

Case Officer	Anna Clark
Application Number	2017/0818/FUL
Site	Land North Of Bath Road Beckington Frome Somerset
Date Received	24th March 2017
Applicant/ Organisation	Doric Developments . Doric Developments
Application Type	Full Application
Proposal	Erection of car dealership; a co-working hub and 5 No. employment starter units (Class B1); and associated access and landscaping works. (Additional drainage strategy info. received 8/5/17; Ecology report received 22/5/17; additional highway info, amended description and amended plans received 5/6/17; Noise Impact Assessment received 8/6/17; Amended description, application form, plans and supporting information received 8/11/17; add highway info 23/11/17); and amended description 28/11/17).
Ward	Beckington And Selwood
Parish	Beckington Parish Council

Description of Site and Proposal and Constraints

The application relates to land north of Bath Road, to the west of the roundabout with the A36 and A361 in Beckington. The site is currently a ploughed field in agricultural use, with agricultural land to the north-west beyond. The A36 dual carriageway runs along its north-eastern side, the village recreation ground lies to the south-west; and there is a petrol filling station (Bathway Service Station), Travelodge hotel and Starbucks café on the opposite side of the road to the south-east.

As amended, the application seeks full planning permission for: *Erection of car dealership; a co-working hub and 5 No. employment starter units (Class B1); and associated access and landscaping works.*

The application followed a formal pre-application enquiry. It has been subject to a number of amendments and the submission of additional supporting information throughout its lifetime as summarised below:

- 8/5/17 - Additional drainage strategy information received
- 22/5/17 – Extended Phase 1 Habitat survey
- 5/6/17 - Additional highway information, amended description and amended plans received
- 8/6/17 - Noise Impact Assessment received
- 8/11/17 - Amended description, application form, plans and supporting information received;
- 23/11/17 - Additional highway information received
- 28/11/17- Amended description.

Re-consultation with specific technical consultees, the parish council and local residents have been undertaken as appropriate.

Summary of Consultation Responses

Beckington and Selwood Ward Member (Cllr Clive Mockford) – Refer to Planning Board if Officer Recommendation for Approval

County Councillor and nearby Norton St Philip ward member (Cllr Linda Oliver) - Objects

On following grounds:

- Inappropriate location outside of development limits, adjacent to village amenities and proximity to residential
- Traffic generation
- Confusion over use classes of proposed development given health screening and car dealership not B class and no change of use applied for land from agriculture
- No identified need / alternative sites available
- Unsustainable development – contrary to NPPF
- Location is contrary to spatial strategy of Local Plan

Beckington Parish Council (host) – Recommends Refusal

- Outside of development limits
- Contrary to Local Plan (especially core policy CP4) and NPPF
- No existing business on the proposed site.
- No need identified in this location (the 'needs of the rural economy' in Beckington are already being very well met)
- Other more suitable sites available, especially Commerce Park
- Impact on the recreation ground and the historic/conservation/residential character of Beckington village
- Traffic generation & highway safety
- Inadequate drainage/ flood risk (existing flooding problem worsening and affecting the residential property concerned, workshops and associated businesses)
- Impact on ecology
- Light pollution.
- Facilitates another space for illegal encampment / fly-tipping to take place

Sets out conditions and section 106 obligations sought should planning permission be granted.

Following re-consultation, added the following points:

- little substantive change in the amended proposal, except for the replacement of the proposed health screening clinic by a 'co-working hub'. - Beckington has a thriving rural economy and high levels of existing employment, with a bookable hall and an additional bookable meeting room at the Memorial Hall, plus further such facilities available close by.
- the roadside land available for a car dealership at Commerce Park remains available (i.e. at the end of November 2017).
- Small and start-up businesses are also catered for at Commerce Park, despite the comments made in this application to the contrary

Frome Town Council - Recommends Refusal for the following summarised reasons:

- Unsuitable location for this type of development
- Contrary to Local Plan (especially CP4) especially given its size
- Commerce Park would be more suitable location given it's an established site in a convenient location for travel in a sustainable manner for employees living in and around Frome.

Rode Parish Council - Object

- Wrong location – outside of settlement limits.
- Precedent for future development of the rest of the triangle between the old A36 and the present highway
- Alternative more suitable sites nearby, including Commerce Park and Fussell's.
- Light pollution

- Traffic generation

Confirmed no change of view following re-consultation.

Woolverton Parish Council - Recommends Refusal for the following summarised reasons:

- Traffic generation & highway safety
- Precedent for future development of the rest of the triangle between the old A36 and the present highway
- Out of character with the rural setting.
- No justification of need for health screening clinic or car showroom here
- Noise and light pollution and impact on residential amenity
- will be very intrusive for the houses along
- sufficient surface water drainage has not been demonstrated/ flood risk
- no indication that the energy needs of the site can be met from the existing infrastructure

Lullington Parish Council - Objects

- Outside Beckington village development limits and is 'Open Countryside' as defined in the Local Plan.
- Too close to an existing residential area.
- Traffic generation & highway safety
- No demonstrated need for a 'Health Screening Centre' [*officer note: this element has since been omitted*]
- Commercial development site potential at Commerce Park already available.
- Inadequate surface water drainage - already a problem for the village.

David Warburton MP – Highlighting concerns raised by constituents, particular in terms of the location.

Frome Civic Society – No comment

Historic Environment Service – No objections

As far as we are aware there are limited or no archaeological implications to this proposal and we therefore have no objections on archaeological grounds.

MDC Environmental Protection – No objection, subject to conditions

Following receipt of a noise assessment, confirmed initial concerns had been addressed adequately, subject to conditions to control construction site noise; Construction Environmental Management Plan and plant noise

Highways Agency – No objection

No objection following receipt of additional information to address their earlier concerns.

Local Highway Authority (SCC Highways) – No objection, subject to conditions

Following receipt of additional information and amended plans advised that in terms of traffic generation the applicant has provided sufficient information and analysis to demonstrate that the scheme will not have a severe impact on the local highway network at peak periods. Raised no objection subject to conditions relating to a Construction Traffic Management Plan; the provision of the footway and dropped kerb crossing facility prior to occupation; the provision of the access as proposed, but also no steeper than 1 in 10 and for a consolidated surface; surface water drainage; and the provision of the vehicle and cycle parking as shown. Reference is also made to the travel plan needing to be secured by section 106. Advice notes are also included regarding the need for a Section 184 Permit for the creation of the new access and a suitable legal agreement with the Highway Authority to secure the construction of the highway works necessary as part of the development.

SCC Ecologist – No objection, subject to conditions

Conditions are sought to protect and mitigate any harm caused to bats, badgers and birds.

Tree Officer – Comments/ Observations/ conditions

Although it is achievable to implement the Tree Protection measures as required by the current proposal layout, the proposals introduce an industrial and regimented layout into a location that is an integral element of the open countryside adjacent - the proposals therefore could be considered to be out of character to a degree.

Concerns regarding the layout due to the impact of the access road into the site (and parking) along the line of the mature boundary hedgerow (western boundary running north-south, approx.) that also contains three significant landscape specimen Oak trees. Concerns there would be pressures to heavily prune the hedges and trees due to concerns over falling debris, and fears over safety in high winds.

Seeks a management plan that takes into account the important features and that focuses on the ecology / wildlife of the area and makes adequate provision for the long-term biodiversity gains that could be acquired.

Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection, subject to condition

Originally objected, but following consideration of the surface water drainage strategy submitted 8/5/17, seeks a condition to provide a more detailed drainage strategy than the outline details proposed. This is required to ensure the increase in impermeable areas would not generate an increase in surface water runoff that is not adequately controlled to prevent increased flood risk to the adjacent properties or the highway.

MDC Drainage Engineer – No objection, subject to conditions

Originally objected, but following consideration of the surface water drainage strategy submitted 8/5/17, raises no objection subject to conditions requiring further investigation to justify and design the most appropriate for surface water drainage. The functionality and capacity of the ditch will also need to be proven and riparian responsibilities will need to be clarified to ensure long term maintenance of the ditch is secured and the necessary permissions [outside the planning process] is sought.

Crime Prevention Design Advisor - No Objection, subject to comments

Ministry of Defence - Confirmed no safeguarding objections.

Public Consultation

117 letters of objection have been received, 2 neutral and 3 in support

The reasons for supports are summarised as follows:

- Job Creation
- Provides suitable start-up and grow-on accommodation to enable local business and economy to grow.

The reasons for refusal are summarised as follows:

- Inappropriate location outside of development limits, adjacent to village amenities and proximity to residential
- Contrary to Local Plan (especially core policy CP4) and NPPF
- No identified need
- Other more suitable alternative sites available, especially Commerce Park
- Impact on the recreation ground and the historic/conservation/residential character of Beckington village
- Landscape & visual impact
- Traffic generation & highway safety
- Inadequate drainage/ flood risk (exacerbate existing problems)
- Noise
- Light pollution.

- Impact on ecology
- Facilitates another space for illegal encampment / fly-tipping to take place

Relevant planning history

No planning history of relevance.

Summary of planning policies:

Policy Context

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 places a duty on local planning authorities to determine proposals in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The following development plan policies and material considerations are relevant to this application:

Development Plan

- Mendip District Local Plan Part 1: Strategy and Policies 2006- 2029 (adopted December 2014)
Policies CP1 (Spatial Strategy), CP3 (Business Development and Growth), CP4 (Sustaining Rural Communities), CP6 (Frome Town Strategy) DP1 (Local Identity and Distinctiveness), DP4 (Mendip's Landscapes), DP5 (Biodiversity and Ecological Networks), DP7 (Design and Amenity), DP8 (Environmental Protection) DP9 (Transport Impact of New Development), DP10 (Parking Standards), DP21 (Managing Town Centre Uses) and DP23 (Managing Flood Risk).

Material Considerations

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
- The Frome Neighbourhood Plan (December 2016)
- Somerset County Council Highways Development Control Standing Advice (June 2017)
- The Countywide Parking Strategy (2013)
- Somerset Travel Plan Guidance (November 2011)

Assessment of relevant issues

Principle of development

Although approx. 90m from the settlement limits of Beckington, identified as a "Primary Village" in the local plan, the application site lies outside of the development limits of any settlement, in open countryside, where development is strictly controlled in accordance with policy CP1.

Whilst the second sentence of criteria 3 of policy CP1 refers to any proposed development outside of development limits only being permitted where it benefits economic activity (or extends the range of facilities available to the local communities), criteria 3 is considered to relate to identifying land for future development through the LP part II – Site Allocation DPD. In any case the proposal is not considered to benefit the economy of the district given its failure to follow the settlement hierarchy in the spatial strategy and availability of alternative sites. The preamble text to Policy CP1 makes it clear that development should be distributed with reference to the settlement hierarchy, which is in the interests of the economy.

Policy CP1 allows for permitting development in exceptional circumstances were they meet the criteria of policy CP4.

Policy CP4 (criteria 4 (b) seeks to allow for development that helps sustain rural communities. It sets out that rural settlements and the wider rural area will be sustained by, amongst other things, supporting proposals for development of the rural economy which:

'enable the establishment, expansion and diversification of business in a manner and of a scale which is appropriate to the location and constraints upon it'.

The proposal is for the establishment of new businesses and not the expansion or diversification of an existing business/es on the site, or demonstrated to be solely for new business in the nearest settlement – Beckington, and as such is not essential to sustaining the rural community it is nearest to. Indeed the number and strength of objections from the local community, host and nearby parish councils and ward members reflects that this officer view is shared by the rural community. The proposal does not demonstrate any links to the village, rather utilising the adjoining road network to Frome, thus fostering a growth in the need to travel. The proposal therefore fails to be appropriate to the location and its constraints.

Policy CP3 supports business development and growth, but only where in accordance with policies CP1 and CP4 and where they (among other matters) limit the growth in demand for private transport and are accessible by sustainable transport modes.

Whilst it is acknowledged there is a need for employment and particularly start-ups in Mendip, it has not been adequately demonstrated why this site in open countryside should be developed for this purpose, in preference to others in more accessible/ sequentially preferable locations (with reference to the Local Plan spatial strategy's hierarchy).

The suggested model of flexible purchase/ lease for the occupation of the units is not something that can be controlled through the planning process, to justify us accepting that Commerce Park as an existing allocated employment site within the nearest of Mendip's principal settlements (Frome), should not be considered a preferable site. A statement of an estate agents confidence in take up of land is not sufficient to rule it out.

The argument that the car dealership will assist in cross subsidising the B1 units and including coworking workhub is not justified through any viability evidence. The need for the whole proposal to be provided together rather than split up to fit on existing allocated sites has therefore not been justified.

Given the principle of the development in terms of the location of the proposal is not accepted the manner and scale of the development in this open countryside location cannot be justified in visual terms, as is discussed further below.

For the above reasons the proposal is not considered to comply with policies CP1, CP3 and CP4 of the Local Plan and is not considered sustainable development and is not acceptable in principle.

It is therefore contrary to the NPPF para's 7 and 8 which stress the importance of the economic, social and environmental role in sustainable development. Under the economic role, the proposal fails to be in the right place, under social it fails to be accessible to or reflect the community's needs and under environmental it fails to protect the natural and built environment in terms of its landscape impact and fails to utilise natural resources, minimise pollution and adapt to climate change by its reliance on travel by the private car. This is also contrary to section 4, particularly para 34 which require promotes sustainable transport and requires developments that generate significant movement to be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised.

The proposal is also contrary to para 28 which seeks to support sustainable growth and expansion of business and enterprise in rural areas.

Impact on character and appearance of the area

Policy CP4 only allows for the establishment of business in a "a manner and of a scale which is appropriate to the location and constraints upon it"

The site's open countryside location is a constraint itself and without the location of development being justified in terms of principle, as a significant urban styled development in a prominent location in the open countryside, the proposal would result visually in an

unacceptable urbanising encroachment of development into the countryside. This would be to the detriment of the visual character of the area and wider landscape. Furthermore as discussed in the tree section below there is a concern that the layout does not respect existing trees on the site that are important landscape features.

The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policies CP4, DP1, DP4 and DP7.

Impact on residential amenities/ adjoining properties

The scheme is separated from residential properties to the south by the main road and a distance of approx. 50m (from the site boundary to their living accommodation) and from the residential properties to the west by approx. 110m (from the site boundary to their living accommodation). Following a review of the noise assessment the Council's Environmental Protection team are satisfied that the proposal would have no unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby properties, subject to the proposed conditions. The proposal is therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies DP7 and DP8 in this regard.

Ecology

An Extended Phase 1 Ecological Survey, was carried out by Stark Ecology in May 2017 and identified three potential impacts from the development on protected species: bats in respect of light on commuting features; nesting birds; and a badger sett.

Given bat species are adversely affected by the introduction of artificial lighting on commuting routes, which in effect can cause severance between roosts and foraging areas, the County Ecologist seeks a dark boundary area which will also help maintain other light sensitive species on site and contribute towards conserving biodiversity. He also seeks a "lighting design for bats" and is satisfied that these 2 elements could be dealt with by conditions.

The survey also identifies an active outlying badger sett with a single entrance hole on the northern boundary of the site. The sett does not lie within the footprint of the new development and therefore the county Ecologist believes it may be possible to retain the sett while construction works are in progress and when the development is complete. Although the sett may need to be temporarily closed while construction works within 30m of the sett are on-going to reduce the likelihood of disturbance to badgers. Accordingly the County Ecologist recommends that a condition survey of badger setts is carried out within 2 months of site clearance with results reported to the LPA to agree subsequent action to protect badgers.

Given the hedgerows, scrub and woodland at the site boundaries are suitable for nesting birds a condition to restrict vegetation clearance during the nesting bird season is also requested.

Subject to these conditions and further conditions to require biodiversity enhancements in the form of bat and starling nest boxes and a house sparrow terrace as mitigation, as suggested by the ecology report, the development would not have any unacceptable adverse impact on biodiversity in accordance with policy DP5.

Trees

An Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (Revision A 06 November 2017) prepared by Tim Pursey has been submitted with the application,

The assessment states it should be read in conjunction with a Tree Survey and Constraints Plan issued by Tim Pursey on 10th January 2017, which does not appear to have been submitted and so the application has been assessed on the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan therein and the tree officers visual observations of the site.

The tree officer accepts the arboricultural appraisal of the site and existing vegetation, but has reservations with the layout of the scheme, which presents a regimented layout into a location that an integral element of the open countryside adjacent. There is also a concern about the proximity of the access and parking to the hedgerow and some significant landscape oak trees that may threaten them through pressure on pruning and concern with falling debris.

Whilst a layout more in sympathy with the existing mature vegetative features of the site that does not have an access road and parking areas in the vicinity of the mature hedge boundary and the significant Oak trees, would be preferred it is considered that with the use of conditions to ensure adequate tree protection measures and management (to include for biodiversity) the proposed layout does not warrant refusal on the tree impact, beyond that covered under the impact on the visual character of the area as a result of the unjustified encroachment into the countryside.

Surface water and Foul Drainage

The site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and is classed as greenfield. The proposals for development of the site will therefore significantly increase the impermeable areas and the rainfall runoff from the site. The assessment of the existing flood risks to the site is accepted by the Council's drainage engineer.

Whilst the submitted drainage strategy outlines the intention to restrict rainfall runoff rates to greenfield, which is acceptable, the proposals for attenuation appear to only be storing rainfall runoff volumes up to a 1 in 30 year plus climate change event with all events above this being allowed to flow overland direct into the ditch system. In accordance with NPPF guidance on flood risk the Council's drainage engineer would expect all events up to a 1 in 100 year plus climate change event to be attenuated on site. This can be in the form of above ground flooding of open spaces or detention basins, but it must not be allowed to exacerbate the flood risk downstream of the site.

The applicant has shown within their report the surface water flood risk mapping from the EA which indicates an area of high risk immediately upstream of the bridge under the A36. As it is the intention of the strategy to discharge to this ditch it will be important to ensure that runoff coming off the site does not further exacerbate this issue, particularly as the bridge has a finite capacity for flow. Onsite attenuation should be provided for storm events up to 1 in 100yr +40% climate change.

Accordingly the submitted drainage strategy would only be acceptable should it be proven, through further detailed investigation, that infiltration techniques and other forms of source control measures are not suitable.

Additionally, the functionality and capacity of the ditch will need to be proven and riparian responsibilities will need to be clarified to ensure long term maintenance of the ditch is secured and the necessary permissions (outside the planning system) sought.

The Council's Drainage engineer is satisfied that there is a satisfactory solution for surface water and foul drainage and therefore that the drainage details can be dealt with by conditions.

The proposal is therefore considered acceptable, subject to conditions, within regard to drainage in accordance with policies DP7, DP8 and DP23.

Highways Matters

The site lies along Bath Road a classified un-numbered road that is subject to a 30mph speed restriction at the point of the proposed access. On reviewing the recorded PIA's (Personal Injury Accidents) there appear to be none along Bath Rd although there are a number at the Bath Rd / A36 roundabout.

In response to Somerset County Council Highways (Local Highway Authority) and Highways England's (Highways Agency) comments additional information and amendments were received including IMA Transport Planning Transport Assessment Revised Scheme Oct 2017 and Site Plan as proposed Dwg No 101 rev H and the B8 element of the proposal was omitted.

In terms of traffic generation the LHA is satisfied the applicant has provided sufficient information and analysis to demonstrate that the scheme will not have a severe impact on the local highway network at peak periods. Highways England also confirm they are satisfied the proposal would not have a severe impact on the Strategy Road Network and therefore raise no objection.

The documents also included vehicle tracking and parking details together with the previously accepted access arrangement and off site highway works.

As a result of this additional information and amendments the LHA confirmed they have no objections, subject to conditions.

It is therefore considered that the technical highway matters raised by the development could be adequately addressed by way of planning condition.

As the proposed access includes footway which extends out of the site on both sides and proposes a short section of footway and a pedestrian dropped kerb crossing facility along Bath Rd which is acceptable in principle, a Highway Licence/ Agreement and will need to be agreed if planning permission is granted.

The submission also included a Travel Plan which has been revised. In the LHA audit of the TP they state this TP is very near to approval with only a couple of minor amendments: to the targets table to show 5 year progression, to confirm that surveys will be compared to baseline data rather than the previous survey; and to commit to securing the TP by s106.

No section 106 agreement has been received to secure the Travel Plan and in any case the Local Planning Authority's officer view is that given the site's unsustainable location, outside a primary village; with limited alternative modes of transport; and a lack of functional links to the village, rather fostering a growth in journeys (particularly to and from Frome) by private car, along the adjoining road network, the proposal is considered contrary to policy DP9 in addition to CP1, CP3 and CP4.

Environmental Impact Assessment

This development falls within the scope of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (category 10 Infrastructure projects (a) Industrial Estate development projects and (b) Urban Development projects) of Schedule 2 and exceeds the threshold criteria with regards to the area of the development and has therefore been screened. It was determined that the proposal will not result in significant environmental effects. As such an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required, although the environmental effects have been assessed and are set out in this report.

Conclusion

It is recommended that planning permission be refused as the development is unjustified with regard to the relevant Development Plan policies with regards to economic development outside of development limits and would therefore cause unjustified harm to the intrinsic character and appearance of the countryside and result in an unjustified growth in the need to travel by private car.

Reason/s for Recommendation

1. The site lies in open countryside outside the Settlement Limits of Beckington, where development is strictly controlled as a matter of principle, to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, including proportionate growth; and to ensure unfettered development in the countryside does not undermine its intrinsic value. The proposal has failed to adequately demonstrate that it would sustain the local rural community; be of a manner and scale appropriate to its location and constraints; and that there are no suitable alternative sites that are more accessible or sequentially preferable with regard to the Council's spatial strategy. The benefits of the scheme, including in terms of job creation, do not outweigh the harmful impacts of the proposal in terms of conflict with the employment land and spatial strategy. The development would therefore be contrary to policies CP1, CP3, CP4 and CP6 of the Mendip District Local Plan 2006 - 2029 Part I (adopted December 2014) the Frome Neighbourhood Plan (December 2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly in regard to 'Achieving Sustainable Development' and 'Core Planning Principles' and section 3.
2. The site lies in open countryside outside the Settlement Limits of Beckington, where development is strictly controlled in the interests of the character and appearance of the countryside. The proposed development due to its urban nature and significant scale, layout and extent, in a prominent position, would cause an unjustified urbanising effect that would encroach into the open countryside and have a harmful impact on the countryside's intrinsic character and appearance. The development would therefore be contrary to policies CP1, CP4 and DP1, DP4 and DP7 of the Mendip District Local Plan 2006 - 2029 Part I (adopted December 2014) and the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly in regard to 'Achieving Sustainable Development' and 'Core Planning Principles' and sections 7 and 11.
3. The proposal would result in an unsustainable development due to it fostering a growth in the need to travel by private transport as a result of its unjustified unsustainable location, outside of development limits and inaccessibility to facilities and services and limited alternative modes of transport; and lack of functional links to the nearby village. Furthermore the submitted Travel Plan has not been secured by a suitable planning obligation. Accordingly the development fails to accord with the objectives of Policy CP1, CP3, CP4, DP9 and DP19 of the Mendip District Local Plan Part 1: Strategy and Policies 2006 - 2029 (adopted 15th December 2014) and the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular regards to paragraphs 34 and 35 in section.

Conditions

List of Advices

1. This decision relates to drawings 4031 001; 101 rev.H; 102 Rev.A; 103 Rev.A; 104 Rev.A; 105 rev.A; 106 rev.C; 107Rev.B; 108 rev.B; and 120 rev.C; and supporting documents: revised Application form received 8/11/17; Planning Design and Access Statement Rev.A; Transport Assessment October 2017 IMA-16-074; Foul & Surface Water Drainage Strategy dated 3rd November; Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement Rev.A; Noise Impact Assessment Reference: 6742/BL/pw dated June 2017; and Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey dated May 2017.
2. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework the Council works in a positive and pro-active way with Applicants and looks for solutions to enable the grant of planning permission. However, in this case the proposal is not sustainable development for the reasons set out and the Council

was unable to identify a way of securing a development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

3. The Planning Authority is required to erect a Site Notice on or near the site to advertise development proposals which are submitted. Could you please ensure that any remaining Notice(s) in respect of this decision are immediately removed from the site and suitably disposed of. Your co operation in this matter is greatly appreciated.