

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS SHEET

Date: 20 February 2024

The following is a list of the additional representations received since the Planning Committee Agenda was published and includes background papers received up to and including the Monday before the meeting.

A general indication of the content is given but it may be necessary to elaborate at the meeting.

Agenda Item No.	
5a	<p>22/01337/OUT</p> <p>Land Off Lawn Road, Ashleworth</p> <p>Since the Committee report was published, Severn Trent Water has not confirmed its acceptance of a surface water connection to the drain on Sawyers Rise.</p> <p>The recommendation at Paragraph 11.1 of the Case Officer report should change to:</p> <p>It is recommended that authority be DELEGATED to the Development Management Manager, to PERMIT the application, subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement with obligations as set out above, and subject to Severn Trent Water confirmation that a connection to their surface water drain is acceptable.</p>
5b	<p>22/00898/OUT</p> <p>The Retained Land At Brickhampton Court , Greenfields, Churchdown</p> <p>Additional Representations</p> <p>Since writing the Committee report, it has been brought to the attention of the Case Officer that a letter of support from Gloucester City Homes (uploaded to Council website 1 February 2023) was not included within Section 5.4 of the Committee report.</p> <p>Furthermore, an additional letter of support (attached) has been received from a Parish Councillor on Churchdown Parish Council. The Councillor believes the proposal would contribute to the 5YHLS shortage, the shortfall in open market affordable homes, the new footbridge would provide immediate and safe access to residents living at the Innsworth end of Churchdown. It should be noted these are the Councillors own personal views and not those of the Parish Council which objected to the application.</p> <p>The points raised by the additional letter of support are addressed throughout the Committee report and therefore no further comments are made in this regard.</p> <p>Additional Comments from the Applicant to a Member of the Planning Committee</p> <p>Since writing the Committee report, the applicant has provided representations to a Local Councillor ahead of the Committee Site Visit. This email contains 8 key points which the applicant asked the Local Councillor to take into consideration. Full details are in the attachment and the Council has commented on each point as detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Council has assessed the existing infrastructure on the site and within the wider site context. Details are set out within the Committee report.2. A full assessment of the site's context is provided in the Committee report.3. The Council's assessment of the scheme's connectivity is set out in detail within the Committee report4. It should be noted that the Council's Housing Enabling Officer objects to the affordable housing contribution as detailed within the Committee report and as shown by refusal reason 4.

5. The Council acknowledges the potential benefits of the scheme and has assessed the benefits against the harms as detailed throughout the Committee report and, in particular, within the Conclusions under Section 9.

6. A Section 106 Heads of Terms has been provided by the applicant, but this has not been progressed any further due to the Council recommending the application be refused - see Refusal Reason 6.

7. While letters of support have been received, petitions and letters of objection have been received including members of Brickhampton Golf Club and 7 properties within Greenfields and Fairfields as detailed within Section 5 of the Committee report.

8. As per point 5 above and the Council has assessed the proposal in relation to the Green Belt as detailed within the Committee report. In relation to the quotation from the Green Belt Review, this quote relates to Purpose 2 which seeks to prevent the merging of neighbouring towns. This Council considers the proposal to be in conflict with Purpose 1, Checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas, and Purpose 3, Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment as detailed at Paragraph 8.28 of the Committee report. Despite the comments within the Green Belt Review, the site was not released from the Green Belt and remains part of the Green Belt. This factor should be given considerable weight over comments on the Green Belt Review.

Additional Comments from the Agent related to Affordable Housing

The agent sent a copy of an appeal decision to the Case Officer in relation to Land at Ruby Avenue, Bishops Cleeve (21/01173/FUL and appeal ref 3325421) which has been **attached**. Case Officers have reviewed the comments from the agent and have responded explaining that the sites are not comparable as the appeal decision was for a site within a wider site context of circa 600 homes. Furthermore, refusal reason four for Brickhampton also relates to the mix of dwellings being provided as the tenure type does not meet the identified need for the borough.

Agenda Item No. 5b – 22/00898/OUT - The Retained Land At Brickhampton Court, Greenfields, Churchdown

[REDACTED]

13th February 2024

Outline Application: (22/00898/OUT): Tewkesbury Borough Council Planning Committee: Confirmed Date: Tuesday 20 February 2024:

[REDACTED] I am a Parish Councillor on Churchdown Parish Council and live at [REDACTED], Churchdown very close to where the application is located at Brickhampton.

I wish to support this application as I, and many others, believe it is well balanced and has much to offer the future residential, environmental and lifestyle needs of local residents and their families in Churchdown and Innsworth. While also making an immediate contribution to the Council's lack of a Five-Year Housing Land Supply and current shortfall of open market and affordable houses across the Borough.

The affordable housing element is an essential requirement for those not yet on the housing ladder to have the opportunity to stay in their own locality. We know from the council's Housing Officer that there are over 472 local people in Churchdown and Innsworth actively looking for this type of accommodation.

As a local resident myself, I regularly use the foot-paths that criss-cross the golf course connecting to the local foot-paths leading to Down Hatherley, Twigworth, Staverton and Norton. As an active member of the local walking groups, I am aware that the Churchdown Medical Centre, through its Social Prescriber, advise and recommend that patients join local walking groups to enhance both their physical and mental well-being. I'm aware that these groups have expanded since the end of Covid restrictions through these recommendations.

The new footbridge proposed on the southern part of the site connecting it to the Highgrove Estate provides immediate and safe access for those residents living at the Innsworth end of Churchdown. Their families will then be able to take full advantage of the application's "green benefits" created by the New Community Woodland, its Public Open Spaces and Outdoor Play Area. At present people would have to walk along Innsworth Lane and Cheltenham Road East to access these walks which isn't ideal for the elderly and young families.

When you take into account the application's overall mix of housing, public open spaces, and connectivity I hope you will agree that the benefits far outweigh any concerns regarding extra properties in this location.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

Jonny Martin

From: Jonny Martin
Sent: 16 February 2024 12:13
To: Jonny Martin
Subject: FW: Hybrid Outline Application 22/00898/OUT: Retained Land: Brickhampton Court, Cheltenham Road East, Churchdown, Gloucester (Applicants: J Evans & S. Price): Number 5b:
Attachments: 22.00898.OUT - Plans.pdf

From: Jeremy Evans
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2024 2:54:58 PM
To: Councillor Gore <councillor.gore@tewkesbury.gov.uk>
Subject: Hybrid Outline Application 22/00898/OUT: Retained Land: Brickhampton Court, Cheltenham Road East, Churchdown, Gloucester (Applicants: J Evans & S. Price): Number 5b:

CAUTION: This message originated outside of Tewkesbury Borough Council's network.
THINK TWICE before clicking links or attachments.

Good afternoon, Councillor Gore

Hybrid Outline Application 22/00898/OUT: Retained Land: Brickhampton Court, Cheltenham Road East, Churchdown, Gloucester (Applicants: J Evans & S. Price): Number 5b:

I trust you are and your colleagues on the Planning Committee are keeping well.

Further to the above information about the application that was delivered to you on Sunday 4th February 2024 relating to the Committee's Site Visit to Brickhampton on Friday 16th February and appearance before the Committee on Tuesday 20th February.

Please find attached a file containing three plans to assist with your Site Visit tomorrow.

The first one shows the application's red line boundaries of its 2.4 hectares (five acres). The second plan shows the design and layout of the application's three component parts, featuring the community woodland and public open spaces, the 7 affordable houses and the 8 open market houses. The third plan shows their different colour schemes, green, yellow, blue.

Set out below is a summary of the application's key points that you might like to consider when visiting it tomorrow.

1. Its 35-year planning history (1987/2022) and built infrastructure incorporating the golf centre, club house, car parks, floodlit driving range, greenkeepers maintenance store, established road access (B4063), the 8 residential houses (Fairways/Greenfields) and their private roads.
2. Its enclosed location featuring all the above infrastructure plus the Highgrove Estate to the south and the NATO Forces Base (Innsworth) to the west.
3. Its accessibility and connectivity to local transport and community services featuring the new cycleway, and bus stops on the B4063, existing and proposed new footpaths and bridges connecting to the Highgrove Estate to the south.
4. Its balanced mix of 7 Affordable Houses (35% Market Discount) and 8 Open Market Houses to offset Tewkesbury not having a Five-Year Housing Land Supply and its Settlement Boundaries for Housing development being out of date.

5. Its Environmental, Ecological and Recreational benefits for local residents and schools in Churchdown and Innsworth featuring the new Community Woodland, Public Open Space, New Footpaths & Bridges, Outdoor Play Area, culminating in a Biodiversity Net Gain of 15%.

6. Its submitted Section 106 Agreements for the Community Woodland, Public Open Spaces, New Footpaths & Bridges, Outdoor Play Area, PROW, Education and Library Services.

7. Its level of support from local residents in Churchdown and Innsworth (12 Letters), the Highgrove Estate (60 residents), Gloucester City Homes and local Parish Councillor.

8. Its balanced package of housing, environmental and recreational "benefits" for Churchdown and Innsworth and how they outweigh any potential harms to its "moderate" Green Belt status.

This important point was noted in Tewkesbury's 2017 Green Belt Report on the Site (PO2) which said, "*its removal from the Green Belt was unlikely to constitute a significant loss of the physical or perceptual gap between areas of urban development!*"

Kind regards

Jeremy Evans (Joint Applicant/Owner Retained Land)

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. It may contain information that is confidential, copyright material and/or subject to legal privilege.

If you are not the intended addressee this e-mail has been sent to you in error and you must not copy, distribute or use it in any way whatsoever. Please inform the sender of the error immediately.

The content of this email and any related emails do not constitute a legally binding agreement and we do not accept service of court proceedings or any other formal notices by email unless specifically agreed by us in writing.

This e-mail is believed to be free of viruses but it is your responsibility to carry out all necessary checks and the Council does not accept any liability in connection therewith.

If you are contacting me as your Councillor, please be aware that I may need to share your personal information with Council Officers, other Councillors, other agencies/organisations to help me answer your query. For more information on how I use personal data, please visit <https://www.tewkesbury.gov.uk/councillors-mps-and-meeps>

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. It may contain information that is confidential, copyright material and/or subject to legal privilege.

If you are not the intended addressee this e-mail has been sent to you in error and you must not copy, distribute or use it in any way whatsoever. Please inform the sender of the error immediately.

The content of this email and any related emails do not constitute a legally binding agreement and we do not accept service of court proceedings or any other formal notices by email unless specifically agreed by us in writing.

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2023

by **C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G1630/W/23/3325421

Land off Ruby Avenue, Bishops Cleeve GL52 7ZN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Rooftop Housing Association Ltd against the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01173/FUL, dated 25 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is proposed residential development to erect 22 units with associated car parking; development 100% affordable
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed residential development to erect 22 units with associated car parking; development 100% affordable at Land off Ruby Avenue, Bishops Cleeve GL52 7ZN in accordance with application Ref 21/01173/FUL, dated 25 September 2021 subject to the conditions set out in Schedule 1 of this decision.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Rooftop Housing Association Ltd against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal was originally to be determined via a hearing. However, during the course of the appeal and having considered representations from the main parties, I deemed the written representations procedure to be appropriate for this case.
4. Since the determination of this application, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 19 December 2023. The main parties have been given the opportunity to provide comments on the updated Framework, which have been taken into account in preparing this decision.

Background and Main Issues

5. The main issues are whether the proposal would:
 - comply with paragraph 97 of the Framework regarding services and facilities;
 - provide affordable housing in a seamless and integrated manner in accordance with Policy SD12 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (the JCS); and

- make adequate provision for education, affordable housing and waste and recycling facilities through a planning obligation.

