

# DCL/21/27

**Application No:** 20/2091/FH

**Location of Site:** Land adjoining Casebourne Cottage, Underhill Rd, Folkestone

**Development:** Retrospective application for the change of use of an agricultural field to a dog walking facility and associated field shelters

**Applicant:** Ms P Suddens & Ms C Goodchild

**Agent:** Mr Nick Kirby  
Pegasus Group  
The Columbia Centre  
Station Road  
Bracknell  
RG12 1LP

**Officer Contact:** Rob Bailey

## SUMMARY

This application seeks permission for the change of use from agricultural land/field to a dog walking facility with associated field shelters, including access to the land and parking provision on the driveway of Casebourne Cottage for customers. Having regard to development plan policies in respect of development in the countryside, the nature of the use, additional information submitted at the request of Members, and the imposition of planning conditions to strictly control the intensity of the use of the site, and to ensure appropriate landscaping, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable as a matter of principle, being appropriate in a rural location, would not give rise to harm to visual or residential amenity, nor to highway safety or convenience, and would amount to sustainable development.

## RECOMMENDATION:

**That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out at the end of the report and that delegated authority be given to the Chief Planning Officer to agree and finalise the wording of the conditions and add any other conditions that he considers necessary.**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. This application was reported to the Planning and Licencing Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> April this year, recommended for refusal. Members resolved to defer consideration of the application. The minutes of the meeting state:

*RESOLVED: That the application be deferred in order to give the applicant an opportunity to come forward with further information, particularly in relation to justifying*

# DCL/21/27

*the need for this business to operate in this particular rural location, by means of a sequential test.*

- 1.2. The application was originally reported to committee at the request of the Chief Planning Officer, who considered that the application raises issues which should be considered by the Planning and Licensing Committee, in accordance with point 10.2.1e) of the Folkestone and Hythe District Council Scheme of Delegation.

## 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. The application seeks planning permission for the change of use of the land from pasture/agricultural land to land for the walking of dogs. The application is retrospective and the business has been operating since October 2019.
- 2.2. Full details of the proposals, together with plans and photographs, the relevant planning history for the site, a list of consultation responses, and a list of the relevant planning policies are set out in full within the original report to committee, attached here as **Appendix 1**.
- 2.3. As set out above, consideration of the application was deferred from the April committee meeting in order to allow for the submission of additional information regarding the need for a rural location. Additional information has been received and is considered below.

## 3. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- 3.1. The following further information has been submitted by the applicants in support of their application, as follows:

*“The supplementary statement has focused on approved dog runs in the local area. Objectors have suggested that there are other private dog walking fields in the local area. Several of these are not within Folkestone and Hythe District Council and as such, are excluded from the assessment as would be subject to different planning policies and potentially do not serve the same client bases. Nevertheless, many of those highlighted by objectors such as Hugo’s Fun Dog Field are within rural areas like the proposal, which serves to evidence the rural location of the dog walking use.*

*Consideration of the fields located within Folkestone and Hythe have been highlighted by objectors as well as a recent application to the Council are provided below:*

- *Poplars Pooches – Planning permission not in place and so could be subject to enforcement action, does not have contiguous 1.8m fencing, is located close to A2070 so not tranquil and possible to meet other dogs on road.*
- *Spring Rise – Exclusive parking available but subject to change as a result of weather conditions. It is part of a wider dog enterprise – dog agility classes also take part on the same field and as such, walking activities could not take place when these are in session and therefore the use is not reliably available. Planning permission not in place, possible to meet other dogs at the site, some disabled provision and no dog waste bins on site.*

# DCL/21/27

• *St Johns Cottages – planning permission not in place and therefore could be subject to change in the future, access gate directly off road – could lead to dog safety concerns despite 2 metre contiguous fencing.”*

## 4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

### Consultees

4.1. Further consultation was carried out on the basis of the additional information with Hythe Town Council, which maintained its previous objection. For the sake of clarity and ease of reference, the following consultee responses are those originally received in relation to the application

**Hythe Town Council:** Object on the grounds that there are health and safety issues, access and egress issues, drainage issues, a detrimental effect on wildlife, the location is not suitable for this sort of business and the effect of traffic and noise would have an adverse effect on the neighbours.

