

## **REPORT TO MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

**By Graham Self MA MSc FRTPI**

Appeal by Mr and Mrs B Middlemiss against a grant of planning permission.

Reference Number: P/2022/0789

Site at 12 Les Quennevais Gardens, St Brelade JE3 8FQ

---

### **Introduction**

1. This appeal is being assessed by written representations and a site inspection. I inspected the site on 7 December 2022.
2. The appeal is against a decision to grant planning permission for development described in the application and in the decision notice as: "Construct two storey extension to South elevation. Construct single storey extension to North elevation". The application was by Mr David Taylor (see paragraph 5 below).
3. The planning authority's stated reason for approval was:

"Permission has been granted having taken into account the relevant policies of the approved Island Plan, together with other relevant policies and all other material considerations, including the consultations and representations received".
4. The permission would have been subject to the two normal standard conditions covering implementation of the development within three years and compliance with approved plans.

### **Procedural Matters**

5. Most of the documents submitted for this appeal – including those submitted by an agent for the applicant – incorrectly specify the applicant as "Mr and Mrs D Taylor". In the application published online the identity of the applicant is blacked out (wrongly in my view) and in order to make normal checks I have had to make special arrangements through the Judicial Greffe to see an unedited copy of the application.
6. The orientation of the site and of the proposed extension in relation to compass points and neighbouring properties is described incorrectly in the written material submitted for the appellants. The errors, combined with the fact that the appeal documents did not include any plan showing the location of the appellants' property at 12 Les Quennevais Gardens, made it initially difficult to understand the matters of dispute. There also appeared to be errors in the application plans. I therefore considered holding a hearing for a case which appeared otherwise to be suitable for the written representations procedure. However, I decided that the issues could be clarified during a site inspection.
7. As part of the preparation for this case I arranged for messages to be sent to the appeal parties. These were partly about the site inspection procedure mentioned above, and also raised a query about the type of glazing proposed for the roof windows. One of the submissions for the appellants<sup>1</sup> had suggested that obscure

---

<sup>1</sup> This is in the third paragraph of a letter dated 22 August 2022 from the appellants' agent to Infrastructure, Housing and Environment.

glazing would be likely for an earlier design involving dormers, though no such proposal was made in the application (as amended proposing roof windows) or would have been required by the permission subject to appeal.

### **Site and Surroundings**

*The location of the site in relation to its surroundings can be seen on the Site Location Plan (Drawing Number 7604-01 S01, at a larger scale on the Existing Site Plan (Drawing Number 7604-01 S02) and on the Proposed Site Plan (Drawing Number 7604-01 P01 Revision A).*

8. Les Quennevais Gardens is the name of a lane which provides access into a residential part of northern St Brelade, located to the east of La Route des Quennevais. The area is apparently known as Pinnacle Estates. The access lane is evidently a private road. Part of it, leading off La Route des Quennevais, has an east-west alignment; part has a north-south alignment and has a junction with la Route du Francief in the north.
9. The application site at Number 12 is located on the east side of the northern end of a cul-de-sac "spur" which leads northwards off the east-west length of Les Quennevais Gardens. The property occupied by the appellants at 11 Quennevais Gardens is sited east of the application site on the west side of the north-south portion of the lane.
10. The numbering of the properties in this area does not appear to follow any normal or consecutive pattern and not all house numbers are displayed clearly. As far as I could tell (having checked with local residents present at the site inspection), the dwelling south of Number 12 is Number 13, the dwelling to the south-east (on the corner where the road has a turning circle) is Number 10, the dwelling north of Number 10 is Number 11 (the appellants' property) and the dwelling to the north of that is apparently Number 6.
11. Most of the dwellings in the neighbourhood are sited fairly conventionally in their plots with their frontages facing and parallel to the adjacent road. The house at Number 12 is different, in that it is positioned at an angle in its roughly rectangular-shaped plot, as can be seen on the site plan. The house is of chalet bungalow style with first floor flat-roofed dormer windows set in the roof. Looked at "in plan" (from above), the house has a roughly rectangular shape with its longer sides facing approximately east-northeast and south-southwest; the shorter "ends" face approximately south-southeast and north-northwest.
12. Immediately to the north of the application site is the rear garden of the dwelling at Number 6 Quennevais Gardens (the dwelling itself being sited more towards the north-east, near the road). The appellants' property at Number 11 is east (or slightly south of east) of the application site.<sup>2</sup>
13. The dwelling at Number 11 has two storeys. On the northern part of the ground floor there is a kitchen and utility room and in the southern part there is a study and lounge. The dwelling has its main rear outlook towards the rear garden, the openings including windows to the study and full-length glazed doors to the lounge. On the first floor there is a rear-facing bedroom window in about the centre of the rear elevation and other windows (obscure-glazed) to bathrooms.

