



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-310703-21

Development	Demolition of existing roof, addition of first floor level, rear decking and all other associated site works.
Location	Templeverick, Bunmahon , Co Waterford.
Planning Authority	Waterford City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	21129
Applicant(s)	Tadhg Buckley
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	John, Agnes & Mark Collins
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	8 th of February 2022
Inspector	Angela Brereton

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is located in the seaside village of Bunmahon Co. Waterford. The site (stated area .097 ha) is accessed via the regional road R675 to the west on the main approach to the village from Dungarvan direction. It is within a cluster of elevated low density housing on the approach to the village.
- 1.2. There is an existing detached single storey bungalow on this elevated site. Levels rise sharply upwards from the public road. Submitted drawings indicate a 6m variation in levels through the site to rear. There is decking in the small rear /side garden area and a retaining wall to the rear adjoining the more elevated site to the house to the west. The parking area is to the front of the subject house and this is accessed via the steep and winding access road off the R675.
- 1.3. The site forms part of a cluster of dwellings at various elevations and setbacks as seen from the road frontage including a number of bungalows to the immediate south, elevated above the road. There is a dwelling (part single/part two-storey) to the immediate rear (west) of the site and a two-storey dormer dwelling to the immediate north. 'Sea View' to the rear is more elevated than the subject site and is visible in the landscape at a higher elevation than the subject house.
- 1.4. A separate access road runs to the west of the site at a higher level which serves these aforementioned dwellings to the rear along with a number of other dwellings in the vicinity. There are views to the south-east to the sea from the elevated sites. There are varying one/two storey house types in the area with some older two storey houses on the opposite side of the R675 to the south.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the following on a site at Templeverick, Bunmahon, Co. Waterford:
 - Demolition of existing roof, addition of first floor level
 - Rear decking and all other associated site works.
- 2.2. Documentation, including drawings and a letter from the applicants to provide a rationale for the proposed development have been submitted.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 3rd of June 201, Waterford City & Council granted permission for the proposed development subject to 6no. conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner had regard to the locational context, planning history and policy, to the submissions made and the inter departmental reports. Their Assessment included concerns that the proposal in the form submitted, would impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings and be out of character with the pattern of development in the area.

Further Information requested included the following:

- That the first floor deck to be omitted and the associated doors and window serving the kitchen/living area to be omitted.
- Consideration to be given to the incorporation of rooflights to provide natural light to this area.
- Any revised proposal to clearly indicated that there is no overlooking of the rear western property.
- Proposals to deal with surface water disposal to be submitted.

Further Information response

- They submitted 6no. copies of revised drawings (with only minor amendments to the rear elevation).
- They have omitted the rear deck area and all associated doors and windows serving the kitchen/living area. A roof light has been added as advised.
- Surface water drainage has been shown on the accompanying plans using the existing surface water drainage, as the surface water drainage demand has not significantly altered.

Planner's Response

The Planner had regard to the F.I submitted and their response in summary included the following:

- They initially recommended that the proposed development be refused as it would adversely impact on neighbouring property to the rear. This was by reason of overbearing, overlooking, visual obtrusiveness and loss of privacy.
- That the design of the proposed extension in this elevated location and taking into the account the established development pattern in the vicinity would be out of character with and would detract from the visual amenity of the area.
- However, they noted the F.I had been addressed in the revised plans submitted and recommended an appropriate schedule of conditions.

3.3. Other Technical Reports

Note noted on file.

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

No responses noted on file.

3.5. Third Party Observations

Submissions have been received from local residents including the subsequent appellants, who reside in the neighbouring property to the west. They are concerned about the impact of the proposed design and layout on residential amenity, loss of light and loss of views to the sea. That the proposed contemporary design would be totally out of character with the village vista and surrounding houses.

Their concerns are considered in the context of their Grounds of Appeal and in the Assessment below.

It is also noted that some letters of support, including from a local representative have been submitted.

4.0 Planning History

As noted in the Planner's Report there is no recent planning history relevant to the subject site or adjacent sites.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Following the amalgamation of Waterford County Council and Waterford City Council in 2014, the lifetimes of the existing development plans within the amalgamated council area were extended. The 2011-2017 County Development Plan remains in effect until a new City and County Development Plan is prepared following the making of the Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy.

Chapter 3 refers to the Core Strategy, Chapter 4 refers to Settlement, Chapter 5 to Housing, Chapter 7 to Infrastructure, Chapter 8 to Environment and Conservation, and Chapter 10 to Development Standards.