**KCC Highways and Transportation:** KCC Highways has commented on the proposal and initially did not intend to comment on the application but sought to clarify their position on this matter further in regards to the junction of Underhill Road and Horn Street. They confirm that this particular section of Underhill Road is unclassified and publicly maintainable by KCC. They set out that under NPPF guidance, they are only allowed to object on highway grounds if the impact of the proposal is severe in nature. They have checked personal injury records, which indicates there have been no accidents on Underhill Road at the junction with Horn Street. They have set out that the applicant's Transport Statement explains that they plan to limit the number of bookings per day (with a maximum of 6 bookings per day during GMT and 8 bookings per day during BST), limit to one car (unless one additional car is authorised at the time of booking), and include an additional gap half an hour between bookings to allow for one person to leave before the next person arrives. This is acceptable and reasonable, with very low resulting traffic movements. As such, they do not consider the proposals will have a severe impact on the junction of Underhill Road and Horn Street.

**KCC Ecology:** No ecological information has been submitted with this retrospective application. If planning permission is granted they advise a condition to ensure that no net-loss of biodiversity occurs and that enhancement measures are implemented. The condition would include the planting of native vegetation.

**Environment Agency:** The Environment Agency raised no objection on the understanding that where a channel had been dug, it should not be carrying any pollution, such as dog excrement laden runoff into the river. They have included an 'environmental permit' informative which refers to the applicant needing to obtain a permit for any activities which will take place on or near the Seabrook Stream.

**Environmental Protection Officer:** Initial comments from the Environmental Health Officer received February raised concerns around assumptions made in the Acoustic

# DCL/21/27

report (due to variables such as weather conditions/seasons/number and size of dogs etc). The Environmental Health Officer suggested conditions, including hours of operation, limit of 6 dogs on site at one time, any external lighting to be switched off by 18:00hrs, no over-night boarding and that a 2.0m high solid timber fence/wall should be erected. Following the submission further information and clarity on the assumptions made in the initial Acoustic report (from agent dated 10 March) the Environmental Health Officer has submitted revised comments dated 31 March confirming that Environmental Health department cannot reasonably request the 2.0m high acoustic fence and they withdraw this proposed condition, they would however welcome the proposed reduction in maximum number of dogs, from 6 to 4. The other suggested conditions should remain. In addition to the suggested conditions the Environmental Health Officer advised that it would not be reasonable for clients to self-regulate themselves regarding excessively barking dogs and therefore advise the site to be appropriately staffed, while in operation.

## Local Residents Comments

- 4.2. Since the committee meeting in April, a further 166 representations have been received (although a number of these are duplicates), in addition to the 176 received at the time of writing the original report and the 6 additional representations submitted prior to the April meeting.
- 4.3. I have read all of the letters received. For the sake of clarity and for ease of reference, the key issues raised previously together with any new key issues are as follows:

## Objections

- Impact on ecology
- Similar facilities available elsewhere in the wider area and therefore no need for this site
- Underhill Road isn't suitable for the increase of traffic movements
- Impact on Horn Street due to increase of traffic
- Noise generated from increased traffic movements, numerous dogs, shouting and noisy training aids/dog toys
- Excessive operating hours
- Hazard. Surrounding fields either have sheep, cattle or equine which spook easily
- Nature of business attracts dogs that are antisocial and cannot be let off in public places with other animals/people
- Danger of dogs escaping
- Access point not owned by applicant but gate has been installed
- Flooding issued caused by new drainage system

## Support

# DCL/21/27

- No other comparable sites nearby, willing to travel from outside the district to use facilities
- Good place for dogs who are not good with other dogs or humans
- Good for persons and/or dogs with disabilities and mental health disorders
- Nothing similar within close proximity/locally. Most fields contain other dogs or livestock
- Dogs have freedom to run off-lead in a safe and enclosed area
- Booking system ensures no crossover of persons or dogs resulting in minimal congestion and noise
- Sheltered with seating and dog toy/training aids and other provisions (including water/wash area and dog waste bins) are on site, unlike public dog runs
- Fences/enclosures are high and screened, unlike that found in local authority dog runs
- Will not impact upon neighbours

4.4. Responses are available in full on the planning file on the Council's website:

<https://searchplanapps.folkestone-hythe.gov.uk/online-applications/>

## 5. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

5.1. The Development Plan comprises the Places and Policies Local Plan 2020 and the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013.