---

<sup>2</sup> The north-point on some of the application plans, in particular the Proposed Site Plan (Drawing 7604-01 P01 Revision A) is disproportionately small, but is reasonably clear. I have checked it against other sources including publicly available maps and aerial photographs and it appears to be accurate. The north point on the Site Location Plan (Drawing 7604-01 S01, 1:2500 scale at A4 size) also appears to be accurate.

14. The rear garden at Number 11 is partly covered with astroturf-type plastic, timber boarding, and some patio slabs.<sup>3</sup> In the south-west corner there is a hot tub and adjacent timber building housing related equipment and a changing room. Along the boundary between Numbers 11 and 12 there is a wall about 2 metres in height with attached decorative features. Next to the wall there is some vegetation including raised flower beds, two small evergreen trees and four magnolia shrubs. The trees and shrubs appear to be fairly young; they are spaced at about 2 metre intervals and their upper parts extend about 1.5-1.7 metres above the wall.

### **Case for Appellants**

15. The main points made for the appellants are summarised below.
- The two-storey extension would have an unreasonable overbearing impact on the occupiers of the property at 11 Les Quennevais Gardens including its principal garden space, contrary to Bridging Island Plan policy GD1.
  - The extension would be only 400mm from the property boundary at its closest point and would rise to 6 metres in height. The harm would be exacerbated by the fact that the closest affected windows serve the principal living room at Number 11.
  - The impact of the proposal would be worse than was found in relation to two similar appeals, especially since the proposed extension would be directly to the south of 11 Quennevais Gardens.
  - The proposal would cause loss of sunlight and daylight at 11 Les Quennevais Gardens, including unreasonable loss of sunlight to the garden at important times, for example in the late afternoon. The effect would again be greater than was found in a recent appeal case. No sunlight path analysis was submitted with the application.
  - The proposed design would include a large box dormer on the south elevation. Such features are usually resisted as failing to meet Policy GD6 of the Island Plan and should be replaced by two smaller dormers.

### **Case for Planning Authority**

16. Representations in response by the planning authority are, in summary:
- The two-storey extension would be set between 1.1 metre at the nearest point and 4 metres at the furthest point from the boundary with Number 11. It would be 6 metres in height, 0.4 metre below the ridge of the existing house.
  - Allowing for the height and distance from neighbouring properties, the extension would not be overbearing or oppressive, would not unreasonably harm the appellants' amenities and would be in keeping with the area in accordance with Policy GD1.
  - The effect of the proposal on daylight and sunlight to the garden and principal living room at Number 11 was fully considered. Amended plans were submitted replacing a previously proposed dormer with rooflights. The Department also requested sun path assessments; these showed that the extension would have some additional impact on part of the appellants' garden between about 5pm and 6pm in June and around 4pm in September.

---

<sup>3</sup> Most of the features described here can be seen in the photograph at Appendix 3 of the appellants' statement of case. The roof of the existing conservatory at Number 12 is also visible above the boundary wall. This photograph was apparently taken from outside the rear of the house at Number 11 at 4.30pm on 20 September 2022.

The impact on the appellants' living room would be very limited. This was not considered to be an unacceptable impact.

- The design and materials would be suitable and in line with Policy GD6, taking into account the existing building and the character of the area.

### **Case for Applicants**

17. For the applicants, it is contended that the proposal would meet their needs without unduly affecting the neighbouring property and that Island Plan goals would be met. Other points with particular reference to policies are:
  - Policies SP1 on responding to climate change and on spatial strategy would be met as the proposal looks to make use of land in the built-up area and optimise the density of development. Policy PL2 encourages development in Les Quennevais as the Island's secondary urban area; the proposal would be in keeping with this policy.
  - The proposal would contribute to the Island's housing stock and so comply with Policy SP7. The design offers the flexibility to provide a first floor guest room and ground floor bedroom suite in the short term with possible accommodation for a carer if needed by Mr and Mrs Taylor in later life.
  - The criteria in Policy GD1 requiring development not to unreasonably harm amenities of occupants would be met. The apex of the extension would be set back from the boundary by 4.1 metres at its nearest point and would be 12.7 metres from the neighbouring house. The roof apex would be 6.07 metres high.
  - The effect on the garden of Number 11 would be minimal and the proposal would not unreasonably affect Number 11's privacy or sunlight or daylight. The only real impact would be after 6pm in the evening. The impact would be more noticeable in March and September but this would only be in the late afternoon.

### **Assessment and Conclusions**

#### **Preliminary Points**

18. Before considering the main matters of dispute in this case it is necessary to deal with errors in the evidence for the appellant, and in the application, and to a lesser extent in the planning authority's statement. As mentioned in paragraph 5 above, I drew attention to these points and checked with all parties at the start of the site inspection.
19. Incorrect statements relating to compass point orientation have been made for the appellants, and these are potentially important. For example, in a letter on their behalf dated 22 August 2022, their agent referred to the appellants' property at 11 Quennevais Gardens as "adjacent to the application site, located immediately to the north". The proposed extension at Number 12 was described as "east of the dwelling". The appellants' statement of case contends that the proposed extension "will be only 400mm from the southern boundary of 11 Quennevais Gardens"<sup>4</sup>; and that "the proposal...is a worse case because of the extension's location, directly facing and to the south of 11 Quennevais Gardens, rather than being from the side and to the west"<sup>5</sup>. Another argument is that the nearest part of the appellants' house and garden at Number 11 has significant

---

<sup>4</sup> Unnumbered paragraph near the bottom of page 1.

<sup>5</sup> Unnumbered paragraph in about the middle of Page 2.

amenity value "since this is its south-facing side". The statement also refers to "a large box dormer on the south elevation" of the application property.<sup>6</sup>

20. In fact Mr and Mrs Middlemiss' property at 11 Quennevais Gardens is to the east of the application site,<sup>7</sup> not the north. The 400mm dimension quoted on behalf of Mr and Mrs Middlemiss - which is incorrect anyway as I explain later - relates to the western (not southern) boundary of Number 11 and the reference to the "worse case...directly facing and to the south of" Number 11 is also wrong by about 90 degrees because the proposed extension would be to the west of the dwelling at Number 11, not to the south. The part of the appellants' house facing the application site is the rear, which faces slightly north of west (it is not the "south-facing side"). The proposed dormer would be on the front elevation of Number 12 which faces west-southwest (away from and out of sight from the appellants' property), not the south elevation.
21. There are also errors in the application. No drawing was submitted showing the position of the cross-sections A-A, B-B, C-C and C-C (the last of which is also obviously wrongly titled as "C-C" is duplicated on Drawing 7604-01 P05 Revision A). However, it is possible to work out the locations from what is depicted.
22. More importantly, the sets of drawings Numbered 7604-01 S06 and 7604-PO1 Revision A purport to show "Existing Elevations and Isometrics" and "Proposed Elevations and Isometrics" respectively. Two of the drawings in each of the "existing" and "proposed" sets purport to show, at 1:100 scale, what is labelled as: "South-East Isometric" and "North-West Isometric".
23. An isometric drawing of a structure is supposed to show a "three-dimensional" view. These drawings do so. But the drawings as labelled are incorrect, and do not correspond with what is shown in the other drawings. Looking, for example, at the "South-East Isometric" depiction of what is proposed, the single-storey extension is nearest the viewpoint, and the two-storey extension is at the far end of the building. In the "North-West Isometric" drawing, the two-storey extension with the proposed dormer is closest to the viewpoint. In both cases, based on the other application plans, approximately the opposite would apply: what is shown in the isometric drawings as the view from the south-east would be the view from approximately north-northwest, and what is shown as the view from the north-west would be the view from approximately south-southeast.
24. In the application plans the "front" or west-southwest elevation is labelled "west elevation", the "rear" or east-northeast elevation is labelled "east elevation" and so on. Similar approximations are used in the officer's report appended to the planning authority's statement - for example, the north-northwest elevation is referred to as the north elevation and the south-southeast as the south (the report refers to "the conservatory on the southern elevation"). Although those descriptions are imprecise they are not misleading in the same way as the plainly wrong compass directions mentioned above.
25. Some of the points above relating to the application plans could potentially have legal consequences. For example, where a planning permission is subject to a standard condition requiring implementation in accordance with specified plans and those plans are mutually conflicting or inconsistent, uncertainty and enforcement problems could arise. The faulty isometric drawings were evidently not noticed by the planning authority during the processing of the application.

---

<sup>6</sup> Page 3, after the sub-heading "Expanded Case".

<sup>7</sup> Indeed a notional point placed in the centre of the plot of Number 11 is slightly to the south of east from a notional point in the centre of the plot of Number 12.

26. For the sake of simplicity in the rest of this report I refer to the facing directions of the elevations of the house at Number 12 with some approximation, treating west-southwest (the "front") as west, east-northeast (the "rear") as east, north-northwest as north, and south-southeast as south. This is the same as the labelling in the application plans, but the imprecision should be noted.
27. One other matter of apparent dispute about what is proposed concerns the distance which would exist between the proposed two-storey extension and the site boundary (ie the boundary between the application site and the plot of the appellants' dwelling at Number 11). The written evidence on this point varies between the appellants' agent's figure of 400 millimetres "at its closest" and the planning authority's minimum figure of 1.1 metre (ie stated as between 1.1 and 4 metres allowing for the angled siting of the building).
28. In assessing the effect of this overhang at the south-east corner of the proposed extension, it is necessary to allow for the angled position of the structure in relation to the site boundary, taking account of two aspects: (i) the extent of eaves overhang from the rear (north-eastern) wall, as shown in the proposed sections; (ii) the fact that the roof and eaves of the extension would project south-eastwards slightly beyond the end gable wall.<sup>8</sup> The eaves overhang to the rear is shown as projecting only about 15 centimetres from the wall, though normal-sized guttering would increase the overhang. This would be a much smaller eaves projection with much narrower soffits than the existing house eaves.
29. During my inspection I asked those representing the appeal parties to agree the position of the corner of the proposed extension nearest the site's boundary with Number 11. This position was marked with a temporary stake. The dimension between this point (which was within some hedge or shrub vegetation) and the wall marking the ownership boundary was found to be a little over 1 metre. Allowing for eaves overhang, I estimate that at the corner point where the extension would be closest to the site boundary, the projecting eaves of the proposed structure would be about 1 metre from the boundary, the precise figure depending on guttering shape which is not shown on the application drawings<sup>9</sup>. The rest of the structure would be at a greater distance. Even allowing for possible inaccuracies in measuring and in estimating the effect of various angles, this dimension would be much greater than (ie at least double) the 400mm contended for the appellant.

#### **Assessment of Main Issues**

30. There is no dispute about the proposed single-storey extension to the north-west of Number 12 or about the proposed internal alterations and I do not see any objections to these parts of the proposal. The dispute relates to the extension to the south-east, and concerns the effect of the proposal on the amenities of the property at 11 Les Quennevais Gardens, having regard in particular to outlook, privacy, sunlight or daylight, and relevant planning policy.
31. If the proposed extension were built, it would noticeably reduce the extent of sky in the outlook currently available from the rear garden of Number 11 and from some rooms in the house. The part of the extension closest to Number 11 would

---

<sup>8</sup> The drawings indicate that this overhang would be about 10 centimetres (ie south-eastwards measured at 90 degrees from the gable end wall).

<sup>9</sup> During my inspection I queried the presence of a small square shape shown on the drawings of proposed sections (Drawing Number P05A) in the approximate position where guttering might be expected. This shape is apparently not intended to indicate the presence or size of guttering and is a draughting error.

be about 10 metres from the full-length glazed doors at the back of Number 11's lounge, though the rest of the extension would be further away because of the angle of the walls and roof slope. The lower part of the extension would be screened from view by the existing boundary wall. The upper part would be screened to some extent by the trees and shrubs at the rear of Number 11's garden (assuming the retention and continued health of this vegetation). From positions towards the south-west corner of Number 11's garden (near the shed housing hot tub equipment) the gable-end wall of the proposed extension would be quite prominent, and this wall would also be visible, though not so prominently because the view of the gable-end would be at an angle, from the lounge and other places in or near the house.

32. Privacy at the rear of Number 11 could potentially be affected by the presence of the two roof windows which are proposed in the north-east facing roof slope of the extension. The bottom edge of these windows would be 1.8 metres above floor level, which would be above eye height for most - but not all - human adults. Bearing in mind the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy for occupiers of Number 11, conditions could be imposed to require that these windows would be obscure-glazed and possibly non-opening, a matter I return to later below.
33. The effect of the proposal on the incidence of sunlight or daylight at Number 11 is partly shown in the submitted "Sun Studies" drawings ("partly shown" because as is normal, the drawings only depict example dates - in this instance the dates are in March, June and September). From what I saw on site and from the available evidence on this issue, it is apparent that at certain times of year the proposal would cause some loss of sunlight in part of the rear garden of Number 11. The effect would mostly be in the evenings during Autumn or at times during the Spring. During the winter the amount of afternoon sunlight reaching the rear garden of Number 11 would be limited anyway because of the orientation of the plot and the height of the boundary wall. The presence of the proposed extension would have some effect on sunlight reaching the rear of the house itself at Number 11, but the impact would be quite limited.
34. To have an effect on daylight, a structure normally has to be very close to the daylight receptor, typically a window. The effect of the proposed development on the incidence of daylight in either the house or garden at Number 11 would be so limited as to be insignificant.
35. Different considerations arise when assessing whether the extension would have an overbearing effect for occupiers of Number 11. This is an issue which may be perceived in different ways by different people. In my judgment if, hypothetically, the extension were to exist when potential occupiers of Number 11 were considering whether to move into the property, they would probably not find the extension to be overbearing. But as a prospect for existing occupiers who have become used to enjoying a fairly open rear outlook, the proposal would be more likely to be perceived as having an unacceptable, overbearing impact. This effect has to be weighed in the overall balance.
36. The statement for the applicants draws attention to the distance between the site boundary and the apex of the roof of the proposed extension. In my view that distance is less of an issue than the distance between the corner of the extension and the site boundary at around eaves level. In views from ground level in the garden or house at Number 11, the 2 metre boundary wall would screen much of the lower part of the proposed extension, but the eaves would be a little above the wall and the corner of the extension would be much closer than the existing conservatory seen in the photograph at Appendix 3 of the appellants' statement.

The height and bulk of the extension with its gable-ended ridged roof, with its apex only a little lower than the ridge of the main house, would also of course be much greater than the existing conservatory.

37. Policy GD1 of the Bridging Island Plan appears to be the policy most relevant to this case. Under this policy, development proposals will only be supported where (among other things) the development would not unreasonably harm the amenities of nearby residents, would not create a sense of overbearing or oppressive enclosure or unreasonably affect privacy or the level of sunlight and daylight that occupiers might reasonably expect to enjoy.<sup>10</sup>

**Other matters**

38. The applicant's arguments about contributing to the Island's housing stock and focusing development in Les Quennevais (with reference to Policies SP7 and PL2) have little weight in my judgment. Those arguments stretch the interpretation of policy SP7 on planning for community needs so as to fit the personal desires of the applicants for increased living space; and the designation of Les Quennevais as a "focus" for economic growth and regeneration under Policy PL2 is not a good reason to permit this development.
39. The contention for the applicant that the proposal would meet Mr and Mrs Taylor's needs is also unpersuasive because such needs could be met by a differently-designed extension (for example, with its roof ridge aligned approximately north-south instead of continuing the line of the existing house ridge, enabling the southern part of the extension to be set further from the eastern site boundary so as to reduce its impact to the east). But what has to be assessed is the proposal subject to the appeal.
40. One of the concerns expressed for the appellants is that the proposed extension would have its own staircase independent of the house and that the accommodation could be let to tenants, thereby intensifying the use of the site and detrimentally affecting the neighbours' enjoyment of their property.<sup>11</sup> I can see why that might be a concern, since the intentions of the current owners could change, as could ownership and the intentions of future owners. The possibility envisaged by the appellants could be prevented by imposing a suitable condition, but even if the proposed extension were to be occupied in the way suggested, the possible effect on the level of activity or traffic generation would not necessarily cause any significant harm by way of noise or disturbance to neighbours. Any material change of use of the property as a whole would require planning permission or be liable to enforcement action. So on balance I do not think a controlling condition on this matter would be justified.
41. Comments have also been made for the appellants about other appeal decisions relating to a site at La Maison du Mont au Pretre, La Route du Petit Clos, St Helier. One of these (Reference RP/2020/0855) is a case which I assessed. Although there are some comparisons between the cases, there are also differences: for example, the property potentially affected by the proposed extension at La Maison du Mont au Pretre has a smaller rear garden than the appellants' property in the present case; the plot shapes are different; and other comments for the appellants contending that the impact of the development

---

<sup>10</sup> In paraphrasing this policy, I have in places changed the verb "will" which is used in the Island Plan (eg "will not unreasonably harm") to the conditional "would" because I consider that the latter is the correct tense when making statements about proposals for possible development. The future "will" implies that a development proposal will be carried out.

<sup>11</sup> This objection was raised in the letter dated 22 August 2022 but not repeated in the main statement of case for the appellants.

subject to the present appeal would be worse than what was proposed at La Maison du Mont au Pretre are incorrect for the reasons I have already explained relating to compass-point relationships and dimension from the site boundary. Moreover, as is apparent from my report on that case, I considered that the objection to the development on grounds of impact on the neighbouring property's amenity was only justified as a secondary reason for refusing planning permission (there were other grounds relating to design issues and the listed building status of the property).

### **Conclusions**

42. Considering all the above factors together, I find that what I have identified as the main issues discussed above are finely balanced, partly because there are weaknesses and flaws in the cases for all parties.
43. The proposal would make the rear outlook from the property at Number 11 less open and so less pleasant: in essence, an area of sky would be replaced by a view – in places quite a close view - of the upper part of a building, mostly roof and a gable end seen at an angle. At certain times depending on the season there would be some reduction in the amount of sunlight reaching parts of the property at Number 11. The residential amenity currently enjoyed by the occupants of Number 11 would be affected.
44. What has to be decided in the light of currently adopted policy is whether the development would cause *unreasonable* harm. Although the extension would increase the sense of enclosure at Number 11, I do not consider that it would go so far as to be oppressive or overbearing, or unreasonably affect the levels of sunlight and daylight as specified in criteria 1(a) and 1(c) of Policy GD1. Subject to possible conditions, nor do I consider that the proposal would unreasonably affect the level of privacy which occupiers of Number 11 might expect to enjoy (criterion 1(b) of the policy).
45. Other policies are of less direct relevance. The dormer on the south-west side of the proposed extension would be a quite prominent feature but would be set within the roof slope, would be smaller than the existing dormer and would relate reasonably well to the form of the building, so would meet the basic design requirements of Policy GD6.
46. Having regard to all the considerations discussed above, I conclude that planning permission should be granted.

### **Possible Conditions**

47. If you decide that planning permission should be granted, it should be subject to the standard condition A originally imposed by the planning authority (specifying the start of development within three years of the date of permission).
48. As for standard condition B, this normally specifies that the development be carried out "entirely in accordance with the plans, drawings, written details and documents which form part of this permission". For the reasons I have explained above (in paragraphs 21-22), compliance with this condition would be impossible. I suggest that in order to prevent confusion or legal issues arising from the errors in the application plans relating to the isometric drawings, the full stop at the end of this condition be deleted and the following words be added:

"...except for the isometric drawings in Drawing Number 7604-01 PO4A. Those drawings shall be ignored for the purposes of this permission."

49. I also suggest two other conditions. These are because I consider that a condition requiring the fitting (and retention) of obscure glazing in the north-east facing roof windows of the extension would be appropriate, partly to prevent any possibility of overlooking of the garden and house at Number 11 (especially by tall occupiers of Number 12), and partly to help prevent any feeling or perception of lost privacy at Number 11. For the latter purpose in particular it would also be appropriate to specify that the roof windows shall be non-opening. (The first floor bedroom in the extension would have ventilation by means of the front window.) I suggest two conditions here so that details of the degree of obscurity of the glass can be properly controlled – the term “obscure glass” or glazing is insufficient by itself as it can be open to different interpretations and can cover a wide range of types.
1. No development shall be carried out until details of the type of glazing to be installed in the two roof windows of the proposed extension at the south-east end of the property have been submitted to the planning authority for its approval and have been approved in writing. The development shall not then be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.
  2. The type of glazing approved as above shall be retained. In the event that the glazing first installed is damaged or removed it shall be replaced within one month with glazing which shall match or have an equivalent degree of obscurity to the original.

**Recommendation**

50. I recommend that the appeal be dismissed and that planning permission be granted subject to conditions as described above.

*G F Self*

Inspector

17 December 2022