

**CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA – PF/25/1571 – Demolition of existing non-traditional construction dwelling and construction of replacement dwelling with associated landscaping and widening of access (self-build) at Thornhill Farm, Bridgefoot Lane, Cley-next-the-sea, Holt, Norfolk NR25 7BB.**

**Minor Development**  
**Target Date: 7 October 2025**  
**Extension of Time: None**  
**Case Officer: Mark Brands**  
**Full Planning Permission**

## **RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS**

Located within the countryside  
Located within Glaven Valley Conservation Area  
Landscape Character Assessment – Rolling Heath and Arable / river valleys  
Norfolk Coast National Landscape (formerly AONB)  
Tourism Asset Zone  
GIRAMS Zones of Influence (various)

## **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

Reference	PF/07/1703
Description	Erection of single-storey rear extension
Outcome	Approved 18.12.2007
Reference	PF/03/0522
Description	Erection of replacement double garage
Outcome	Approved 09.05.2003
Reference	PF/02/1547
Description	Erection of single-storey rear extension
Outcome	Approved 25.11.2002
Reference	PF/88/1060
Description	Lifting of agricultural occupancy condition
Outcome	Approved 09.06.1988

## **REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE**

The application has been referred to committee at the request of Councillor Holliday for the following reasons:

Despite a welcome decrease in extent, there is still a considerable increase in glazing over the existing dwelling in this revision, together with a significant increase in footprint, height and mass. I concur with Landscape regarding the glazing on the north and west elevations. The proposed landscaping is welcomed but questions remain if the planned intermediate level screening adequately infills the central gap on the northern boundary, and the time it will take to establish the proposed hedge. I feel this application still does not conform to new Local Plan policies ENV1, 2, 3 and HOU6.

## THE APPLICATION

Seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing single storey dwelling and construction of replacement contemporary two storey dwelling.

The proposal is located in the countryside on the north side of Bridgefoot Lane in a relatively isolated position, with mature and hedgerows around the borders of the site with the adjacent land comprising an arable field. There is a detached curtilage outbuilding proposed to be retained as part of the proposals. The dwelling is relatively well screened from Bridgefoot Lane, a narrow countryside lane by the mature hedgerows. The site is within the National Landscape, and Glaven Valley Conservation Area

### Further details / amendments received during the course of the application

Design and access statement planning addendum, received 22 January 2026

Proposed site and roof plan PP.500 Rev. E, received 22 January 2026

Proposed floor plans PP.1000 Rev. A, received 3 October 2025

Proposed elevations PP.2000 Rev. A, received 3 October 2025

Amended 3D views, received 3 October 2025

## CONSULTATIONS

Conservation and Design (NNDC) – **No objections** (to revisions subject to conditions)

Norfolk Coast Partnership – No responses received

County Council Highways (Cromer) – **No objections** (subject to conditions)

Landscape (NNDC) – **No objections** (to revisions subject to conditions)

Cley Parish Council - **Objects**

### Plans as originally submitted

Concerns were raised by Cllrs that the access road is narrow. Sewage lorries and sugar beet lorries regularly use the route. The visibility splay is poor and requires the hedgerow to be cut back. Cllrs asked that the developer is made aware of the Cley Code of Construction Practice. The building will be twice as big as the existing. Concerns were raised with the glazing, which is a 3- fold increase. Residents on Glanford Road have a direct line of sight. Less glazing would be preferred. Due to the significant size and glazing Cllrs all voted to OBJECT

### Revised plans

Cllrs wish to OBJECT to the planning proposals due to the amount of glazing and additional light spill, especially in the North West corner of the property. Cllrs request that the windows here are reduced in size.

Cllrs also requested more screening. On plan 2419.PP.500 at point G7C there is a large gap which Cllrs would like to see filled with additional screening.

Ward Councillor – **Objects**

### Plans as originally submitted

This proposes an extensive new build on the site of a modest bungalow. The proposed dwelling is taller, has a larger footprint and the mass is significantly greater. I struggle

to see how this conforms to Local Plan Policy H08 in terms of the scale of the replacement of the existing building.