5.1 The Folkestone & Hythe District Council Core Strategy Review Submission Draft (2019) was submitted to the Secretary of State on 10 March 2020. Inspectors were appointed to examine the plan on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2020 and public hearings were held from 15<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> December 2020, from 5<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> January 2021 and from 29<sup>th</sup> June to 1<sup>st</sup> July 2021. The Inspectors wrote to the council on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2021 to state that the Core Strategy Review complies with the duty to cooperate and can be made 'sound' by amendment through main modifications. The Inspectors followed up their initial assessment by letter on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2021, stating that, subject to main modifications concerning detailed policy wording, they consider that the plan's spatial strategy and overall approach to the district's character areas and settlements is sound. The Inspectors find that the housing requirement is justified and that the Core Strategy Review will provide an adequate supply of housing over the plan period and at least a five year supply of housing land at the point of adoption. In accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (2021) paragraph 48, the policies in the Core Strategy Review should therefore be afforded significant weight, having regard to the Inspectors' outline of main modifications required.

5.2 The relevant development plan policies are as follows:-

Places and Policies Local Plan 2020

Policy HB1 – Quality Places through Design

Policy T2 – Parking Standards

Policy NE2 – Biodiversity

Policy NE3 – Protecting the District’s Landscapes and Countryside

Policy HE2 – Archaeology

Shepway Local Plan Core Strategy (2013)

Policy DSD – Delivering Sustainable Development

Policy SS1 – District Spatial Strategy

Policy SS3 – Place Shaping and Sustainable Settlements Strategy

Policy CSD3 – Rural and Tourism Development of Shepway

Policy CSD4 – Green Infrastructure of Natural Networks, Open Spaces and Recreation

Core Strategy Review Submission draft (2019)

Policy SS1 – District Spatial Strategy

Policy SS3 – Place Shaping and Sustainable Settlements Strategy

5.3 The following are also material considerations to the determination of this application.

## **Government Advice**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019

Members should note that the determination must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. A significant material consideration is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF says that less weight should be given to the policies above if they are in conflict with the NPPF. The following sections of the NPPF are relevant to this application:-

Paragraph 11 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Paragraph 47 - Applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan.

Paragraph 48 – Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans.

Paragraph 55 - Whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations.

Paragraph 84 – Supporting a prosperous rural economy. Sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas and sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside.

Paragraph 85 - Decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. Important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an

# DCL/21/27

unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable.

Paragraph 111 - 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.

Paragraph 174 - Decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.

## National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

Design: process and tools  
Effective Use of Land  
Natural Environment  
Noise  
Use of Planning Conditions

## National Design Guide October 2019

C1 - Understand and relate well to the site, its local and wider context

## **6. APPRAISAL**

6.1. A number of issues have been raised by Hythe Town Council and interested parties in the representations received which do not amount to material planning considerations and which Members therefore should not have regard to in considering this application. They are as follows:

- Animal welfare;
- Health and safety;
- Possibility of dogs escaping from site;
- Matters relating to land ownership;

6.2. I have reviewed the application details in light of the additional information received, and re-appraised the scheme against the development plan and government policy and guidance. In light of the above the main issues for consideration are:

- a) Principle of development
- b) Visual amenity, impact on the character and appearance of the countryside and on the Local Landscape Area
- c) Residential amenity

- d) Highway safety and convenience
- e) Other issues

## **a) Principle of Development**

- 6.3. The general thrust of national and local plan policy is to secure the sustainable patterns of development through the efficient reuse of previously developed land, concentrating development at accessible locations, generally within or close to existing settlements.
- 6.4. Policies SS1, SS3 and CSD3 of the Council's Core Strategy set out that development sites should primarily be located within settlements.
- 6.5. Policy SS1 also says that development in the open countryside (defined as anywhere outside of the settlements) will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances, where a rural/coastal location is essential.
- 6.6. The supporting text to CSD3 states that "appropriate flexibility is needed for genuinely rural uses...in areas outside of settlements – where the countryside protection principle established in SS1 would otherwise substantially constrict specifically rural development."
- 6.7. CSD3 itself policy CSD3 states that development outside existing settlements "may only be allowed if a rural or coastal location is essential", but that "rural economic diversification will be supported".
- 6.8. Policy CSD3 goes on to state that where sites are unavailable within settlements and the development is proportionate in scale/impact and accessible by a choice of means of transport, it may be acceptable on the edge of Strategic Towns and Service Centres, and failing that, Rural Centres and Primary Villages.
- 6.9. The NPPF, at paragraph 84, states that planning decisions should enable "the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses" and "should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport)."
- 6.10. Taken as a whole, the relevant policies and guidance seek to afford a significant degree of protection to land outside settlement boundaries, whilst broadly encouraging appropriate economic uses in the countryside.
- 6.11. The core strategy limits this to uses which require a countryside location. The NPPF, which is more recent, widens this and encourages land based rural businesses, which might not be found in entirely sustainable locations.
- 6.12. In my view, the use proposed here could theoretically be provided within existing settlements. I am though of the opinion that applications for the use of land for dog walking/exercise would be most unlikely to come forward within settlements, primarily because such a use requires a reasonably significant area of land, and land prices and