Chapter 3 identifies Bunmahon as a 'Stronger Rural Area'. Chapter 4 notes that Bunmahon is one of 9 Local Service Centres which provides a lower range of services and facilities for the population of the immediately surrounding hinterlands.

Chapter 5 refers to Building Re-Use and Brownfield Site Development. It notes that the Council will encourage the re-use of vacant dwellings for use as permanent homes.

Chapter 7 notes that the Bonmahon Sewerage Scheme has been included for upgrading.

Chapter 8 identifies the Mid-Waterford Coast SPA which is just south of the site.

Objective CP 4 states it is an objective: *To protect the scenic value of the Coastal Zone from Cheekpoint to Youghal including landward and seaward views and continuous views along the coastline and manage development so it will not materially detract from the visual amenity of the coast.*

Chapter 10 provides the Development Standards. Section 10.23 refers to extensions and notes: *'The Council shall only look favourably on extensions that respect the*

scale and character of the existing structure, and that afford protection to the existing residential amenity of the area’.

Appendix 9 of the Plan is ‘Scenic Landscape Evaluation’.

Volume 2 – The Map Booklet of the Plan includes Bunmahon/Knockmahon.

The site is zoned ‘R2’ Residential where the Objective seeks to - *Protect amenity of existing residential development and provide new residential development – low density (clustered housing, serviced sites, large plot size).*

Variation no.1 of the Waterford County Development Plan – *Development Management Standards* was adopted on the 8th of September 2016.

Section 7.8 refers to House Extensions i.e:

The design and layout of extensions to houses should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties particularly as regards sunlight, daylight and privacy. The character and form of the existing building should be respected and external finishes and window types should match the existing.

Extensions should:

- Follow the pattern of the existing building as much as possible;
- Be constructed with similar finishes and with similar windows to the existing building so that they will integrate with it;
- Roof form should be compatible with the existing roof form and character.

Traditional pitched roofs will generally be appropriate when visible from the public road. Given the high rainfall in Waterford the traditional ridged roof is likely to cause fewer maintenance problems in the future than flat ones. High quality mono-pitch and flat-roof solutions will be considered appropriate providing they are of a high standard and employ appropriate detailing and materials.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The closest Natura 2000 site is Mid-Waterford Coast SPA (Site Code 004193) which is located c.0.8kms to the south of the site. Ballyvoyle Head to Tramore pNHA (Site Code 001693) is also located to the c.0.4kms south of the site.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A Third Party Appeal has been submitted by proximate residents John, Agnes & Mark Collins against the Council's decision to grant permission for the proposed development. Their Grounds of Appeal are summarised as follows:

Adverse impact on Residential Amenity

- The height of the proposed extension will lead to over shadowing and reduce natural light within their living room/kitchen and other bedrooms.
- They have regard to Section 7.8 of Variation No.1 to the Waterford CDP 2011 (Development Management Standards) which provides the criteria for 'Extensions'.
- The development would be overbearing, overlooking and be visually obtrusive and should be refused on residential amenity grounds.
- They note the concerns of Council Planner's as per their original recommendation.

Scale of Development

- The proposed scale increase from a bungalow with sloping eaves to a double height plain concrete façade is totally out of proportion and scale of the original building and surrounding dwellings.
- It would impact adversely on their residential development and neighbouring property, which they note was run as a B&B by their parents in the past.
- The site is situated within a 'Scenic Route' Scenic Classification in the Scenic Landscape Evaluation as per consultants 1999 on behalf of the Council. The development should be refused on residential amenity grounds.

Visual Impact

- The existing bungalow is modest in scale. This contemporary design is totally out of character with the pattern of development in the area and should be refused on grounds of visual impact.

- The development will take advantage of sea views while blocking views currently enjoyed by neighbouring dwellings.
- They note the long term family history of their house, and that the visual obtrusiveness and loss of view will impact greatly on their quality of life and residential amenities.

Planner's views not addressed in Recommendation

- They note that the Executive Planner recommended refusal but that the Senior Executive Planner recommended F.I. submission. They refer to improper protocol in the processing of this application.
- They submit that their recommendations and concerns were not addressed in the F.I request and were ignored in the Amended Planners Report and that to grant permission for this development is contrary to the proposed planning and development in the area.
- They enclose a copy of their previous submission noting their concerns and refer to photographs and mapping submitted.

