking provision is considered to satisfy the Department's standards.
19. The most directly impacted neighbours are those to the north-west: 'Weelsi' and Le Coin itself. There are two small windows within the north roof plane, to minimise overlooking on the private patio of 'Weelsi'. These two windows would serve bathrooms and therefore a condition would be required to ensure they are obscure glazed.

20. The test of paragraph 3 of Policy GD1 - General Development Considerations of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (revised 2014) is whether a development has an unreasonable impact on adjoining property. Given the reduction in footprint, which would result in a dwelling which is pulled away from the boundary with the neighbouring properties, the proposed dwelling is no longer considered to have an overbearing impact on these properties, despite its elevated position. It is therefore considered to satisfy the requirements of Policy GD1
21. The proposed development includes a landscaping scheme. Given the proximity of the site to the Green Zone and the mature landscaping of Vallee de Vaux, a condition has been attached to ensure that the landscaping is implemented.

### **Case for the Applicant**

22. The application site is located within the Main Urban settlement of St Helier within the Built-up Area, which is where the Spatial Strategy of the Island Plan directs development. The development proposals have been designed in accordance with published guidance Policy Note 6 - Supplementary Planning Guidance "A minimum specification for new housing developments" (1994 & 2009 as amended in 2012) and hence provide an adequate standard of accommodation as required by Policy H6 of the Island Plan.
23. The Island's spatial strategy encourages a more sustainable approach to the development and redevelopment of land and recognises that this requires the delivery of higher densities and greater housing yields. Policy GD3 requires the highest level of density of development on sites consistent with strategic objectives relating to the protection of the environment, design quality and impact on neighbouring uses. The proposed development has been designed in accordance with Policy GD3 taking into account the need to balance the impact of proposals upon the character and environment of the Island and the amenities of neighbours.
24. The application site lies on the edge of suburban La Pouquelaye, which has a very mixed character comprising a mix of twentieth century, predominantly detached houses, set in their own grounds. There are a mix of two-storey buildings and bungalows.
25. The relationships resulting from the location of the proposed development are set out on drawing 1771000 GA(10)-020 and do not appear cramped or out of character with the arrangement of development in the immediate settlement.
26. Policy SP4 provides protection of Jersey's biodiversity and the Island's heritage assets. The proposed development would be entirely within the existing garden of Le Coin, which is currently managed as lawn. Ecological value is confined to the edges of the site and the woodland slopes which fall away to the east. The development proposals include the retention of existing landscape features to the north and on the slopes. The Initial Ecological Assessment recommends measures to mitigate the impacts of development upon protected species. The applicant would carry out development proposals in accordance with the recommended mitigation measures.
27. Paragraph 3 of Policy GD1 provides for the protection of neighbour's amenities. The effect of development proposals upon neighbours has been a key design consideration and has informed design proposals.

28. The application site is currently used as garden and overlooking relationships already exist between the site and neighbours. It is considered that the distance of the wall of the dwelling from the northern boundary, together with retention of the existing boundary hedge does not result in any overbearing impact between the application site and neighbours. Any relationship between the proposed development and neighbours to the north is minimised because of the change in levels caused by topography. Window openings within the proposed development would predominantly face east and overlook woodland. The development proposes the retention of existing boundary landscape features along the northern boundary and the introduction of additional planting to further screen the application site from the garden of Weelsi.
29. The existing parking provides space to meet the Regulation Department's requirements. Vehicle access from Manor Park Road exists.
30. The grant of planning permission does not override the need to ensure that development can take place without resulting in adverse impacts through land slippage. Any implementation of the permission would need to be informed by an engineer's assessment. Consideration could be given to working hours to reduce disturbance to neighbours during construction.

### Consultation Responses

31. The Roads Committee of the **Parish of St Helier**, in its response of 6 November 2019, approve the scheme, provided that the refuse store and collection arrangements are agreed in detail with the Parish Refuse Manager and that a refuse separation and recycling strategy is also agreed in conjunction with the Parish.
32. The **Growth, Housing and Environment Department - Drainage** Section issued two responses dated 29 October 2019 and 6 November 2019. The first requested further information about proposals for foul water drainage proposals. Following provision of further information by the applicant, in the form of drawing GA(10)-022-P1, the Department confirmed that it had no further objection to the proposal.
33. The **Natural Environment Team** also issued two responses. In its response of 23 October 2019, the team requested further information in relation to protection of boundary features and the woodland and cōtil beyond. In particular, it requested information to demonstrate how the works would be achieved without causing adverse impacts to the hedgerow and habitats to the east of the site.
34. Following receipt of revised landscape plan GA-10-201, the Team confirmed that, *"provided the undertakings given to put in place mitigation, compensatory and corrective measures are fully implemented as described"* then the scheme could be approved.