## DCL/21/27

availability would render such a use unviable. Those undeveloped areas of land allocated for employment use seek to secure more standard business uses such as Silver Springs in Park Farm. Even if such a use would be viable in these locations, I consider that a dog walking facility on such allocated sites would be unlikely to be granted planning permission, firstly because the use would be incompatible with the employment allocation in the local plan and secondly because the employment density (the number of people employed per square metre of the use) would be markedly lower than the uses allocated in the plan.

- 6.13. Whilst, therefore, the applicants have not provided details of a sequential search as requested by Members, it is considered likely that such a search would not have demonstrated that there was land for this purpose reasonably available.
- 6.14. In light of the above and the discussion at the previous committee I have further considered the development plan for parallels given that the plan does not specifically provide for dog walking. Policy CSD3 sets out that equestrian developments in the countryside are acceptable as a matter of principle. I consider that a parallel can be drawn here between use of land for dog walking and use of land for equestrian purposes. Both could theoretically be provided within settlements, but this is most unlikely. Both require large areas of land to function. Both require the provision of limited built development, although in the case of equestrian uses, this is likely to be more significant than for a dog walking/exercise facility.
- 6.15. I am mindful that the previous report considered that facilities of the type proposed here did not require a countryside location in part due to the lack of such facilities in the countryside, and because existing dog exercise areas in the District are located within settlements.
- 6.16. Having further examined the Council's retained planning records, there are two approved schemes for "dog training", both in the countryside, dating from 2014, one application which refers to a dog walking area, (although in this case the use did not require permission) and two recent applications for similar facilities, one of which has been granted permission under delegated powers, and is located in the countryside, and one which remains undetermined at the time of writing.
- 6.17. The dog walking areas within existing settlements all appear to be Council owned and provided within recreation grounds and parks. Part of the function of a Council, as Members will be aware, is to provide facilities of this nature for its residents, and given that the areas in question are all provided in existing parks, they do not require planning permission, did not require the purchase of the land and therefore the question of viability does not arise.
- 6.18. Non-Council owned facilities are all located in the countryside, and the Council has in the past considered them to be acceptable in principle in such locations, noting that they amounted to development which complied with the general thrust of core strategy policies and the NPPF.
- 6.19. On further consideration I am satisfied that, on balance, a dog walking/exercise facility could require a countryside location, by the nature of the use. I therefore conclude that it meets the tests of Policy CSD3 of the Core Strategy. Furthermore, the proposal is for a land based rural business, which the NPPF encourages.

## DCL/21/27

- 6.20. The previous report acknowledges that the site lies in a reasonably sustainable location, close to the built up area, and reasonably well served by public transport, albeit that it is unlikely that patrons will visit the site on foot. The NPPF accepts that rural based enterprises are unlikely to be located in wholly sustainable locations and I conclude that the proposal would not be unacceptable in this regard.
- 6.21. Having regard to the above, I am on balance of the view that the proposed use of the site broadly accords with the core strategy and NPPF in respect of the acceptability of this use in this location. Accordingly, I consider that the proposal is acceptable as a matter of principle.

### **b) Visual amenity, impact on the character and appearance of the countryside and on the Local Landscape Area**

- 6.22 The use of the field itself is comparatively low key. No jumps, nor any other apparatus is used and I recommend imposing conditions 1) and 3) below, which prevent any such equipment being used at the site and restrict the use of the site to a dog walking/exercise field only. Subject to this condition, I do not consider the use of the site in itself to give rise to harm visual amenity, nor the character and appearance of the countryside or the Local Landscape Area (LLA).
- 6.23 The site is not readily visible from public vantage points, these being limited to the public footpath to the north, at a distance of approximately 83 metres from the entrance to the field. The majority of the fencing that has been erected at the site is unobtrusive and unobjectionable. Where the fencing is post and wire, it blends in to the land and is not harmful to visual amenity, the character and appearance of the countryside or the LLA.
- 6.24 The fencing along the southern boundary of the site is post and wire fencing with a green mesh along its length. I understand this is to minimise disturbance to the horses which use the land beyond the boundary. This fencing is in my view unacceptable. Some planting has taken place to the front of the fence, and it is understood that more is intended to take place. I am of the view that a substantial landscaped buffer is required here, and have accordingly discussed with the applicants. Condition 2) below requires the planting of a 2.5 metre deep belt of landscaping along the entire length of this boundary, and the removal of the green mesh from the fencing within the next 5 years. This would allow the landscaping to mature such that the mesh would no longer be visible.
- 6.25 I also recommend imposing condition 7) below, which would give the Council control over the erection of any further fencing or means of enclosure within the site.
- 6.26 The field shelters which have been located on the land are very small in scale and constructed of materials sympathetic to the rural location of the site. I do not consider them to cause harm to visual amenity, or to the character and appearance of the countryside or the LLA. The seating within the site is domestic in nature. However – it is comparatively small in scale and unobtrusive. I do not consider it harmful. I do though recommend imposing condition 3) below, which prevents the stationing or storage of further structures, jumps, dog agility equipment and similar within the site.

# DCL/21/27

6.27 Subject to the imposition of suitably worded conditions, I do not consider that the use would cause harm to the visual amenity of the area, nor to the character and appearance of the countryside or LLA.

## **c) Residential Amenity**

6.28 The previous report considers in detail the impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of the closest dwellings to the site, including an appraisal of the submitted noise assessment and the comments of the Environmental Health Officer and concludes that, subject to conditions, no significant harm to residential amenity would occur.

6.29 I agree with the conclusions of the previous report in this respect. I recommend imposing conditions restricting the hours of use to between 8am and 6pm, restricting the number of customers on the site at any one time to 4, the number of dogs to 4 at any one time and preventing the erection of any lighting within the site. This would, in my view, minimise noise and light pollution from the site and would prevent harm to residential amenity.

6.30 Subject to these conditions, I am of the view that the development would comply with the development plan and government guidance and is acceptable.

## **d) Highway safety and convenience**

6.31 The previous report considers the highway implications of the proposal in detail and I concur with its conclusion that the use would, if controlled by appropriate conditions in respect of provision and retention of parking, cause no demonstrable harm to the safety or convenience of users of the highway. I recommend imposing condition 9) below, which requires the existing parking to be kept available for such a purpose.

## **e) Other Issues**

6.32 A substantial number of representations from objectors comment on the availability of other such facilities in the wider area. The availability or otherwise of such facilities would only be a material consideration if this development were contrary to policy and unacceptable as a matter of principle and if an argument were being advanced that the proposal provided a much needed facility not currently available. As set out above, this is not considered to be the case.

6.33 KCC Ecology has requested a condition regarding biodiversity enhancements. This is recommended to be imposed as condition 5) below.

## **Environmental Impact Assessment**

6.34 In accordance with the EIA Regulations 2017, this development has been considered in light of Schedules 1& 2 of the Regulations and it is not considered to fall within either category and as such does not require screening for likely significant environmental effects.

## **Local Finance Considerations**

# DCL/21/27

6.35 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that a local planning authority must have regard to a local finance consideration as far as it is material. Section 70(4) of the Act defines a local finance consideration as a grant or other financial assistance that has been, that will, or that could be provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown (such as New Homes Bonus payments), or sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of the Community Infrastructure Levy. There is no CIL requirement for this development.

## Human Rights

6.36 In reaching a decision on a planning application the European Convention on Human Rights must be considered. The Convention Rights that are relevant are Article 8 and Article 1 of the first protocol. The proposed course of action is in accordance with domestic law. As the rights in these two articles are qualified, the Council needs to balance the rights of the individual against the interests of society and must be satisfied that any interference with an individual's rights is no more than necessary. Having regard to the previous paragraphs of this report, it is not considered that any interference with these rights is proportionate and justified.