The area of glazing is increased very significantly. Even with reduced visible light transmission glass, this will be a large increase in light emissions with the subsequent adverse impact on the National Landscape's Dark Skies. I cannot find any details of a compatible lighting plan. I question the compliance with Local Plan Policy EN2.

The natural screening from the most sensitive aspects, the north and north west, where this dwelling comes into sight from the village, is patchy and not dense. 11 healthy trees are to be felled. Highways request a significant extent of mature hedging be removed or thinned for access. These changes have landscape and biodiversity consequences. Do these comply with LPP EN2 or 9"

#### Revised plans:

"Whilst welcoming the reduction in glazing, there is still a considerable increase in this revision over the existing dwelling, especially to the north and west; together with a significant increase in footprint, height and mass. The proposed landscaping is welcomed but questions remain if it is sufficient on the northern boundary, and the time it will take to establish. I feel this application still does not conform to new Local Plan policies ENV1, 2, 3 and HOU6. Should this application be approved, I agree with all Landscape's requested conditions"

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

2 representations have been received during the processing of the application, 1 **supporting** and 1 **objecting**. The main issues are summarised (full public comments can be viewed in full on the planning portal website):

#### Objections

Highway safety concerns

Size and scale of replacement dwelling

Increase in glazing

Concerns over loss of planting, detriment to landscape, ecology and biodiversity

Detrimental design

Impact on views

#### Support

Site is well screened

New dwelling would sit comfortably in its surroundings

## **HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS**

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life. Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Having considered the likely impact on an individual's Human Rights, and the general interest of the public, approval of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

## **CRIME AND DISORDER**

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

## **EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES**

The application raises no significant equality and diversity issues.

## **LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS**

Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the council is required when determining planning applications to have regard to any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application.

Local finance considerations are not considered to be material.

## **RELEVANT POLICIES**

### **North Norfolk Local Plan 2024-2040 (December 2025):**

CC 1 - Delivering Climate Resilient Sustainable Growth  
CC 3 - Sustainable Construction, Energy Efficiency & Carbon Reduction  
CC4 - Water Efficiency  
CC7 - Flood Risk & Surface Water Drainage  
CC 8 - Electric Vehicle Charging  
CC 9 - Sustainable Transport  
CC 10 - BNG  
CC 12 - Trees, Hedgerows & woodland  
CC 13 - Protecting Environmental Quality  
SS 1 - Spatial Strategy (Except Small Growth Villages which is apportioned no weight  
SS 2 - Development in the Countryside  
HC5 - Fibre to the Premises (FTTP)  
HC 7 - Parking Provision  
HOU 6 - Replacement Dwellings, Extensions, Domestic Outbuildings & Annexed Accommodation  
ENV 1 - Norfolk Coast National Landscape & The Broads  
ENV 2 - Norfolk Coast National Landscape & The Broads  
ENV 2 - Protection & Enhancement of Landscape & Settlement Character  
ENV 3 - Heritage and Undeveloped Coast  
ENV 4 - Biodiversity & Geodiversity  
ENV 6 - Protection of Amenity  
ENV 7 - Protecting & Enhancing the Historic Environment  
ENV 8 - High Quality Design

Material Considerations:

### **Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance:**

Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (December 2008)  
North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment SPD (2021)

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):**

Chapter 2 - Achieving sustainable development  
Chapter 4 - Decision-making  
Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed places  
Chapter 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
Chapter 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

## **OFFICER ASSESSMENT**

### **Main issues for consideration:**

- 1. Principle of Development**
- 2. Design and Conservation**
- 3. Landscape and ecology**
- 4. Environmental**
- 5. Highways**
- 6. Planning Balance and Conclusion**