### Representations

35. Eleven responses were received from 10 parties during the application stage. One of these supported the scheme. The remaining responses were objections on the basis of:
  - Overdevelopment of a cramped site;
  - Effects on light and privacy of residents;
  - Noise and disturbance to neighbours;
  - Risk of landslide;
  - Disturbance of wildlife and loss of trees;

- Overbearing to houses below & conflict with GD7;
- Restricted access for vehicles and parking
- Not in accordance with Island Plan GD1.

36. Seven comments were received during the appeal. All except one of these comments were received from parties who had also commented at the application stage. The new comment was made in support of the application. The grounds of objection from five parties mirrored the concerns raised at the application stage.

### Policy assessment

37. A summary of the key policies within the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (revised 2014) identified by the Department in its assessment or in representations is provided below.
38. **Policy SP1 - Spatial Strategy** directs development to the Island's Built-up Area and in particular the Town of St Helier.  
*Inspector's assessment:* The proposal lies within the Built-up Area, within the Main Urban Settlement and the designated Town of St Helier. There is no dispute between parties on this point.
39. **SP4 - Protecting the natural and historic environment** states that the protection of the island's heritage assets will be key material considerations in the determination of planning applications.  
*Inspector's assessment:* The appeal site lies next to an area of woodland, which lies within the Green Zone and is owned by the National Trust. The effects of the proposals on this woodland area are one of the grounds of objection raised by the appellants and is considered further in the next section.
40. **Policy H6 - Housing Development within the Built-up Area**, sets a presumption for proposals for new dwellings within the boundary of the Built-up Area, provided that the proposal is in accordance with the required standards for housing as established and adopted by the Minister for Planning and Environment through supplementary planning Guidance.  
*Inspector's assessment:* The proposal lies within the Built-up Area. There is no disagreement between parties that the proposed dwelling meets the required standards.
41. **Policy GD3 - Density of Development** promotes a more sustainable approach to the development and redevelopment of land in accord with the Strategic Policies of the Plan (Policy SP1 'Spatial Strategy' and Policy SP2 'Efficient use of resources'). This will require the highest reasonable density is achieved for all developments, commensurate with good design, adequate amenity space and parking and without unreasonable impact on adjoining properties.  
*Inspector's assessment:* the ability of the proposal site to accommodate development is one of the appellant's grounds of appeal.
42. **GD1 - General development considerations** sets out the criteria that must be met by all proposed development. The six paragraphs that make up the policy refer to different aspects of a development. Paragraph 3 relates to effects on neighbouring uses.  
*Inspector's assessment:* The extent to which the proposal complies with the requirements of paragraph 3 in relation to effects on neighbouring uses is an issue of dispute between the parties.

43. **Policy GD7 - Design quality** requires that developments should have a high quality of design that respects, conserves and contributes positively to the diversity and distinctiveness of the landscape and built context, in accord with the principles of good urban design set out in policy SP7. It also lists the criteria that will be considered when assessing the quality of design. These include (1) the scale, form, massing, orientation, siting and density of the development and inward and outward views; (2) the relationship to existing buildings, settlement form and character, topography, landscape features and the wider landscape setting; (3) the degree to which design details, colours, materials and finishes reflect or complement the style and traditions of local buildings; (5) the incorporation of existing site features into the development such as boundary walls, banks and trees.  
*Inspector's assessment:* the quality of the design and how it relates to the existing buildings, character of the area and wider landscape setting are matters raised in the appellant's objection.
44. **Policy NE7 - Green Zone**, provides for a high level of protection of the Green Zone. It defines the circumstances and criteria for identifying circumstances where development within the Green Zone may be permissible.  
*Inspector's assessment:* The proposal does not lie within the Green Zone, although it abuts it.

#### **Inspector's assessment and analysis of the issues**

45. Based on the written documentation including the grounds of appeal, the representations to the application, my site inspection and discussions at the Hearing, I conclude that the main issues in this appeal are the extent to which the proposals accord with the requirements of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (revised 2014), and in particular:
- The density and scale of the proposed development and how this relates to the requirements of policies GD3 and GD7;
  - The effects of the proposals on neighbouring amenity in relation to overbearing, loss of privacy, loss of light and noise generation and how these relate to the requirements of Policy GD1;
  - The mass and design of the proposed development and how this relates to the requirements of Policy GD7;
  - The effects of the proposals on the natural environment; and
  - The adequacy of the proposed parking arrangements.