Reasons

Provision of Facilities and Services

6. The site is a parcel of open land off Ruby Avenue. The surrounding area is primarily residential in nature, with a range of commercial uses and services also present, such as a medical practice, a shop and a gym. The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of 22 residential units of affordable housing.
7. Paragraph 97 of the Framework states that in order to provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should, among other things, plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities; guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services; ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise, and are retained for the benefit of the community; and ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services. The proposal would make provision for 22 affordable housing units, but would not provide additional facilities or services.
8. The appeal site forms part of the wider mixed-use Cleavelands development, for which outline planning permission was granted in July 2012 for up to 550 dwellings with associated facilities, to include a high street, community facility and open space¹. The masterplan for this development designated the appeal site as part of 'High Street' being an area of retail and employment class uses, including 16 live/work units, and comments from interested parties indicate a strong local preference for such a use at the site. However, no reserved matters application was submitted in respect of this outline planning permission within the required timeframe. Accordingly, the site does not benefit from any such designation at the time of this appeal either within local policy or as a result of this permission.
9. Planning permission was later granted in February 2020 for the erection of a pub and restaurant with ancillary accommodation, community amenity areas and associated access, parking and landscaping at the site². Based on the evidence before me and my observations on site, this planning permission remains implementable but the development has not yet come forward. In granting permission for the scheme before me, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that the permitted pub and restaurant use would not be developed.
10. However, it remains that this use has not commenced such that no existing or established service or facility would be lost. The main parties also agree that the original applicant has no intention to implement the permission believing that there is no sufficient demand for the use in this location and following a 6 month marketing exercise in 2019 that resulted in no bids. A later marketing exercise in 2020 similarly resulted in no bids. While concerns have been raised that these marketing exercises were not long enough, given that the proposal does not involve the change of use of an existing public house, there is no policy requirement setting out how long the marketing periods should have been, and I note that the Officer's Report did not find issue with these periods. On this basis, notwithstanding that the

¹ 10/01216/OUT

² 18/01031/FUL

permission for the pub and restaurant use could still be lawfully implemented at present, the existence of this fallback position carries little weight.

11. The site is located within the residential development boundary of Bishops Cleeve, defined as a Rural Service Centre within the JCS and recognised as a settlement that contains a higher range of services and facilities. In addition, I noted on my visit that the immediate area comprises a range of facilities to serve the local community, including a shop, a medical centre, and a gym. There is nothing substantive before me to suggest that the facilities both local and within the wider area would be unable to continue to effectively serve the needs of the community if the proposal were to be granted planning permission.
12. As such, while the proposal would not provide for any services and facilities, it would not result in the loss of existing services and facilities or prevent established services and facilities from further modernising or developing. Future occupiers of the development would have the opportunity to make use of the existing services located in close proximity as part of their daily routines and in meeting their day to day needs, ensuing an integrated approach in the proposed location of this housing proposal and the nearby community facilities and services.
13. For the reasons given, the proposal would comply with paragraph 97 of the Framework insofar as it relates to the provision of services and facilities.

Affordable Housing

14. Policy SD12 of the JCS outlines the approach to the provision of affordable housing in new development. In particular, it states that, where possible, affordable housing should be provided on site and should be seamlessly integrated and distributed throughout the development scheme. The proposal relates to the provision of 22 affordable housing units. The Council raises no objection to the provision of a 100% affordable housing scheme, but has expressed concerns that the proposal would result in a cluster of affordable housing at the site, rather than the affordable housing provision being integrated and sitting among market dwellings. I note that interested parties have expressed similar concerns.
15. I have been provided with the planning layout of the wider Cleavelands development, within which the appeal site is located. This demonstrates that, although clusters of affordable housing are provided as part of that wider scheme, in each phase of development these clusters are spread among and alongside the market dwellings. The Council contends that this complies with the definition of Affordable Dwellings within the section 106 agreement relating to that development, which refers to such dwellings 'to be built across the whole site', and lists clustering requirements for each phase of affordable housing provision, with limits of clusters of 8, 12 and 16 dwellings depending on the housing type and mix to be provided.
16. Nevertheless, this section 106 agreement is not directly applicable to the scheme that I have before me, and the relevant part of Policy SD12 is not an absolute requirement, but is to be followed 'where possible'. Given that the proposal relates wholly to affordable units, such distribution among the completed market housing of the Cleavelands development is not possible in this instance. I note a reserved matters approval for the erection of 30 dwellings, all of which are affordable units at a site directly to the north of the appeal site, resulting in a combined 52 affordable units in close proximity. However, I do not consider that this would prevent the proposal from being integrated within the wider residential setting.

17. The proposal would introduce residential development that would sit among the housing of the wider Cleavelands development scheme, which the main parties agree would be of a sympathetic scale and complementary design. Set back from Sapphire Road and facing the commercial development that serves the immediate community, it would create an avenue style approach to the wider residential area to the north, visible from and alongside multiple elements of the Cleavelands scheme. Even acknowledging that it would be immediately to the south of other affordable units and not dispersed among market dwellings, it remains that the proposal would be experienced as part of the overall residential use and setting of the immediate vicinity.
18. For the reasons given, the proposal would provide affordable housing in a seamless and integrated manner in accordance with Policy SD12 of the JCS.

Planning obligation

19. The Council's reasons for refusal stated that the proposal would fail to secure a planning obligation in relation to education contributions as requested by the County Council pursuant to policies INF6 and INF7 of the JCS. However, having updated its independent planning viability report concerning the impact of the education contributions on the viability of the proposal, the Council has withdrawn this reason for refusal as set out in the submitted Statement of Common Ground.
20. Furthermore, the Council is clear that its reason for refusal relating to the absence of a completed planning obligation to secure a minimum of 40% affordable housing or provide for recycling/waste bin facilities could be overcome by the provision of a suitably worded section 106 agreement in this respect. The main parties have supplied a completed planning agreement during the course of the appeal. Among other things, this secures the delivery of 100% affordable housing units on the site, being 22 units in total, and the payment of a refuse and recycling contribution to Council prior to first occupation of any dwelling.
21. For the reasons given, the proposal would make adequate provision for education, affordable housing and waste and recycling facilities through the completed planning obligation. In this regard, it would comply with Policies INF6, INF7 and SD12 of the JCS insofar as they seek to ensure new development delivers affordable housing, is served and supported by adequate and appropriate infrastructure and services, and that financial contribution towards the provision of infrastructure and services are sought through a planning obligation.

Other Matters

22. I note concerns from interested parties on a number of issues, namely: parking provision, highway safety, flood risk, living conditions, over supply of housing, character and appearance through the loss of open space, emergency vehicle access and sanitation.
23. With regard to highways and parking, the proposal would increase the amount of vehicular traffic in the vicinity. However, it would provide ample parking spaces prior to occupation of the dwellings. It would also utilise an existing junction off Ruby Avenue that based on my observations would provide good visibility. Taken together with the existing speed limits in the area, even acknowledging the additional traffic movements I do not consider that concerns regarding highway safety or parking provision would arise. There is also nothing substantive before me to suggest that emergency vehicles would be unable to access the site.

24. The precise positioning, layout and separation of the proposed dwellings in relation to both the surrounding commercial and residential uses, and the other dwellings proposed as part of the scheme, is such that the living conditions of both future and existing residents would not be compromised. The largely residential nature of the surrounds would also ensure the increase level of activity and movements associated with further dwellings would not create undue noise and disturbance.
25. While the proposal would result in the loss of an open area of space, it has been sensitively designed with a range of landscaping measures and planting that would ensure an effective visual integration within the immediate area. Although it would result in additional housing, combined with the other surrounding residential uses, it would not appear out of place or create undue visual harm and, as discussed below, would assist the Council in meeting its required housing land supply.
26. With regard to concerns regarding flooding and sanitation, the proposal is located in Flood Risk Zone 1 and has been accompanied by a flood risk assessment and drainage strategy that the Council deemed acceptable in its Officer's Report. Based on my observations, I have no reason to disagree. A condition would also ensure that the surface water and foul water drainage scheme is to be completed prior to occupation of the dwellings.

Planning Balance

27. Paragraph 11(d) of the Framework states that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole. This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply (or a four year supply, if applicable) of deliverable housing sites (with a buffer, if applicable) and does not benefit from the provisions of paragraph 76 of the Framework.
28. The main parties agree that the Council cannot demonstrate the required supply of housing. There is nothing substantive in the evidence before me to suggest that the provisions of paragraphs 76 or 77 of the Framework alter this position in this instance. The Statement of Common Ground sets out that the main parties agree that there are no adverse impacts of granting permission for the proposal that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
29. On the basis of my observations, I have no reason to disagree. The proposal would provide for 22 affordable housing units, a clear benefit of the scheme that carries significant weight. I have also found that the proposal would not cause harm in respect of any of the main issues. I have also addressed the other matters raised by interested parties above and, while I recognise the fallback position of the extant pub use permission at the site, for the reasons given above I have attributed this limited weight.
30. Accordingly, I find that there are no adverse impacts of granting permission for the proposal that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, and that planning permission should therefore be granted subject to the imposition of suitably worded conditions.

Conditions

31. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council, and have provided the appellant with an opportunity to provide comments on these, including those which are pre-commencement conditions.
32. I have attached the standard timeframe condition, as well as a condition specifying the relevant plans in accordance with which the development is to be carried out in the interests of certainty and proper planning. As the plans condition contains reference to Site Layout Plan D20 RevN, a separate condition that the development be carried out in accordance with the site levels noted thereon is not necessary. A condition that the development be in accordance with the agreed waste strategy is also necessary to ensure effective implementation of waste minimisation.
33. A condition that no development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing is necessary in the interests of highway safety. A further pre-commencement condition is also necessary in the interests of protection for existing trees. A condition that no development above plate level shall take place prior to approval of external materials has been attached in the interests of the surrounding character and appearance.
34. I have attached various conditions that are to be discharged prior to first occupation. These relate to: drainage scheme completion; installation of bird boxes and hedgehog fencing; submission of a noise assessment relating to the pumping station; layout of access, parking and turning; and provision of a dropped kerb. These are necessary in the interests of: flood risk; ecology; living conditions of occupiers; highway safety and parking provision, respectively. I further attach a condition relating to the approval of a residential welcome pack in the interests of promoting sustainable transport.
35. I have attached a condition that planting shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of any building or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner, in the interests of surrounding character and appearance. A condition restricting the hours of demolition and construction works is necessary in the interests of the living conditions of surrounding residents. I have also attached a condition outlining the approach should contamination be found during the course of construction of the development to ensure there are no unacceptable impacts with regard to land contamination. Finally, a condition that no external lighting is to be installed without approval is required in the interests of character and appearance and the living conditions of surrounding residents.

Conclusion

36. For the reasons given, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions at Schedule 1.

C Rafferty

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE 1 - CONDITIONS

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:
 - Site Location Plan D100 Rev A;
 - Site Layout Plan D20 Rev N;
 - Floor Plans and Elevations House Types C Plots 1-2, 21-22 D14 Rev A;
 - Floor Plans and Elevations House Types B/D Plots 3-4 D12 Rev B;
 - Floor Plans and Elevations House Types B/D Plots 5-6 D11 Rev B;
 - Floor Plans and Elevations House Types A1 Plots 7-12 D10 Rev A;
 - Floor Plans and Elevations House Types F/F1 Plots 13-16 D16 Rev B;
 - Floor Plans and Elevations House Types E Plots 17-18 D15 Rev A;
 - Floor Plans and Elevations House Types C Plots 19-20 D13 Rev A;
 - Detail Planting Plan D900 Rev B;
 - Bin Strategy Plan D95;
 - Amenity Areas and POS figures D20;
 - Wastewater Plan 506148-2;
 - Clean water plan 506148-1;
 - Gas Plan 21306639 dated 15 February 2021;
 - Landscape and Habitat Management and Maintenance plan dated August 2021;
 - Storm Water Calculations dated 30 November 2022;
 - Drainage Strategy 21-063/502a DS;
 - Drainage Catchment Plan 21-063/523;
 - Tree Survey and AIA dated February 2021;
 - Lighting Assessment prepared by Dwd dated 15 June 2021;
 - Flood Risk Assessment dated August 2021;
 - Parking Court and Open Space Management Plan;
 - Transport Statement dated 2021; and
 - Energy Statement dated 22nd October 2021
3. The development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with the waste strategy, Bin Collection Strategy and the SWMP document as received by the local planning authority on 2 February 2023.
4. No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
 - Parking of vehicle of site operatives and visitors (including measures taken to ensure satisfactory access and movement for existing occupiers of neighbouring properties during construction);
 - Advisory routes for construction traffic;
 - Any temporary access to the site;
 - Locations for loading/unloading and storage of plant, waste and construction materials;
 - Method of preventing mud and dust being carried onto the highway;
 - Arrangements for turning vehicles;
 - Arrangements to receive abnormal loads or unusually large vehicles;

- Highway Condition survey; and
- Methods of communicating the Construction Management Plan to staff, visitors and neighbouring residents and businesses.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

5. No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, site clearance, materials delivery or erection of site buildings, until the erection of tree protection measures of any retained tree are undertaken in accordance with the approved details specified in the tree protection plan Drawing No D17270- before any development. The approved tree protection measures shall remain in place until the completion of development or unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority. Excavations of any kind, alterations in soil levels, storage of any materials, soil, equipment, fuel, machinery or plant, site compounds, latrines, vehicle parking and delivery areas, fires and any other activities liable to be harmful to trees and hedgerows are prohibited within any area fenced, unless agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
6. No development above floor plate level shall take place until samples or a precise specification of all external facing materials, including hard landscaping, have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample details.
7. No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until the surface water and foul water drainage scheme for the site shall have been completed in accordance with the submitted details. The sustainable drainage system shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.
8. No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until bird nesting sites/boxes and hedgehog fencing has been installed in accordance with details, including a plan showing locations, height and orientation of the boxes and fencing, that have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.
9. No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until a noise assessment report relating to any potential noise arising from the adjacent pumping station has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The report shall include any required noise attenuation measures and a timetable for their implementation. All measurements shall be made in accordance with the methodology of BS4142:2014+A1:2019 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound.
- 10.No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until the access, parking and turning facilities have been implemented as detailed on approved drawing Site Layout Plan D20 Rev N. These areas as detailed on the approved drawing Site Layout Plan D20 Rev N, shall thereafter be kept available at all times for the access, parking and turning of vehicles.
- 11.No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until a dropped kerb tactile crossing has been provided at the site access junction and made available for public use.

- 12.No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until a residential welcome pack promoting sustainable forms of access to the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved pack shall be provided to each resident at the point of the first occupation of their dwelling.
- 13.Demolition or construction works, including the receipt or despatching of deliveries during the construction or demolition phase, shall take place only between 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday – Friday inclusive, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday, and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.
- 14.Any contamination that is found during the course of construction of the approved development that was not previously identified shall be reported immediately to the local planning authority. Development on the part of the site affected shall be suspended and a risk assessment carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Where unacceptable risks are found remediation and verification schemes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These approved schemes shall be carried out before the development is resumed or continued.
- 15.All planting comprised in the approved details of tree/hedgerow planting shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of any building or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or hedgerows which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation. If any trees or hedgerows fail more than once they shall continue to be replaced on an annual basis until the end of the 5 year period.
- 16.No external lighting/floodlighting is to be installed on the site prior to details having been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.