### **1. Principle of Development**

Policy SS 1 states that the majority of new development in North Norfolk will take place in the towns and designated villages proportionate to their size. Policy SS 2 states that within the countryside development will be restricted to set criteria including replacement of dwellings. Furthermore, the site is within the National Landscape (ENV 1) and Glaven Valley Conservation Area (ENV 7). The principle of replacement dwellings within this area is acceptable subject to compliance with all relevant Core Strategy Policies principally the guidance on replacement dwellings under policy HOU 6 This policy permits replacement dwellings provided that the development would not materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding area and comply with the high quality design policy taking into account the design guide. When determining what constitutes a 'material increase in impact' account will be taken of the size of the exiting property, prominence, plot coverage, and impact of the proposal on the landscape of the area. Subject to compliance with this and the other policies in the Local Plan, the principle for the development for a replacement dwelling could be supported.

### **2. Design and Conservation**

Policy ENV 8 requires all development to be of high-quality design, that reflects the characteristics of the site and respects local character in terms of layout, landscaping, density, mix, scale, massing materials, finish and architectural details and delivers an energy efficient and low carbon development. All proposals should take account of the North Norfolk Design Guide SPD and applications will be expected to demonstrate the proposals contribute positively to the public realm, retains important landscaping and natural features, includes appropriate landscape and ecological enhancements. Development is expected to provide and enhance the green infrastructure network, the special character of the historic environment, reduce opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour, create safe, secure and accessible environments. Application should provide appropriate private amenity space and appropriate facilities for refuse and recycling, ensure development is designed in accordance with minimum space standards, accessible and adaptable homes policies and finally it should maximise opportunities for the provision of Sustainable Drainage Systems.

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF highlights that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

Paragraph 135 advises amongst others matters, that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area; be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; be sympathetic to local character and history while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change; establish or maintain

a strong sense of place creating attractive, welcoming and distinctive places; create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible.

The application site lies within Glaven Valley Conservation Area, which is a designated heritage asset. Any new development within this area must aim to at least preserve its established character and appearance. In accordance with paragraph 203 of the NPPF, proposals should also consider the desirability of making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness and comply with policy ENV 7.

The existing modest bungalow is of negligible aesthetic value, as such its demolition and replacement is considered acceptable subject to design of the replacement dwelling. The site benefits from a large curtilage, capable of accommodating a larger replacement dwelling. The existing outbuilding to the east of the site is to be retained.

The proposed replacement is considerably larger both in terms of footprint and its three-dimensional presence on the site. The replacement dwelling would be of a larger massing and scale than the modest existing bungalow. The replacement would include a second floor with flat roof.

The topography of the site rises to the northeast and as such the proposed dwelling appears partly sunken into the contours from certain views. The built form has been split into a series of angular elements which step in and out at various points of the elevations, this helps to breaking up the overall massing, bulk, and volume as well as creating some architectural interest

The flint facing at ground floor level would help to set the buildings within its site whilst the larch cladding would weather up over time and respond well to its soft rural environs. The siting and layout of the building also responds well to its site context and takes account of a range of environmental factors. This assists in mitigating some of the increase in scale.

The site is generally sylvan in character; however, the perimeter tends towards being “gappy” on the northern and western periphery. From these aspects the increased scale could be more apparent within the wider landscape, particularly during the winter months when deciduous screening is less effective. The larger quantum of glazing could lead to unwanted light spillage within the countryside; the remoteness of the location makes heightens this sensitivity.

Officer concerns were raised over the “boxy” quality of the original design, with eaves lines to the fore and, where unbroken, these would have created strong horizontal desire lines. This would increase the impact of the massing and counteracts the intended layering and articulation. The design has since been amended to supplement the boundary planting, reduce the glazed areas and amend the design of the dwelling to express more of a vertical emphasis and articulation. The overall result of the amendments is a better overall form and breaks up the roofline creating a cascade down through the elements. The creation of the higher block adds an additional 0.6m to the height on this raised section. Vertical projecting batten details to the upper flood has also been added to further add to the vertical emphasis with this dentil course detail.

