The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 21 July 2015
Site visit made on 21 July 2015

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 4 August 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/H1840/W/15/3005494
Walcot Meadow, Walcot Lane, Drakes Broughton, Pershore, Worcestershire

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Crown House Developments Ltd against Wychavon District Council.
- The application Ref W/14/00273/OU, is dated 6 February 2014.
- The development proposed is 32 dwellings.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 32 dwellings at Walcot Meadow, Walcot Lane, Drakes Broughton, Pershore, Worcestershire in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref W/14/00273/OU, dated 6 February 2014, subject to the conditions contained in the attached Schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application is submitted in outline form with matters of appearance, scale, landscaping, layout and access reserved for subsequent consideration. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

3. No formal decision was issued by the Council in this case but it has since provided evidence suggesting that it would have refused planning permission due to a conflict with saved Policy GD1 of the Wychavon District Local Plan (LP) (2006). I have taken this to be the decision the Council would have made if it had been empowered to do so.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the site is a suitable location for the proposed residential development with regard to Policy GD1 of the LP and other considerations.

Reasons

Policy GD1

5. Policy GD1 of the LP sets out a location strategy for new development in the district, directing most new development to the main built up areas of Droitwich Spa, Evesham and Pershore, with some in the villages. In all cases,

development is to be within defined settlement boundaries and/or on allocated sites. It is common ground between the parties that the site is outside the settlement boundary for Drakes Broughton, and is not an allocated site. The proposed development is, therefore, in clear conflict with Policy GD1.

6. The appellant argues that Policy GD1 is out of date by virtue of the Local Plan being time expired, its specified plan period having ended in 2011. However, it was acknowledged that the policy is saved by virtue of a saving direction issued in 2009. As such, it retains its full weight as part of the statutory development plan. Nevertheless, it is possible for material considerations to outweigh the development plan and the policies and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) are an important material consideration.

7. It was agreed during the Hearing that the principle of defining settlement boundaries is consistent with the Framework. I note an alliance with objectives to protect the countryside and promote sustainable patterns of development and the policy can be considered to be broadly consistent with those of the Framework. That said, it is not entirely consistent in that the boundaries and housing allocations were drawn up to address a housing need up to 2011. The Framework now seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing and attracts substantial weight.

8. It is agreed between the parties that the Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites as required by paragraph 47 of the Framework. Under these circumstances, the decision-taking criteria contained in paragraph 14 of the Framework are not engaged. Whilst this is so, the Framework seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing and the ability to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply should not be seen as a maximum supply. Regardless of such a supply being available, the Framework advocates a presumption in favour of sustainable development and the application must be considered in these terms.

9. In June 2014, officers' of the Council took a report to its planning committee recommending approval of the application based on a conclusion that the development would represent sustainable development for the purposes of the Framework. It is argued that the establishment of a demonstrable 5 year housing land supply and the advanced stage of the emerging South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) have since altered this conclusion.

10. The availability of sufficient land to accommodate housing needs for the next five years based upon the objectively assessed housing need determined by the Examining Inspector for the SWDP is a positive step. However, I have already established that the 5 year housing land supply is not a maximum criteria. Furthermore, whilst the SWDP has reached an advanced stage it does not yet form part of the development plan. Although I was told that the plan was likely to be adopted following main modifications, consultation is yet to take place on these modifications and the final outcome of the examination process cannot be predicted. This includes the allocation of sites sufficient to meet the Council's housing requirements. Furthermore, I was advised that unresolved objections in respect of some aspects of the plan remain outstanding. In light of this, I attach only moderate weight to the SWDP at the present time.

11. I was referred to a recent appeal decision[1] in Oundle, Northamptonshire where the Inspector questioned whether development on Greenfield land, outside of settlement boundaries in circumstances where a 5 year housing land supply existed could be considered to represent sustainable development. I do not know the full details of this case, however, the Inspector is clear that no material considerations existed that were sufficient to outweigh the development plan in that case. As I have set out above, this balancing exercise is a necessary part of the appeal process and I shall go on to make such an assessment below. Although paragraph 14 of the Framework sets out criteria for the application of development plan policies in decision taking it does not, in my view, alter the overarching presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Other matters

12. The Statement of Common Ground confirms the main parties' views that the site is not constrained by ecology, archaeology, heritage matters, trees, noise and air quality, flooding and drainage (including foul drainage) and agricultural land classification. Furthermore, both the Council and a representative from the Local Highway Authority confirmed during the Hearing that no outstanding concerns remained in respect of highway safety and capacity. However, there are a number of concerns raised by interested parties, many of which concern the above matters. As such, I consider them in more detail below.