6.2. Applicant Response

A First Party response has been submitted by the applicants Tadhg and Sinéad Buckley and this includes the following:

Context of Application

- They request permission to extend and adapt their home to fit the needs of a growing family and improve their residential amenity.
- They note that there is a lack of quality housing in the area within the average budget of a young couple. There are no properties in the area which would present an alternative option that could meet all of their needs.
- A history is provided of Tadhg Buckley's family and business connections to the Bunmahon community and local area. His business at Bunmahon Surf School requires him to be on hand short notice so proximity to this establishment is an important factor in their lives. They have invested in their community and the business benefits Bunmahon tourism as a whole.

- They note that Sinéad works in Waterford City and is also involved in local community activities such as Scouts.

Design and Layout – Existing/Proposed

- There are challenges with their current house design in respect to light, prompting them to propose an extension which allows for significant layout modification.
- The proposed design will allow for a reconfiguration and improvement to the layout of their living space.
- Their garden space is overlooked to a significant degree by the Collins property on their western boundary. This is an issue which is not easily rectified, considering the elevated nature of the sites. The current proposal would give their family the opportunity to enjoy outside space with a feeling of adequate privacy.
- Extending to the side or rear would make much of their limited outdoor space unavailable to enjoy.

Design Considerations and Benefits

- Details are provided of the overall design concept, including the proposed balcony element.
- The proposed works will ensure that the energy rating of the current house (now D2) is increased to at least B2, with a project aim of A2.
- They have a mature garden with a significant amount of greenery and hope to maintain it as a pollinator friendly area.
- Extending to the side is not practical as the land is not believed to be suitable for building (as advised by a groundworks engineer).
- There is no request to increase the ground floor footprint, rather to increase the habitable space into their roof and change the roof design.

Impact on Residential Amenities

- The proposed extension cannot be considered overbearing or visually intrusive. They note Waterford CDP encourages innovative design solutions.

- They note the elevation of the Collin's property above their site and that their house was significantly modified in 1997 with a two-storey extension with full pitched roof constructed.
- This house on this elevated site offers many natural benefits, privacy and all-day sun light which will not be impeded by their property. They consider that this extended house detracts from their residential amenities.
- The initial concerns of planners were not ignored during the decision making process but were either nullified or mitigated through the further information response and the Council's conditions.
- Sunlight and daylight are not impacted, and they refer to the Guidelines.
- Privacy concerns have been mitigated in their response to the F.I request.
- They note the dominant houses on Templeverick Hill to the north and west of the site have afforded them the scope to consider a non-traditional design for their extension.

Visual Impact

- They refer to condition no.5 of the Council's permission which refers to 'Landscaping'. They note existing and proposed screen planting.
- The houses on Templeverick hill vary in design which adds to the character of the village.
- The residential architecture on the hillside is seen as a collage that marries well together and does not detract from the character of the seaside village on Bunmahon. They include photographs to show the hillside vista.
- There are many strong flat roof elements and balconies on adjacent houses.
- They are matching with the existing context and character in a considered and sympathetic way.

Scale of Development

- The before and after photos submitted by the Appellants appear to exaggerate the height and mass of their proposal and they question the accuracy of these photographs.

- There will be no loss of sea view to the Collin's property as a result of the current proposal. A view to the sea is not considered in planning development policy in Ireland or in the EU.
- All concerns with respect to planning compliance were nullified or mitigated through the request for F.I or schedule of conditions.
- A response from the Council's Fire Officer is not a requirement for a planning decision.

Conclusion

- It is their opinion that this appeal should be dismissed and be considered vexatious as it is frivolous and without substance or foundation.
- No new information has been submitted or tendered by the appellant that would render the decision by the Council as invalid.
- They have developed a proposal for their house that is as respectful and minimally invasive as possible.
- The appellant has not demonstrated that any aspect of the planning process followed by the Council in granting permission was contrary to proper protocol or was lacking in any respect.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

None noted on file.

6.4. **Observations**

None noted on file.

7.0 **Assessment**

- 7.1.1. The application site is located on the north western side of the small seaside village of Bunmahon which is located on the 'Copper Coast' in the southeast of the County. It is identified in Volume 2 of the Waterford County Development 2011-2017 as a Local Service Centre. The Map of Bunmahon/Knockmahon shows that the site is within the 'R2' 'Residential zoning', where the objective seeks to: *Protect amenity of*

existing residential development and provide new residential development – low density (clustered housing, serviced sites, large plot size). Therefore, the principle of an extension to an existing house is acceptable within this residential zoning.

- 7.1.2. The Third Party are concerned that the proposed development would not comply with planning policy having regard to extensions. As noted in the Policy Section above Section 7.8 (*Extensions*) of Variation no.1 of the Waterford County Development Plan 2011-2017 (as extended) is referred to. They consider that the design and layout of the proposal, by reason of height, scale and bulk on this elevated site, will impact adversely on the character and amenities of the area. This includes their residential amenity, including by loss of privacy, overlooking, views and being out of character with the pattern of development in the area.
- 7.1.3. The First Party provides that the proposed development will provide for a much needed family extension. That it has been duly designed to be as respectful to their neighbours as possible and they also refer to the revisions made in their Further Information response. They consider that having regard to the revisions made and its locational context, that it will not detract from the pattern of development or the character and amenities of the area or neighbouring properties.
- 7.1.4. While this proposal is being considered 'de novo', regard is had to the locational context, planning policy and guidelines and to the documentation submitted. Also, to the issues raised in the Third Party Appeal and in the First Party response and to the Council's permission in this Assessment below.

7.2. Design and Layout

- 7.2.1. The existing house is a single storey pitched roofed bungalow on an elevated site (c.0.097has). Levels rise considerably from the public road and the site is c.6m above, with access from the R675. Drawings have been submitted showing the existing and proposed development. The site is set into the landscape as shown on Site Section A-A the Appellant's property is c.4m above the subject site.
- 7.2.2. The Floor Plans submitted show that the existing bungalow is 89sq.m in floor area and contains 3no. bedrooms, kitchen/dining room and bathroom all on ground floor level. The height of the existing bungalow is shown as c.5m. As shown on the Site Plan, the rear garden area is limited and it is set within 4m of the rear boundary.

- 7.2.3. There is a shed at the rear which is to be demolished. There is a retaining wall along the rear boundary. There is an existing area of decking to the side/front and rear of the property. The site is fenced off from the upland garden area. The latter mainly comprises an area of lawn and shrubs.
- 7.2.4. It is proposed to demolish the existing roof, and to provide an addition of a first floor level, rear decking and all associated works. Floor plans show that the proposed accommodation is to provide 4no. bedrooms on ground floor level with living accommodation to provide kitchen/living and sitting room accommodation on first floor level. The First Party provide that the proposed design will allow for a reconfiguration so that the living rooms can be moved to the front of the house (unimpeded by the 4.8m wall to the rear of the house) and will give them space for a growing family and remote working.
- 7.2.5. While it is not proposed to increase the ground floor footprint, the first floor area will be greater i.e. 101sq.m to allow for the angle of the external balcony and steps at the side. Therefore, the proposal will result in a two storey dwelling with a floor area of c. 190sq.m (including the external balcony) i.e more than double that of the existing single storey house. Concerns have been expressed about overlooking from the windows proposed in the first floor rear elevation and relative to the decking.
- 7.2.6. In response to the Council's F.I request, the plans were modified. This included that they omitted the rear deck area and all associated doors and windows serving the kitchen/living area. They added a rooflight over this area as advised by the Council. Only the wc obscure glazed window remains. Having regard to the issue of overlooking and loss of privacy, I would consider these modifications to be an improvement on those originally submitted.
- 7.2.7. As shown on the plans submitted, the roof type is to be a sloped mono-pitch roof with a variation in height between c.5.7m and 6.5m. A balcony is to be included along part of the front elevation. External finishes are to include stone cladding to the front elevation, render and zinc eaves cladding and soffit standing seam.
- 7.2.8. It is recommended that if the Board decide to permit that the revised plans, which are considered to be an improvement on the original be permitted. That conditions be included that there be no windows on the first floor rear elevation other than the

obscure glazed bathroom window and relative to details of external finishes to be submitted prior to the commencement of development.

7.3. Impact on Character and Amenities

- 7.3.1. The existing bungalow is modest in scale and is in character with the pattern of residential in the area on this elevated site built into the slope of Templeverick Hill. The proposed addition of the first floor and change of roof type to mono-pitch with a slope front to rear which will increase the height of the existing house by c.1.5m and will make it appear visually more dominant in the landscape. The Appellant's property is to the rear of this on a higher elevation, over 4m higher than the ground level of the subject site.
- 7.3.2. The Appellant considers that it would be preferable and less obtrusive to provide a single storey side extension. The First Party provides that they are seeking more accommodation for family reasons and in view of the constraints of the site, have submitted a design that while using a similar footprint, results in an increase in scale and height. They submit that extending to the side is not practical as they have been advised by a groundwork's engineer that the land is not believed suitable for building. It is noted that this has not been substantiated. However, extending to the side, would increase the overall mass and footprint of the building when seen from the road frontage. Having regard to the Site Layout Plans, if the Board decides to permit, I would recommend that it be conditioned that the footprint of the existing house not be extended any closer to the rear boundary.
- 7.3.3. It is noted that the Appellant's house is due west of the subject site and is part single storey/ part two storey with permission granted in 1997 for a two-storey side extension. In view of the elevated nature of the site, this property has sea views and the Appellant's are concerned about any loss of such. While there will be some impact, Site Section A-A shows that these will be only marginally affected in view of the slope and the lower level of the subject property. It is noted that the proposed roof type would have less of an impact than a two-storey pitched roof.
- 7.3.4. The proposed first floor extension which is to follow the footprint of the existing house will, taking into account the lower level of the subject site, be a maximum c.1.5m above the height of the Appellants house to the west and as shown on the

Site Plan set back c.6-7m to the east (rear) of that property. This does not take into account the low wall and some screen planting along their eastern site boundary.

- 7.3.5. The First Party response provides that sunlight and daylight will not be impacted. They provide that an assessment of obstruction angle was made using guidance from BRE (2011) 'Site Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to Good Practice' and COP for Daylighting BS 8206-2 2008 (Figure 9 of their response refers). In view of the difference in ground and finished floor levels between the two sites, it is considered that the height of the proposed extension will not adversely impact on the sunlight and daylight of the more elevated site to the west.
- 7.3.6. The First Party provide that the external balcony will mirror that of the adjacent property to the north ensuring the character of the house is in keeping with the locality. On site, I noted that there is a two-storey contemporary style house to the north of the subject site and this has a front (east) facing balcony. This is in a more elevated location and is adjacent to the Appellant's property and accessed via the higher road to the west.
- 7.3.7. While the majority of houses in the area are single storey, there is a variation of single and two storey houses in the vicinity. There are also some contemporary dwellings such as that to the south on the lower road closer to the sea. Therefore, I would not consider that the proposed development would detract from the pattern of development in the area. In view of its contextual location set lower down on the slope, I would consider that provided quality materials are used that it would not appear overly visually dominant in the landscape or on the approach to Bunmahon seaside village.

7.4. Infrastructural issues

- 7.4.1. The vehicular access from the R675 is existing. The site is accessed via a steep and winding access road and there are two parking spaces at the frontage. There are no changes proposed to this access in the subject application. If the Board decides to permit in view of the elevated nature of the site and the proximity to adjacent residential properties it is recommended that a construction management plan condition be included.

7.4.2. The application form provides that there is an existing connection to the public mains and public sewer. As part of the Council's F.I request they asked that proposals to deal with surface water relative to the extension be submitted. The Applicants responded that they have indicated the existing surface water drainage on the Site Map submitted (mains connection). They propose to continue using the existing surface water drainage, as this is not deemed to have been significantly altered. If the Board decide to permit it is recommended that an appropriate surface water drainage be included.

7.5. Screening for Appropriate Assessment

7.5.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development for an extension to an existing house on a serviced site and the distance to the nearest European site, it is concluded that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise as the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend that permission be granted subject to the conditions below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the design and scale of the proposed development, as an extension to an existing dwelling house on residentially zoned land in the village of Bunmahon, to the provisions of the Waterford County Development Plan 2011-2017 (as varied and extended), it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of adjoining properties and would constitute an acceptable form or development at this location. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 28th day of April 2021 and by the further plans and particulars received by An Bord Pleanála on the 27th day of July, 2021, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed extension shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

3. a) The proposed extension shall not extend beyond the footprint of the existing dwelling at the rear (towards the western boundary) of the site.
b) There shall be no windows in the first floor rear elevation, other than the obscure glazed wc window as shown on the revised plans submitted on the 28th of April 2021.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

4. Notwithstanding the exempted development provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, and any statutory provision replacing or amending them, no development falling within Class 1 or Class 3 of Schedule 2, Part 1 of those Regulations shall take place within the curtilage of the house, shall be erected on the site/within the rear garden area, without a prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interest of the amenities of the area.

5. The existing dwelling and proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity.

6. Existing trees and hedging along boundaries of the site shall be retained and adequately protected during the construction period. Any damage to same caused during construction shall be replaced with suitable naturalised species.

Reason: In The interests of visual amenity.

7. Drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

8. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, traffic management and noise reduction measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.

9. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to

An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission

Angela Brereton
Planning Inspector

23rd of March 2022