Given the context of the site, the proposals are now considered to comply with local policy considerations and provisions within the NPPF. While the replacement dwelling is of a more notable size, massing and height than the existing, this is effectively mitigated by the landscaping around the site and its undulating topography. Officers do consider the proposals would not adversely and materially increase the impact of the replacement dwelling in terms of its appearance of the surrounding area. The site is well contained with the mature trees and landscaping on the boundaries. The large undulating plot offers scope to accommodate a

larger replacement dwelling without the proposals imposing themselves on the wider landscape. The proposals are considered to comply with Local Plan Policies HOU6 and ENV8.

### **3. Landscape and ecology**

Policy ENV1 sets out the highest degree of protection will be given to the designated landscapes and settings including the Norfolk Coast National Landscape. Development in such areas should seek to further the purposes of designation and contribute positively to the conservation and enhancement of the defined key qualities through appropriate siting, scale, massing, materials and design. Wildlife and cultural heritage should be conserved and enhanced, negative impacts on key qualities minimised. Where development proposals are considered to have potential adverse impacts on the local landscape character, these would need to be informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

Policy ENV 2 sets out proposals should demonstrate that their location, scale, design and materials will protect, conserve and enhance the defining qualities and local distinctiveness of the Landscape Character Type; landscape features; visually sensitive areas; important views; nocturnal character. Proposals should demonstrate measures that enable a scheme to be well integrated into the landscape. The site is located within the Undeveloped Coast whereby policy ENV 3 only permits development where policies in the plan permit such schemes or can be demonstrated to require a coastal location which would not be significantly detrimental to the open coastal character.

Policy ENV 4 sets out all policy proposals will be expected to provide suitable ecological surveys, retain, protect and buffer ecological and geological features and provide for the appropriate management of those features, deliver BNG, incorporate biodiversity enhancement measures and avoid net loss or fragmentation of habitats. Adverse impacts must be addressed, be in accordance with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and any adverse effects on nationally and locally designated sites only permitted where it can be demonstrated that the needs outweigh the adverse impacts.

In response to concerns raised by the officers concerning adverse impact on the nocturnal character of the National Landscape, glazing has been reduced by 18.7m<sup>2</sup> from that originally proposed to now total of 76.4m<sup>2</sup>. The Committee should note the replacement dwelling will see an overall increase in openings compared with that of the existing dwelling (27.2m<sup>2</sup>). Timber slats have been introduced to 6m<sup>2</sup> of openings. Whilst Officers have some disappointment that there has been no agreement to reduce the size of the large windows on both floors of the corner of the north and west elevations, the applicant confirms they would be willing to include external blinds on the north-west elevations to limit light spill. The use of blinds will need consideration in terms of enforceable / reasonable conditions tests - Officer view is that such conditions may not be enforceable.

The GIA (Gross Internal Area) of the proposed dwelling is 269.2m<sup>2</sup>. This is nearly twice the area of the existing dwelling which is 135.3m<sup>2</sup>. The proposed dwelling is set into the sloping site which will reduce its presence and impact. The roof level will be slightly higher (0.8m compared to the existing dwelling) with an increase of 1.3m on the northern block. The resulting building will be significantly larger than the existing dwelling.

Soft landscape mitigation has been increased on the north site boundary and to the west of the dwelling within the existing garden. This is in the form of mixed native hedgerow planting to supplement weak sections along the north boundary and strategically placed groups of trees and shrubs within the garden area to the north and west to assist in filtering the impact of the large replacement building.

The site lies within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area, the applicant offers control over the management of the garden vegetation which plays a vital function in making this proposal acceptable. The proposals would result in the loss of 7 category C trees and 4 category C groups to facilitate the demolition and construction of the replacement dwelling. Additionally, the mixed species hedgerows at the site entrance would be cut back to allow for improved visibility (*likely required in any case if overgrown over NCC highway land*). The trees proposed for removal are internal with little wider visibility, as such are not considered to result in significant adverse residual effects. Officers accept the arboricultural details. The supplementary planning is in the form of new hedgerow and supplementary planting groups to filter views comprising Hawthorn, Hazel and Holly, Yew, Guelder, rose, dogwood and holly. An extended hedgerow to the northern boundary is also provided. Officers consider that this compensation off sets the loss of the trees and is considered acceptable.