## Public Sector Equality Duty

6.37 In determining this application, regard has been had to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) as set down in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, in particular with regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. It is considered that the application proposals would not undermine objectives of the Duty.

It is considered that the application proposals would not conflict with objectives of the Duty.

## Working with the applicant

6.38 In accordance with paragraphs 38 of the NPPF, Folkestone and Hythe District Council (F&HDC) takes a positive and creative approach to development proposals focused on solutions. F&HDC works with applicants/agents in a positive and creative manner.

## 7. CONCLUSION

7.1 The proposed use is considered to be appropriate in the countryside, and acceptable as a matter of principle.

7.2 The operational development including the fencing and gates, and the siting of the shelters and table are not considered harmful to the character and appearance of the countryside, to the Local Landscape Area or to the visual amenities of the area.

# DCL/21/27

7.3 Subject to conditions, it is considered that the proposed development would not harm residential amenity or highway safety and convenience.

7.4 Accordingly it is concluded that, subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposal is in accordance with the provisions of the development plan, and acceptable.

## 8. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

8.1 The consultation responses set out at Section 4.0 are background documents for the purposes of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

## 9. RECOMMENDATION

**That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions and that delegated authority be given to the Chief Planning Officer to agree and finalise the wording of the conditions and add any other conditions that he considers necessary.**

- 1) The use hereby permitted shall be restricted to dog walking and exercise only, and no organised classes, dog agility or organised training shall take place within the site.

**Reason:** In the interests of residential and visual amenity, and highway safety and convenience.

- 2) Within six months of the date of this decision, details of a 2.5 metre landscaped buffer, measured from the southern boundary fence line, shall have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority. These details shall show the numbers, species and location of native planting, shall include an implementation programme and a timescale for removal of the green mesh currently affixed to the southern boundary fence. Upon approval, the landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and implementation programme.

**Reason:** In the interests of visual amenity.

- 3) With the exception of the shelters as shown on the approved plans and one table and chairs, no further buildings shall be erected or stationed within the site, whether temporary or not, no external storage of materials or items of any kind including jumps, caravans, mobile homes, vehicles or trailers shall take place on the site.

**Reason:** In the interests of visual amenity.

- 4) Waste arising from the dogs using the site shall only be disposed in accordance with the approved details set out in the letter from the agent dated 18<sup>th</sup> February 2021 and no waste shall be burnt on site.

**Reason:** In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

- 5) Within six months of the date of this decision, details of how the development will enhance biodiversity, including an implementation programme, shall have been submitted to the local planning authority for written approval. The approved details will be implemented and thereafter retained.

**Reason:** In the interest of enhancing ecology and biodiversity.

# DCL/21/27

- 6) No lighting shall take place within the site.

**Reason:** In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

- 7) Notwithstanding the provisions of Class A, Part 2, Schedule 2, of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order, no fences, gates walls or other means of enclosure shall be erected within the application site.

**Reason:** In the interests of visual amenity.

- 8) No dogs shall be kept on the site overnight, and the premises shall not be open to the public on any Bank Holiday, nor on any other day except between the following times:

Monday to Sunday 0800 – 1800 hours

**Reason:** In the interests of residential amenity.

- 9) The area shown on the submitted plan as car parking space shall be kept available for such use at all times and no permanent development, whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order) or not, shall be carried out on the land so shown or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access thereto.

**Reason:** In the interests of highway safety and convenience.

- 10) The use of the site shall be limited to a maximum of 4 people and four dogs at any one time.

**Reason:** In the interests of residential amenity and highway safety and convenience.

- 11) Upon completion of the approved landscaping scheme, any trees or shrubs that are removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced with trees or shrubs of such size and species as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, and within whatever planting season is agreed.

**Reason:** In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and encouraging wildlife and biodiversity.

- 12) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the following submitted plans and documents:

P20-3011\_01A Site Location Plan

P20-3011 02C Block Plan

# DCL/21/27

P20-3011\_02A-2 Block Plan (South)

P20-3011 - Planning-Statement

P20-3011\_02A-1 Block Plan (North)

Letter from agent dated 18<sup>th</sup> February 2021

**Reason:** For the avoidance of doubt and in order to ensure the satisfactory implementation of the development in accordance with the aims of Places and Policies Local Plan.