#### The density and scale of the proposed development

46. The strategic policies of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (revised 2014) supported by Policy GD3 require the highest reasonable density to be achieved for all developments, commensurate with good design. The preamble to the policy, at paragraph 1.8, page 40 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (revised 2014) notes that "*the density of existing development in an area should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change*". Density of development is also one of the aspects to be considered when considering the design of a proposal (Policy GD7 item 1).
47. During my site inspection, I observed the mixed housing character of the area surrounding the appeal site. This includes a mix of mainly detached and semi-detached properties along Manor Park Road. These properties appeared to be closely spaced, with little space between them on the street frontages. There is no doubt

that the proposal would represent an increase in the density of development, through introducing a new dwelling to the garden area. However, based on my observations, I do not consider that this would result in an increase in density that would appear out of character with the immediate surrounding area.

48. I observed that the properties within Palm Grove to the north of the appeal site are more widely separated than those within Manor Park Road. However, the proposed dwelling would be set back from neighbouring properties to the north by a distance in the order of 14 metres laterally and by a difference in ground levels. There would also be space between the proposed dwelling and the existing property Le Coin.
49. The proposed dwelling would have a compact design, over two floors. Nevertheless, it would meet the Housing standards as required by Policy H6 including provision of external amenity space, whilst retaining an area of external amenity space for Le Coin. Consequently, I do not consider that the proposal would represent overdevelopment on a cramped site or result in an overly dense development and so would satisfy the requirements of Policy GD3 and GD7 (item 1) of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (revised 2014).

The effects of the proposals on neighbouring amenity in relation to overbearing, loss of privacy, loss of light and noise generation

50. During my site inspection I visited the neighbouring properties to the north: 'Weelsi' and 'St Patrick'. I observed the significant difference in ground levels between the appeal site and these properties. The roof height of the proposed dwelling would be a little under 0.7 metres higher than the ridge of the Le Coin, which is already clearly visible on the raised plateau above and behind 'Weelsi' and St Patrick. However, the proposed dwelling would be located further to the east and set back behind the face of Le Coin - placing it away from the properties to the north. I consider that this proposed location, set-back back from the edge of the raised land and offset to the east, would be respectful to the properties to the north and would not result in overbearing.
51. I have considered whether the proposed structure would appear dominant in the skyline to the occupiers of 'St Patrick', both from the external terrace and the large picture window, which faces south-east. Whilst I accept that it would be visible from these perspectives, given its set-back position, choice of finishes, the backdrop provided by the school buildings and woodland and presence of soft landscaping, I do not consider that it would be significantly more prominent or dominant in views than Le Coin is at present.
52. The access to the proposed dwelling would be along the northern boundary of Le Coin and the external amenity area would also be to the north of the proposed property. I observed that there is already a visual relationship between Le Coin, including its external amenity areas and the neighbouring properties to the north. The potential for overlooking is greatest along the northern boundary of the garden area of Le Coin. I saw that the existing hedge at the edge of the plateau and topography means that the ability to overlook the properties to the north reduces rapidly as one moves away from the hedge. The use of much of this area as garden ground would remain unchanged. I therefore conclude that any overlooking as a result of the proposals would be no greater than is already possible and would not result in unreasonable harm on the privacy of the neighbouring properties to the north.

53. For similar reasons, I do not consider that the proposals would result in an increase in noise, which would result in unreasonable harm on the amenities of the occupiers of the properties to the north.
54. The proposed dwelling includes only two windows in the northern elevation, both of which would serve bathrooms. Condition 5 to the appealed decision would require these to comprise obscured glass. I therefore conclude that the potential for overlooking from the proposed dwelling is minimal.
55. I have considered the relative distances between the proposed dwelling and the neighbouring properties to the north. Even allowing for the difference in ground levels and the fact that the proposed dwelling would be located to the south, given the distances involved, I do not consider that the proposals would result in a loss of light to the neighbouring properties.
56. It is accepted that there would be some increased noise during construction of the property. However, this would be short-lived and would not be sufficient reasons to refuse the proposal.
57. I do not, therefore, consider that the proposal would unreasonably harm the amenities of neighbouring uses, including the living conditions for nearby residents, and hence would satisfy the requirements of Policy GD1.

#### The mass and design of the proposed development

58. The appellants state that the proposed development is a large, dominant and overbearing structure. They do not consider that its design responds positively to the landscape and the surrounding context of the adjoining Green Zone. In particular, the two-storey design, the box-like form and the use of cladding are considered to be out of character with the surrounding area and adjoining bungalow.
59. As noted above, Policy GD7 requires a high quality of design that respects, conserves and contributes positively to the diversity and distinctiveness of the landscape and the built context, in accord with the principles of good urban design. However, it is not prescriptive about what would be appropriate. These are decisions that need to be taken on a case by case basis.
60. I observed that the appeal site is not visible from the roadside elevation, but can be seen in views along Palm Grove. The proposed development would be distinctly contemporary both in its design and choice of materials and would be clearly different in design to the adjacent Le Coin. Nevertheless, during my site inspection I observed the mixed character of buildings within the wider area. I also noted that the immediate backdrop to the proposed dwelling, when viewed from Palm Grove, is provided by the municipal buildings of the school and badminton hall to the south and south-east and by woodland to the east. In addition, the flat-roofed style minimises the height difference between the proposed dwelling and the ridge of Le Coin and the proposed timber cladding would help to integrate the boxy-profile of the dwelling into the adjacent woodland landscape. Overall, when considered in its context, I find that the proposed design would satisfy the requirements of Policy GD7.

#### The effects of the proposals on the natural environment

61. The appeal site is a domestic garden. The Initial Ecological Appraisal did not identify any issues of particular concern, but included proposed mitigation measures to avoid

harm to any protected species that may be present. Condition 7 of the appealed decision would require that these measures are implemented.

62. At the hearing, the applicant confirmed that all the existing planting along the boundary of the site, including trees, would be retained. A survey of the oak tree mentioned in the appellant's submissions had recently been conducted and a copy of the report was supplied to all parties at the hearing. This confirmed that, with management, the oak tree could be retained. Condition 2 of the appealed decision would require the submission and approval of a landscape scheme prior to development commencing. I am content that this would allow for and ensure the future for this tree.
63. The land to the immediate east of the application site does not benefit from any formal protection, but is a valuable landscape and biodiversity asset. The proposals would introduce large areas of glass, allowing overlooking of this woodland area. However, I do not consider that normal domestic lighting is likely to result in a significant increase in light pollution. I also note that Condition 8 to the appealed decision removes Permitted Development rights for any external lighting.
64. I therefore conclude that the proposals would satisfy the requirements of Policy SP4 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (revised 2014).

#### The adequacy of the proposed parking arrangements

65. During the site inspection I observed the area available for parking, which is accessed by a private road. I note that the owner of that road has supported the application for the dwelling and the Department is content that the proposed parking provision would comply with the required parking standards.

#### Other issues raised in the appeal

66. The appellant has raised concerns about the stability of the slope, which supports the appeal site and how this would be affected by the proposed construction works. Whilst I understand these concerns, the grant of planning permission does not remove the responsibilities on the applicant to undertake the works in a safe manner and avoiding land slippage. It would not represent a reason for refusal of the application.
67. The appellant has also made an alternative proposal in relation to the applicant's aspirations. However, that is not a matter for this appeal, which must consider the planning merits of the scheme that has been submitted.

#### **Conditions**

68. During the hearing there was a 'without prejudice' discussion of the conditions that would be applied, should the appeal be dismissed and planning permission granted.
69. Proposed condition 2, which relates to submission and agreement of a soft landscaping scheme, would allow for the proposed landscaping plans to be amended to accommodate retention of the oak tree. I am content that this condition would enable an appropriate soft landscaping scheme to be developed, which safeguards the existing features.
70. The applicant questioned the need for condition 8, which removes permitted development rights. The Department confirmed that this was required to ensure that new areas of hard standing or similar, which could have effects on neighbouring

amenity, could not be introduced without planning permission. I am content that this is an appropriate and necessary condition, both to safeguard neighbouring amenity from any proposals that may come forward in the future, but also to safeguard any potential effects on the adjoining woodland from supplementary lighting.

### **Inspector's Conclusions**

71. The proposal is for a new dwelling, within the grounds of an existing property within the Built-up Area. It would meet current standards for housing and provision of parking. It would result in an increase in density, but for the reasons set out above, I do not find that this increase would be excessive or result in a development that would be out of character with its surroundings. I therefore conclude that it would be consistent with the Spatial Strategy and policies SP1, H6, GD3 and GD7 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (revised 2014).
72. I find that the proposed development would be visible to the neighbouring properties to the north. However, by virtue of its set-back position, choice of materials, nature of the backdrop and use of soft landscaping, I do not consider that the proposed dwelling would be overbearing or result in a loss of light or privacy. I am satisfied that any potential overlooking from windows could be controlled through condition. Thus, the proposed development would not have an unreasonable effect on neighbouring amenity. I therefore conclude that it would satisfy the requirements of policy GD1 and GD7 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (revised 2014).
73. The effects of the proposals on protected species and ecology have been assessed. I am content that the proposed condition would adequately ensure the safeguard of protected species in line with the requirements of policy SP4.

### **Recommendation**

74. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposed development would be consistent with the requirements of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (revised 2014) and that planning permission should be granted.
75. I therefore recommend that the Minister dismisses the appeal and grants planning permission subject to the two general and 8 specific conditions listed on the original decision notice.

*Sue Bell*

Inspector 23/03/2020