The ecology details set out that no bats were seen to emerge or enter the existing house. It was noted that two trees to the southwest were identified as having bat roost potential, but these are well away from the proposed works area. All existing vegetation on site provides habitat for nesting and foraging birds. Reptiles are most likely to be in wooded areas and dense vegetation and could be impacted during the construction works, reptile checks of potential basking/hibernation areas are proposed. Traditional orchard and native hedgerows are priority habitat; these habitats are largely unaffected by the proposed construction works. Appropriate mitigation measures have been set out and enhancements, including bird, swift and bat boxes/ bricks, to be integrated in the proposals and installed on suitable trees on the site. The site is considered exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain requirements as the proposals are for a self-build dwelling.

When weighing up the changes to the building and the landscape, Officers consider that the proposal would not have a significantly detrimental material impact on the surrounding area. Appropriate ecological mitigation and enhancement have been proposed. The development would comply with the requirements of the replacement dwelling policy HOU 6 and would not conflict with Policies ENV 1, ENV 2, ENV 3, ENV 4.

#### **4. Environmental**

Policy CC 1 sets out that development shall be delivered with the highest regard to sustainable development and climate change principles including positively contributing to mitigating and adapting to climate change, minimising greenhouse gas emissions.

Policy CC 3 sets out new development is required to achieve progressively higher standards of environmental sustainability. This includes reductions in CO2 emissions of a minimum of 31% below the Target Emission Rate to be achieved through the implementation of the energy hierarchy through use of design and energy efficient measures and by provision of appropriate renewable and low carbon energy technologies and incorporation of measures to maximise solar gain, natural ventilation, use of green roofs, natural shading and other appropriate measures.

Policy CC 4 sets out all new development must be designed and constructed in a way that minimises its impact on water resources, with all new dwellings designed and constructed in such a way that enables them to meet or exceed Building Regulations Part G water efficiency higher optimal standard.

The replacement dwelling seeks to achieve high standards of thermal efficiency and use of renewable energy including Air Source Heat Pump, Mechanical Ventilation Heat Recovery System and Photovoltaic panels. These measures are a positive change from the traditional



dwelling that currently sits on site. Whilst further details would be required from the applicant to demonstrate full compliance with the new Local Plan Policies (CC1, 3 and 4), the Committee will note that the retention of the existing inefficient traditional dwelling on site is a material consideration as a fallback potential should permission not be granted.

With this in mind, Officers consider that some matters can be secured through imposition of conditions including water efficiency measures required under Policy CC 4.

On balance, whilst not in full accordance with Local Plan Policies CC1, 3 and 4) Officers find a broad accordance with the environmental policy aspirations and this can be weighed in the planning balance.

## **5. Highways**

Policy CC 9 requires development to provide safe and convenient access for all modes of transport, including access to the highway network.

Policy HC 7 requires new development to have sufficient parking facilities including provision of EV charging points (Policy CC 8).

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The site would utilise the existing access onto Bridgefoot Lane, with this to be widened to improve visibility in both directions with a larger parking area to ensure appropriate parking provision and manoeuvrability on site to accommodate the larger dwelling and could be viewed as an improvement to the existing arrangement with improved visibility.

No objections have been raised by the highway officer on the amended access arrangement. Regarding the comments on maximising the visibility, the boundary hedgerows are overgrown, and the comments encourage this to be cleared back to the boundary of the site and not over the highway verge, which the highway authority would have some powers to enforce this already. There isn't considered to be a conflict between the visibility and retention of the hedgerow.

The updated plan includes provision of an EV charging point, the level of provision of electric vehicle charging points is appropriate to the development size and type, the level of new parking provision together with local context and site location. In any event the fallback position is noted whereby the existing dwelling may be retained on site with no EV charging point. As such this change represents betterment above the fallback position.

The proposals are considered to accord with the aforementioned Local Plan Policy considerations.