Ecology

13. A Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report (December 2013) accompanied the application and an Update Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (December 2013/April 2015) was provided with the appeal documentation. The reports identify limited ecological value within the site and conclude that no significant harm would result subject to a series of recommendations, mitigation measures and enhancements. Subject to these measures being secured by conditions, the development would not harm ecological interests and I see no reason to take an alternative view to the Council. The development would not conflict with Policy ENV6 or ENV7 of the LP.

Archaeology and heritage assets

14. The County Archaeologist advises that some potential exists for assets to be contained within the site, particularly remains of a deserted or shrunken medieval settlement. A geophysical survey has been carried out which demonstrates that the presence of significant remains are unlikely. Further site investigation could be secured by condition to ensure that potential impacts are avoided or suitable recording takes place.

15. No listed building, conservation areas or other heritage assets would be affected by the development.

Trees and hedgerows

16. The site is largely open and laid to grass with hedgerows and tree planting on the boundaries. As such, the development could be accommodated without significant loss or harm in these respects, particularly where tree protection

[1] APP/G2815/A/13/2209113

measures are employed during construction. I find no conflict with Policy ENV8 of the LP.

Noise and air quality

17. The proposed development is residential in nature which is consistent with the surrounding land uses. Whilst the development would intensify activity in the area, this would not unduly alter the residential character of the area or harm neighbours' living conditions, particularly in terms of noise. The application is submitted in outline form only and the detailed layout and design of the development would need to be considered at the Reserved Matters stage. Some noise and disturbance would be likely to result during construction but this would be for a limited period of time and impacts could be controlled by way of conditions. The site is not located in an area suffering from air quality issues and the proposed residential development would have little impact in these regards. I find no conflict with Policy GD2 of the LP.

Flooding and drainage

18. Numerous concerns were raised by local residents with regards to the potential for flooding and drainage issues and I heard that many residents have previously experienced such issues in the village. The site stands wholly within flood zone 1 (lowest risk) as defined by the Environment Agency and the application is accompanied by a detailed Flood Risk Assessment and Water Management Statement. These documents carefully consider the flood risk to both the development and the surrounding area and propose measures to manage water so as to avoid flood risks. A Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) is to be employed, involving a balancing pond that would store excess surface water, along with measures to ensure that the existing Greenfield runoff rate would not be exceeded. As such, no additional impact to the surrounding area would result from the development and the reports predict that the amount of runoff could in fact be reduced.

19. The application details propose to connect the development to the existing foul sewerage network in the village. I heard that this was some distance from the site at Shrubbery Road and that pumping was likely to be necessary given the topography of the site and the surrounding area. Nevertheless, Severn Trent Water, responsible for the foul drains, has confirmed its obligations to meet necessary capacity requirements and has raised no objection to the proposals. I note the ongoing concerns of local people in regards to flooding and drainage but there is no evidence before me to suggest that the proposed development would exacerbate existing problems or could not be suitably dealt with. As such, the development is in accordance with Policies ENV18 and ENV19 of the LP.

Agricultural land classification

20. The site would result in the loss of grade 2/3 agricultural land to development. Paragraph 112 of the Framework suggests that poorer quality land should be used in preference to higher quality agricultural land. The site is relatively small but the development would nevertheless result in a loss of good agricultural land. This matter weighs against the development and must be weighed in the overall planning balance.

Highway matters

21. A number of concerns were raised by local people in respect of highway safety, noting the narrow nature of the surrounding roads and the significant amount of on-street parking that takes place on Walcot Lane. I was provided with photographs of this parking during busy times which effectively restricts the width of the road to a single vehicle, particularly during school drop-offs and collections and when events take place at the nearby church, village hall and sports pitches.

22. A Transport Statement accompanies the application which considers the potential impacts of the development. It concludes that capacity exists within the existing highway network, including at the junctions on Walcot Lane and Stonebow Road so as to avoid any highway safety or capacity issues. The document has been reviewed by the Local Highway Authority, which is content that the development can be accommodated. This was confirmed during the Hearing. I heard from local residents that accidents had occurred in the surrounding streets but these were minor in nature and no recorded accident data was put forward to demonstrate any trend or ongoing highway safety issue.

23. I also heard that the site was located close to a large dairy farm and that it attracted large vehicles to the surrounding highway network, along with other agricultural activity, bin collections, servicing and deliveries. Whilst I do not doubt that the presence of large vehicles can be intimidating for pedestrians, I see no reason why the proposed development would significantly increase the amount of large vehicles in the area or increase pressures on the surrounding roads, given that parking would be provided within the site itself. Paragraph 32 of the Framework advises that development should only be prevented or refused where the residual cumulative impacts of development would be severe. This cannot be said to be the case in the circumstances of this appeal.

24. Access is a reserved matter and the detailed design of the access into the site would be part of a subsequent application. However, the indicative drawing provided suggests that access would be taken from Walcot Lane which is straight in its alignment and stands beyond a grass verge. I see no reason why a suitably designed site access could not the achieved. As such, I find no conflict with Policy GD2 of the LP.

Landscape and visual impact

25. The site is an open and green field on the edge of the village which is surrounded by strong hedgerow boundaries. Its sloping topography down from Walcot Lane allows long views across the site towards Bredon Hill in the distance and I heard that these views were valued by local people, notwithstanding that no public access is available to the site itself. However, I noted that a group of properties stood beyond the appeal site on Brickyard Lane and that these already featured in views across the surrounding landscape. Given the sloping topography of the site, and subject to an appropriate design and the reserved matters stage, views need not be lost in their entirety.

26. It was suggested that the site is the last remaining green space in the village but I noted that the sports pitches and playing field would remain adjacent to

the site and continue to provide a sense of openness in this part of Walcot Lane. Furthermore, the undeveloped countryside beyond the site along Brickyard Lane would continue to provide a rural edge to the village.

27. The submitted Visual Impact Appraisal notes that the development would be seen in the context of the existing village and the surrounding buildings when viewed from a distance. There is potential for the development to erode the dispersed settlement pattern on the edge of the village, described as a typical landscape characteristic in the Worcestershire Landscape Character Assessment but this document also suggests that additional dwellings could be accommodated provided they do not occur at harmful densities. The development would be relatively low density, incorporating large amounts of open space and green infrastructure. I see no reason why an appropriately designed scheme could not be secured at the reserved matters stage, along with landscaping that would soften the built form and assist in integrating the development with the village. This is a view supported by the Council's Landscape Officer.

28. Whilst the development would result in the loss of land that is currently undeveloped and this would intrinsically alter the character and appearance of the site, for the reasons set out above, this would not result in significant harm or material conflict with Policy ENV1 of the LP.

Accessibility

29. The Council accept that Drakes Broughton is a reasonably accessible location with good access to services, facilities and public transport. The village is served by a first and middle school with pre-school facilities, a shop with a post office, a public house, village hall, recreation ground and a church. The nearest bus stop is opposite the application site on Walcot Lane which provides regular services to the larger settlement of Pershore, providing a further range of amenities. Therefore, future residents would be well served by services and facilities, including potential for the use of public transport as opposed to the private car. I find no material conflict with Policy SR5 of the LP in these regards.

Affordable housing

30. It is agreed between the parties that there exists an ongoing need for affordable housing in the district. In light of this, the application seeks to provide 40% affordable housing that would contribute towards this need. This is in excess of the requirements under Policy COM2 of the LP and in line with the requirements of Policy SWDP15 of the emerging SWDP. The Council highlight that a significant number of affordable housing units have already been secured in connection with other planning permissions in the village and that more than enough has been secured to meet local need in Drakes Broughton.

31. The Council's Housing Development Officer has advised that there is a high need for affordable dwellings in the district, suggesting a requirement of 167 dwellings per year in the district. Furthermore, it is identified that there are 1313 households that have expressed a preference for living in Drakes Broughton, of which, 318 are in significant need. 14 households with a local connection to the parish or an adjacent parish have a preference for living there. The Council suggests that there are currently 67 affordable dwellings

which have been built or granted planning permission (some subject to completion of a S106). It is also submitted that planning permission exists for 1008 affordable homes in the district as a whole.

32. Whilst this is acknowledged, the level of need in the wider area clearly outweighs the current supply and the provision of additional affordable housing units weighs in favour of the development.

Other considerations

33. I was referred to an appeal decision[2] on the site in 1989 which was dismissed on grounds of landscape impact and location outside of the established settlement. However, this decision was made in an entirely different planning policy context, a significant number of changes having taken place in the interim, not least the introduction of the Framework. As such, I do not consider that the decision indicates against the current appeal.

34. My attention was drawn to the Localism Act and its objective to shift power away from central government to local people. In this respect, I have had regard to the significant number of representations made in respect of the planning application and appeal, as well as the neighbourhood survey and public engagement undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. The matters raised have been addressed throughout this report and whilst I note the strength of local opposition to the scheme, it does not alter my conclusions. I heard that consultants had recently been appointed to prepare a draft Neighbourhood Plan but no draft was available at the time of the Hearing and I cannot, therefore, take it into account.

Planning Obligations

35. Policy GD3 of the LP requires that Planning Obligations be secured as appropriate to mitigate the impacts of development on local infrastructure. During the Hearing, a Unilateral Undertaking was submitted which, in addition to the affordable housing discussed above, would secure a range of financial contributions. Subsequently, a revised version was submitted which corrected a number of typographical errors.

36. A financial contribution to the value of of £34.15 per dwelling is sought towards recycling facilities for future residents; £335 per dwelling for specific improvements to the local cycling network; £33,498 towards outdoor changing facilities at Pershore High School, £54,400 towards a synthetic turf pitch at Pershore High School; various contributions towards education improvements and capacity enhancements at the local schools (dependent on the number of bedrooms pre dwelling eventually constructed); £31,712 towards junction improvements at B4084/Three Springs Road; the provision of on-site open space; £24,327 towards improvement of the play facilities at the adjacent play ground.

37. It was agreed between the parties that these obligations were necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and a CIL Compliance Statement supported the Unilateral Undertaking setting out the relevant planning polices and specific purpose for the required contribution. In light of this evidence, I am satisfied that the obligations accord with the requirements of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

[2] T/APP/H1840/A/087558/P4

Many of the obligations would amount to the pooling of contributions towards specific infrastructure projects but it was confirmed to me that no more than 5 obligations exist that would be pooled in relation to any one of the projects identified. As such, I am able to take the obligations into account, having regard to CIL Regulation 123.

Balancing exercise and conclusion

38. As set out above, the Framework advocates a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 7 explains that there are three dimensions to be considered; economic, social and environmental. Paragraph 8 states that these roles should not be undertaken in isolation because they are mutually dependent.

39. The development would fulfil an economic role through the provision of housing that brings with it employment associated with construction and delivery, as well as the additional population that would support local services and facilities, increase local expenditure and create additional revenue for the Council through schemes such as the New Homes Bonus.

40. A social role would be fulfilled in addressing housing need, in particular the delivery of 12 affordable housing units, where there is an identified need in the area. Furthermore, the delivery of a range of house types and tenures in the context of the Framework's objective to boost significantly the supply weighs in favour of the development. The Council suggest that the rapid growth of the village might undermine social cohesion and well-being but I see no reason why future residents could not be integrated into the community or act as a benefit for the reasons explained above. Attendant improvements to local infrastructure and facilities are also likely to be of wider public benefit.

41. An environmental role would be fulfilled due to the accessible location of the site which offers the opportunity to deliver housing in a location benefiting from a range of services and facilities and where public transport opportunities exist that would reduce reliance of private vehicles. As set out above, the development would result in limited visual and landscape impacts subject to appropriate design and landscaping at the reserved matters stage and whilst good quality agricultural land would be lost, the other environmental benefits identified outweigh this small loss.

42. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would constitute sustainable development having regard to the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. In this instance, the benefits of development outweigh the limited harm that has been identified and these benefits are sufficient to outweigh the conflict with Policy GD1 of the LP. Therefore, the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development applies.

43. I have had regard to the significant number of planning permissions already granted within the village but this is to my mind, indicative of its sustainable location. There is no evidence to suggest that the provision of further houses through this development would place unacceptable strain on local infrastructure, to the contrary, the evidence before me is clear that the development can be readily accommodated.

44. In light of the above, and having considered all other matters, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

45. The Statement of Common Ground includes a list of conditions agreed between the Council and the appellant in the event that planning permission is granted.

46. I have attached conditions defining the reserved matters and the timescales for submission in line with this document. It is necessary to secure details of the proposed external materials and the proposed floor levels in order to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development. In light of the concerns raised in respect of flooding and drainage, it is appropriate to secure further details in relation to drainage proposals and the use of hard surfacing materials. Tree and hedgerow protection measures are necessary to protect the rural character of the area. However, further tree survey works are not necessary in addition to this condition, nor is the requirement for a landscaping scheme as this is already a reserved matter.

47. Details of proposed boundary treatments are needed to ensure an appropriate appearance and create sufficient privacy for future occupants'. Details of appropriate bin storage should be provided at the design stage to ensure suitable provision. Restrictions on the hours for demolition, clearance and construction works are necessary, along with a Construction Environmental Management Plan to protect neighbours' living conditions and avoid pollution. Archaeological survey works are needed given the potential for the presence of remains and to identify potential heritage assets.

48. It is not necessary to require accordance with the submitted drawing (13-578-1) as this provides only an indicative layout. Nor is it necessary to specify a requirement for details of the proposed roads as access remains a reserved matter. A Travel Plan is required to promote sustainable patterns of travel. An ecological mitigation and enhancement scheme is necessary to ensure accordance with the submitted ecological appraisals and to avoid harm to ecological interests. Finally, details of renewable energy, energy efficiency and water conservation measures are needed to ensure a prudent use of natural resources, along with appropriate use of materials.

49. I have altered the wording of the proposed conditions as necessary to ensure their precision and ensure compliance with Planning Practice Guidance.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Sian Griffiths	Agent
Charles Rodway	Appellant
Ian Miles	Appellant

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Neil Pearce	Development Manager
Fred Davies	Planning Policy Manager
Dave Pilcher	Local Highway Authority
Ken Skillern	Chairman of the Parish Council
Les Wild	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
Paul Middlebrough	District Councillor

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Ian Spencer	Local Resident
John Boulton	Local Resident
Mr Cooper	Local Resident
Roger Starkey	Local Resident
Chris Roper	Local Resident
Richard Booker	Local Resident

DOCUMENTS

Document 1	Appeal decision APP/H1840/A/14/2222679
Document 2	Appeal decision APP/H1840/W/15/3002644
Document 3	Wychavon Five Year Housing Land Supply Report (July 2015)
Document 4	Revised and updated 'Figure 2' from Council's Appeal Statement
Document 5	CIL Compliance Statement
Document 6	Justification for highway contribution from County Council
Document 7	Draft Unilateral Undertaking (Undated)
Document 8	Unilateral Undertaking
Document 9	Appeal decision APP/H1840/A/14/2224292
Document 10	Written submissions by the Drakes Broughton, Wadborough with Pirton Parish Council and The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Schedule of Conditions

1) Details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.

2) Application for approval of reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of 12 months from the date of this permission. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 12 months from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

3) Any reserved matters application relating to appearance shall include details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of any building. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

4) As part of the reserved matters application, the precise floor slab levels of each new dwelling, relative to the existing development on the boundary of the site shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

5) No development shall take place until a drainage scheme incorporating sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development in relation to the disposal of surface water and foul sewage have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before development is first brought into use.

6) The application for reserved matters shall include for the approval by the local planning authority details of proposed surfacing materials and surface water drainage including:
i) a plan showing proposed layout and types of surfacing, including permeable paving in appropriate locations as an integrated part of an overall sustainable urban drainage system (SuDS) for the development. The surfacing materials selected shall be of a design and quality appropriate to the location;
ii) a written specification of proposed surfacing materials and operations;
iii) the range of SuDs components to be used at source, site and regional control levels. These should be used comprehensively and appropriately in accordance with best practice as laid out in the CIRIA Guidance manuals, with consideration given in the first instance to utilising water management through soft features and at ground level;
iv) mechanisms to integrate the SuDS scheme with the Green Infrastructure proposals to maximise the potential for improved biodiversity, visual amenity and water quality; and
v) methods for the protection of SuDS and Green Infrastructure during each phase of construction to ensure that 'soft SuDS' are adequately established prior to bringing into beneficial use.

7) All existing trees and hedges on site, or branches from trees on adjacent land that overhang the site, unless indicated on the approved plan(s) to be removed or as part of any necessary local removal to facilitate visibility splays for the proposed access, shall be retained and shall not be felled or pruned or otherwise removed within a period of five years from the completion of the development without the previous written consent of the local planning authority.

Temporary fencing for the protection of all retained trees/hedges on site during development shall be erected, to a minimum height of 1.2 metres, below the outermost limit of the branch spread, or at a distance equal to half the height of the tree, whichever is the further from the tree. Such fencing should be erected in accordance with BS 5837:2005, before any materials or machinery are brought onto site and before any demolition or development, including erection of site huts, is commenced.

This protective fencing shall be maintained on site until the completion of development, and nothing should be stored or placed, nor shall any ground levels be altered, within the fenced area without the previous written consent of the local planning authority.

There shall be no burning of any material within 10 metres of the extent of the canopy of any retained tree/hedge.

If any retained tree/hedge is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, replacement planting shall be carried out in the first available planting season with plants of similar species, sizes and numbers and in similar positions.

8) As part of the reserved matters application relating to landscaping a plan shall be submitted indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and be implemented prior to the occupation of the dwellings.

9) Any reserved matters application relating to the appearance of the development shall include details of the facilities for the storage of refuse for all proposed dwellings. No individual dwelling shall be occupied until refuse storage facilities to serve that dwelling have been constructed in accordance with the approved details. The facilities shall thereafter be retained.

10) Demolition, clearance or construction work and deliveries to and from the site in connection with the development hereby approved shall only take place between the hours of 08.00 and 18.00hrs Monday to Friday and 08.00 and 13.00hrs on a Saturday. There shall be no demolition, clearance or construction work or deliveries to and from the site on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

11) No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

12) The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until a travel plan that promotes sustainable forms of access to the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This plan thereafter will be implemented and updated in accordance with a timetable to be approved by the local planning authority.

13) No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

This shall include measures to ensure that vehicles leaving the site do not deposit mud or other detritus on the public highway; details of site operative parking areas, material storage areas and the location of site operatives' facilities (offices, toilets etc).

The measures set out in the approved plan shall be carried out in full during the construction of the development hereby approved. Site operatives' parking, material storage and the positioning of operatives' facilities shall only take place on the site in locations approved in writing by the local planning authority.

14) The application for reserved matters shall include a detailed ecological mitigation and enhancement scheme, which shall be based on the recommendations contained within Section 6 of the Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report by Focus Ecology Limited dated December 2013 and the Update Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated December 2013/April 2015. The scheme shall also include lighting information in relation to bat roosting and foraging habitat, suitable precautionary measures in respect of mammals; amphibians and birds and details of long term management. The approved ecological mitigation and enhancement scheme shall thereafter be carried out in full.

15) Notwithstanding the information submitted with the application, no development shall take place until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
i) details on how renewable energy measures are to be incorporated into the proposed development;
ii) details of measures to conserve and recycle water to be incorporated into the proposed development;
iii) details of energy efficiency measures to be incorporated into the proposed development; and
iv) details of construction materials to be used in the proposed development with the aim of minimising the use of primary non-sustainable materials.

The approved measures shall be implemented and incorporated into the approved development in line with an implementation timetable to be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development.