## **6. Other material considerations**

Local Plan policy HC5 – Fibre to Premises requires applicants provide evidence demonstrating that fibre (FTTP) connections in accordance with the National Building Regulations will be provided. Where this cannot be demonstrated to be practical or viable then the policy allows alternatives such as superfast fibre to be delivered.

The applicant confirms that fibre broadband will be provided to the dwelling in accordance with the Building Regulations, or should the connection be not viable under the terms set out within the Regulations, alternative provision will be provided in accordance with the Regulations.

The submission fails to provide clear evidence of engagement with the relevant network operators. There is no clear, non-technical statement confirming that FTTP can be delivered as part of the development. The applicants have supplied an aspiration that if granted planning permission that the proposals will then comply with building regulations requirements. This fails to demonstrate full compliance at the point of granting planning permission. The proposals therefore fail to meet the full technical requirements of Policy HC 5, although Officers recognise that this matter could be secured via imposition of planning condition.

As above officers are aware of the potential fallback position, i.e. whereby the current traditional dwelling remains occupied on site with no fibre connection. The aspiration to connect and where necessary seek alternatives to full fibre connections would represent small positive weight in favour of the proposals.

Self-Build and Custom Housing (SBCH) – policy HOU 2 “housing mix” does not require any element of SBCH on sites where less than 5 dwellings are provided. As such the applicant’s intention to create a new unit of SBCH will exceed policy requirements.

Members attention is also drawn to the recent appeal decision APP/Y2620/W/25/3368039 at Edgefield, in this decision the inspector found that up to five SBCH units should be afforded substantial positive weight in terms of meeting an observed unmet demand for SBCH in the district. Here the proposals are for a single dwelling consequently the ability to significantly boost SBCH is therefore proportionate.

## **7. Planning balance and Conclusion**

Section 38(6) of the Town and Country Planning Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sets out that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposal seeks permission for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the construction of a larger replacement dwelling. The revised scheme has been designed to respond successfully to the site’s context, and landscape. The proposals now ensure an appropriate high-quality design and scale is delivered. The site is well screened, with filtered planting both existing and proposed. The design makes good use of the undulating topography and assimilates well into that context. Further that the use of VLT glazing will mitigate, to a significant degree, the impacts of introducing the larger dwelling and greater glazing in this sensitive location. The proposed design and mitigation will effectively minimise impacts on the surrounding landscape. For the reasons outlined in the report the proposals are not considered to materially increase the detrimental impact of the proposals on the appearance of the surrounding area.

In addition the proposals will provide a single unit of SBCH which will attract positive weight in terms of meeting the observed under supply within the district.

The report notes areas where compliance with policy has not been achieved. Officers note the negative weight that would normally be applied in these circumstances. However, the proposals should be considered within the fallback position, i.e. that the original dwelling in its traditional form would otherwise remain. In such circumstances the negative weight applied is balanced out by the fallback position, i.e. there will be building regulations compliance to achieve carbon efficiency and fibre connectivity.

Officers find that there that the negative weight associated with those considerations above is addressed by carefully amended plans, mitigation or is otherwise balanced out by the fallback position. As such reasonable positive weight can be applied to this high-quality contemporary design for a replacement dwelling.

It is therefore concluded that, subject to conditions, the proposed development is acceptable and compliant with the relevant Development Plan policies as outlined above.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**APPROVAL subject to conditions relating to the following matters:**

- Time limit
- Development in accordance with approved plans
- Materials (inc flint sample panel)
- Accordance with ecological mitigation and enhancement measures
- Hard and soft Landscaping details
- Implementation of landscape proposals
- Accordance with Arboricultural Method Statement
- Replacement of tree failures (10 years)
- External Lighting
- Specification for glass of a VLT value less than .65
- Removal of Permitted Development rights
- Access accordance with NCC specifications
- Visibility splays
- Levels
- Water efficiency
- EV parking
- Self-build standard conditions
- Securing Fibre to the premises (or alternative if Fibre not available).

**Final wording of conditions and any others considered necessary to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning**