



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2017

by Daniel Hartley BA Hons MTP MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R1038/W/17/3179326

Ash House, 27 Parkhouse Road, Lower Pilsley, Chesterfield S45 8DG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Edwards against the decision of North East Derbyshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01000/OL, dated 27 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is 4 detached dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for the erection of 4 detached dwellings at Ash House, 27 Parkhouse Road, Lower Pilsley, Chesterfield S45 8DG in accordance with the terms of application Ref 16/01000/OL, dated 27 September 2016, subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

Procedural Matter

2. This is an outline planning application. The Council's decision notice indicates that all detailed matters are reserved, but the planning application form indicates that access is a detailed matter to be considered as part of the consideration of this outline planning application.
3. Both the Council and the appellant agree that the proposal is submitted in outline with access details. It is clear that the Council considered access at planning application determination stage and therefore I have determined this appeal on the basis of an outline proposal with access details.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the countryside and (ii) whether or not the proposal would deliver a sustainable form of development.

Reasons

Site and proposal

5. The appeal site forms part of the garden area of No 27 Parkhouse Road (Ash House), a detached dwelling which was previously used/ had planning permission as a care home. The proposed widened access drive (5.25 metres) is located between Ash House and No 29 Parkhouse Road and falls within the

Defined Settlement Limits for Lower Pilsley. The remainder of the site falls within land designated as countryside in the North East Derbyshire Local Plan 2005 (LP). The site includes mature trees/vegetation along the north, east and south boundaries. There is a public right of way which crosses the site (FP33) (albeit that this does not appear to be in use) and there is a footpath running immediately outside the southern and eastern boundary.

6. It is proposed to erect four dwellings on the site. Whilst layout is a matter reserved for a future application, an indicative plan accompanies the outline planning application. This illustrates four detached dwellings (two with detached garages) positioned around a turning head. The indicative layout plan also shows a proposed 1 metre high post and rail fence running alongside the access road and where it abuts the boundary with Ash House.

Planning policies and housing land supply

7. The Council's reason for refusal refers to saved policies in the LP. This plan was adopted in 2005 and covers the period up to 2011. It pre-dates the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which states at Paragraph 215 that *"due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the framework, the greater weight that may be given)"*.
8. As the proposed dwellings would be located in countryside the proposal would not accord with saved Policy GS1 of the LP in so far that it states that development proposals will be *"located within the defined Settlement Development Limits"*. However, saved Policies GS1 and GS6 of the LP do not prohibit development that is *"acceptable in the countryside"*. Such policies do not in themselves confirm what is acceptable in the countryside (to this extent they are silent) but when they are considered in isolation, this does not mean that they are necessarily inconsistent with the Framework which, at paragraph 55, does outline the circumstances where housing in rural areas may be allowed. I deal with this matter later on in the decision.
9. Notwithstanding the above, saved Policy H3 of the LP, which is not referenced in the Council's reason for refusal but is nonetheless detailed in the Planning Committee report, does outline the type of housing development that would be acceptable outside the settlement development limits. Such a policy is not consistent with the Framework in so far that it seeks to restrict new build housing in the countryside to that related to an agricultural/other rural operation, affordable housing on rural exception sites and replacement dwellings. The proposal does not accord with this policy in so far that it does not represent a type of development that is permitted in the countryside. However, this policy was drawn up to reflect a housing need position for a development plan period which has now expired and represents a departure from paragraph 55 of the Framework which is less restrictive in terms of new build housing in the countryside. I therefore afford this policy very limited weight.
10. Policies NE1, BE1 and H12 seek to ensure that development proposals are acceptable in terms of design and the effect upon landscape character. These policies are not inconsistent with the design and landscape character aims of the Framework and I therefore afford them considerable weight in decision making terms.

11. There is no dispute between the parties that the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a deliverable five year supply of housing sites. The Council has confirmed that it can demonstrate 3.8 year's supply of housing sites and on the evidence that is before me I have no reason to doubt what is said. Taking into account the Supreme Court judgment of *Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Ltd and SSCLG; Richborough Estates Partnership LLP and SSCLG v Cheshire East Borough Council* [2017] UKSC 37, the aforementioned development plan policies are not in themselves housing supply policies. However, Policy H3 of the LP has the effect of limiting the supply of housing at a time when the Council cannot demonstrate a deliverable five year supply of housing sites. I afford this out of date and inconsistent policy limited weight in decision making terms.
12. In view of the above, it is necessary for me to also consider the proposal against paragraph 14 of the Framework which states that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies 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 the Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in this Framework indicate that development should be restricted"*. I deal with this matter later in the sustainable development section of this decision.
13. The Council has provided me with a copy of the Interim Planning Policy for New Housing Development in North East Derbyshire 2010 (Interim Planning Policy). The Council has not provided me with details of the status of this document, but the note accompanying the wording of the policy states *"this interim policy supplements the saved housing policies of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan and should only be used in the absence of a five years supply of housing land"*. The policy includes criteria by which housing proposals outside of settlement boundaries are to be judged. I deal with this matter later in this decision in view of the five year land supply position.
14. The Council has confirmed that the Consultation Draft North East Derbyshire Local Plan 2011-2033 (Consultation Draft LP) was published for consultation in February 2017. Given that this Plan is only at consultation stage, I afford it little weight in decision making terms. The Council has confirmed that the Consultation Draft LP proposes to distribute housing development within the higher order settlements (level 1 and level 2 settlements) and that in level 3 settlements (eg Lower Pilsley) only windfall developments are envisaged.

Character and appearance

15. Most of the appeal site is located on the edge of the defined settlement of Lower Pilsley and in countryside. In the main the dwellings on Parkhouse Road follow a linear pattern and hence there is a relatively consistent building line where the built up area meets the countryside.
16. The erection of four dwellings on the appeal site would represent a departure from the more linear pattern of development that exists on Parkhouse Road and would seek to erode the sense of openness that exists in this part of the garden associated with Ash House. In this respect, the proposal would have some, albeit a very limited adverse impact, upon the essentially open character of the appeal site and hence this countryside location.

17. Notwithstanding the above, and given the height and maturity of the existing vegetation around the northern, eastern and southern site boundaries, I am satisfied that it would be possible to erect four dwellings on the site so that they did not appear dominant or out of place in this countryside setting. Furthermore, the site is closely related to existing dwellings on Parkhouse Road and in locational/visual terms the proposed dwellings would not appear isolated.
18. The submitted layout plan is indicative only and at reserved matters stage it would be possible to ensure that all development was kept well away from the boundaries of the site and that there was some additional buffer/screen planting (including evergreen vegetation) in these areas. Subject to the retention of all existing boundary vegetation and the provision of additional planting, I am satisfied that the proposed dwellings would assimilate well into the rural setting and that it would be possible to build four family homes set within spacious plots suitably reflecting the density of development in the surrounding area. Design, layout, landscaping and massing issues would need to be carefully considered at reserved matters stage, but, in land use principle terms four dwellings could be erected on the site without significant harm being caused to the countryside from an encroachment and character/appearance point of view.
19. For the reasons outlined above, I consider that there would be only very limited harm caused to the character and appearance of the countryside and that the proposal would therefore suitably accord with the design, countryside and landscape character aims of saved Policies GS1, H12, NE1, BE1, GS6 of the LP and the Framework.

Sustainable development

20. Paragraph 7 of the Framework states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. It is therefore necessary for me to consider the appeal against each of these matters.
21. In environmental terms, I have already concluded that the proposal would not have a significantly detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the countryside. I do not consider that the proposed dwellings would be positioned in an isolated countryside location and in that sense the proposal would accord with paragraph 55 of the Framework which states that "*local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside*". In addition, I have considered the evidence provided by the appellant in respect of public transport provision and note that there are a reasonable number of day to day facilities and services in Lower Pilsley. I am satisfied that the occupiers of the proposed dwellings would not be solely reliant upon the use of the private motor vehicle for all journeys. Furthermore, where it would be necessary to travel further afield, it would be possible to undertake such journeys using public transport. These are environmental matters which weigh in favour of the proposal.
22. I have carefully considered comments made by consultees including the Highway Authority, Lead Local Flood Authority, the Council's Environmental Health Service, Derbyshire Wildlife Trust, Derbyshire County Council Rights of Way service and the Peak and Northern Footpath Society. I have no reason to disagree with the views expressed by consultees. Subject to the imposition of planning conditions, there are no objections to the erection of dwellings on the

- site in respect of flooding, contaminated land, footpaths, nature conservation and highway safety issues. In these respects, there is no environmental impediment to the erection of four dwellings on the site.
23. It is evident that the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a deliverable five year supply of housing sites. There is currently a significant shortfall in the supply of housing sites in the District. In this context, the provision of an additional four dwellings would make a much needed contribution towards the supply of houses. Given the significant shortfall in the supply of housing sites, this is a social matter to which I afford considerable weight in the overall planning balance.
24. There is no doubt that the erection of four dwellings would lead to some construction employment. I accept that this would be relatively short lived, but it is nonetheless a positive economic factor which weighs in favour of the proposal. The appeal site would be close to services and facilities in Lower Pilsley and I have no doubt that the occupiers of the dwellings would spend money in the local area and utilise local facilities. In this regard, I am satisfied that the proposal would accord with paragraph 55 of the Framework which states that *"housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities"*.
25. I conclude that in environmental terms the proposal would have a very limited adverse impact upon the open character and appearance of the countryside. However, this impact would not be significant given existing boundary vegetation and the opportunities available for additional screen planting. Furthermore, the site is close to day to day facilities and services in Lower Pilsley and there would be opportunities for occupiers of the dwellings to use public transport for journeys to other settlements. The proposal would boost the supply of houses in the District at a time when a deliverable five year supply of housing sites cannot be demonstrated and there would be a number of clear economic benefits if the development were to be allowed.
26. I acknowledge that the proposal conflicts with saved Policy H3 of the LP, but this policy is out of date and is inconsistent with the Framework. When considered against the Framework as a whole the very limited adverse impacts arising out of the development proposal would significantly and demonstrably be outweighed by the aforementioned benefits.
27. I am not sure of the status of the Interim Housing Policy. Nonetheless, and in view of the fact that the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing sites, it is necessary for me to consider the proposal against the five criteria in such a policy. The proposal accords with all criteria in so far that (i) the site would adjoin a settlement development limit; (ii) it would be well related to the built framework of the existing settlement; (iii) it would not result in a prominent intrusion in the countryside; (iv) it would not result in settlements merging and (v) it would not cause harm to any other overriding policy objective.
28. On balance, and for the reasons outlined above, I therefore conclude that the proposal would constitute a sustainable form of development in accordance with the sustainability aims of the Framework; saved Policies GS1, GS6, NE1, BE1 and H12 of the LP and the Interim Planning Policy. On the evidence that is before me, I do not consider that this windfall housing proposal would significantly depart from the overall housing aims of the Consultation Draft LP

and, in any event, I afford this development plan very limited weight in the overall planning balance.

Other Matters

29. I have considered the representations made by other interested parties. A number of the comments made have already been addressed in the reasoning above.
30. I have considered the proposal against the amended site layout plan which shows a driveway width of 5.25 metres for part of its length. This would be an acceptable arrangement in so far that it would allow vehicles to pass. Hence, I do not consider that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon highway safety. Comments have been made that many cars are parked in the area (including Parkhouse Road) at school times. I do not doubt that it is busy at these times, but the Highway Authority have powers to introduce traffic regulation orders and/or to take enforcement action where vehicles are parked in a manner which causes an obstruction.
31. Whilst the proposal would have an effect upon a designated public right of way, there is no reason why this could not be separately diverted following the submission of a separate footpath diversion application. Refuse storage and collection issues are matters that would need to be addressed as part of the consideration of a reserved matters planning application.
32. I note the concerns raised about localised flooding issues in the area. However, this is a matter that could be addressed by means of the imposition of a planning condition. I have not been provided with any objective evidence to indicate that there are great crested newts on the site. On the evidence that is before me, I do not consider that the proposal would have a significantly adverse impact upon bio-diversity.
33. I note that some have commented that house values would fall if the appeal site were developed. I do not have any evidence to substantiate this claim. In any event, the courts have held that both this and the loss of a view are not material planning considerations.
34. I have considered the relationship of the appeal site (including the access driveway) with neighbouring residential properties. Taking into account separation distances, I am satisfied that in principle it would be possible to erect four dwellings on the site without material harm being caused to the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in terms of loss of light, privacy and outlook.
35. Whilst the proposal would result in the loss of part of the garden associated with Ash House, I am satisfied that the resultant garden area for this property would be proportionate and useable.
36. I acknowledge that there would be more traffic passing the side elevations of No 29 and Ash House than is currently the case. However, given the existing boundary landscaping along the access drive, coupled with opportunities to erect boundary fencing, I do not consider that the effect of the proposal upon the occupiers of No 29 Parkhouse Road would be significantly adverse in terms of comings/goings, noise and disturbance. I reach this conclusion in the knowledge that there are some windows on the side elevation of No 29

Parkhouse Road and that there would have been some traffic associated with the former use of Ash house as a care home.

37. The Council considers that the proposal would constitute the development of a greenfield site. However, and on the evidence that is before me, the appeal site forms part of the garden area and curtilage of Ash House. The site falls within countryside and is immediately outside a built up area. Annex 2 of the Framework states that previously developed land is land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land, and excludes *"land in built up areas such as private residential gardens"*. I do not consider that the subject garden falls within a built up area and hence the site is previously developed. Whilst this is not a determinative issue, I nonetheless do not find that the proposal conflicts with saved Policy GS1 (b) of the LP which states that development should *"make full use of previously developed land before greenfield sites"* or paragraph 17 of the Framework which *"encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value"*.
38. I do not agree with the Council that the existing and proposed landscaping would be *"oppressive, gloomy or unattractive"* for occupiers of the site. The siting of the four dwellings, including the position of windows, are matters to be fully considered at reserved matters stage. I am satisfied that four dwellings could be erected on the site without trees/the buffer strip causing harm to living conditions. Furthermore, and subject to careful house design and garden positioning, the Council has not reasonably substantiated its claim that trees and landscaping would lead to unacceptable levels of overshadowing to the proposed gardens, or that there would be undue pressure from residents to remove or alter boundary planting.
39. I accept that boundary planting/the proposed buffer planting would, to some extent, limit long distance views, but this does not mean that the area would be unattractive for residents. On the contrary, the proposal offers an opportunity for residents to live in a verdant and bosky residential environment without material harm being caused to living conditions. Landscaping (including maintenance) is a matter to be considered at reserved matters stage: I have no evidence that the aforementioned areas could not be properly maintained.
40. None of the other matters raised outweigh or alter my overall conclusion on the main issues.

Conditions

41. The conditions set out in the accompanying schedule are based on those suggested by the Council. Where necessary, I have amended the wording of the suggested conditions, in the interests of precision and clarity, and in order to comply with advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. Where necessary, I have also amended the wording of the Council's suggested planning conditions where it is not necessary for details to be submitted in advance of the commencement of development.
42. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit condition. Otherwise than as set out in this decision and conditions, it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the

approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect.

43. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, planning conditions are necessary relating to landscaping, protection of vegetation at construction stage, materials, levels, boundary treatment details and bin storage.
44. In the interests of the living conditions of the occupiers of residential properties, planning conditions are necessary relating foul/surface water drainage, a dedicated construction storage area on site and contaminated land.
45. In the interests of nature conservation, planning conditions are necessary relating to ecological mitigation measures and the avoidance of vegetation clearance during the bird nesting season. In order to minimise the risk of crime, a planning condition is necessary relating to the inclusion of crime minimisation measures as part of the proposed layout of the site and design of the dwellings.
46. In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free movement of vehicles, planning conditions are necessary relating to car parking/manoeuvring areas and improvements to the access to Parkhouse Road. In order to minimise the effect of the proposal upon climate change, a planning condition is necessary relating to sustainable design measures.
47. Whilst a number of the matters to be addressed by the above planning conditions would, in any event, fall to be considered at reserved matters stage, the imposition of such conditions at this stage provides some certainty for the applicant in terms of what details would need to be submitted as part of reserved matters submissions. To this extent, I consider that they are both necessary and reasonable.

Conclusion

48. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Daniel Hartley

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- (1) Details of the 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 takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- (2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
- (3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- (4) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: A (90)-01 (Existing Site Plan) and A (90)-02 Rev B (Proposed Site Plan).
- (5) The details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority as part of the reserved matters shall include a scheme for mitigating climate change through sustainable design and construction of the dwellings, including a timetable for implementation, including the provision of sources of renewable energy. Thereafter the approved climate change scheme shall be implemented in full and retained as such thereafter.
- (6) The details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority as part of the reserved matters shall include the following: A scheme of landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land; the details of any trees and hedgerows to be retained, together with measures for their protection during development; a schedule of proposed plant species, size and density and planting locations and an implementation programme.
- (7) All planting, seeding or turfing in the approved scheme of landscaping shall be carried out in the first plating and seeding season following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants 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 plating season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning authority gives written consent to any variation.
- (8) The details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority as part of the reserved matters shall include a plan to show the positions, design, materials, height and type of boundary treatment to be erected on the site. The approved scheme shall be completed before the occupation of the dwellings hereby approved and shall be maintained as approved.
- (9) Prior to above ground works commencing, precise specifications or samples of the walling and roofing materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- (10) Before development commences details of the existing ground levels, proposed finished floor levels of the dwellings and the proposed finished ground

levels of the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(11) The details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority as part of the reserved matters shall include a scheme for crime prevention to be integrated into the design of the development. The scheme shall include details of the crime prevention measures to be incorporated into the scheme as well as a timetable for implementation relative to the completion of the approved dwellings. Thereafter the approved crime prevention measures shall be implemented in full in accordance with the approved timetable and shall be retained as such thereafter.

(12) No site clearance works including the removal of trees, hedgerows or other vegetation shall take place during the bird breeding season (March to August), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority following the submission of detailed surveys.

(13) Before development commences a scheme for the disposal of surface water and foul sewage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full before the development is brought into use and shall be retained as such thereafter.

(14) Before development commences, space shall be provided within the site curtilage for site accommodation, storage of plant and materials, parking and manoeuvring of site operative's and visitor's vehicles together with the loading/unloading and manoeuvring of goods vehicles, designed, laid out and constructed all as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in advance of construction work commencing and maintained free from impediment throughout the duration of construction works.

(15) Before any other operations are commenced, the existing access to Parkhouse Road shall be modified in accordance with the application drawing No A(90)-02 Rev B dated Sept 2016, laid out, constructed and provided with 2.4m x 47m visibility splays in both directions, the area in advance of the sightlines being maintained clear of any object greater than 1m in height (0.6m in the case of vegetation) relative to the adjoining nearside carriageway channel level. The development shall thereafter accord with the above details.

(16) The premises, the subject of the application, shall not be occupied until space has been provided within the site curtilage for the parking/manoeuvring of residents/ visitors and delivery vehicles, located, designed, laid out and constructed all as agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and maintained throughout the life of the development free from any impediment to its designated use.

(17) At reserved matters stage, the applicant shall submit detailed drawings demonstrating the location of adequate bin storage and bin dwell area for use on refuse collection days, clear of the public highway, within the site curtilage clear of all access, parking and turning provision. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to occupation and retained thereafter free from impediment to its designated use.

(18) Before the commencement of the development hereby approved:

- a) A Phase I contaminated land assessment (desk-study) shall be undertaken and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- b) The contaminated land assessment shall include a desk-study with details of the history of the site use including the likely presence of potentially hazardous materials and substances; their likely nature, extent and scale; whether or not they originated from the site; a conceptual model of pollutant-receptor linkages; an assessment of the potential risks to human health, property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes, adjoining land, ground waters and surface waters, ecological systems, archaeological sites and ancient monuments; details of a site investigation strategy (if potential contamination is identified) to effectively characterise the site based on the relevant information discovered by the desk study and justification for the use or not of appropriate guidance. The site investigation strategy shall, where necessary, include relevant soil, ground gas, surface and groundwater sampling/monitoring as identified by the desk-study strategy. The site investigation shall be carried out by a competent person in accordance with the current U.K. requirements for sampling and analysis. A report of the site investigation shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval.

(19) Before the commencement of the development hereby approved:

Where the site investigation identifies unacceptable levels of contamination, a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted scheme shall have regard to CLR 11 and other relevant current guidance. The approved scheme shall include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria and site management procedures. The scheme shall ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation. The developer shall give at least 14 days notice to the Local Planning Authority (Environmental Health Division) prior to commencing works in connection with the remediation scheme.

(20) None of the dwellings hereby approved shall be occupied until:

- a) The approved remediation works required by 19 above have been carried out in full in compliance with the approved methodology and best practice.
- b) If during the construction and/or demolition works associated with the development hereby approved any suspected areas of contamination are discovered, which have not previously been identified, then all works shall be suspended until the nature and extent of the contamination is assessed and a report submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the local planning authority shall be notified as soon as is reasonably practicable of the discovery of any suspected areas of contamination. The suspect material shall be re-evaluated through the process described in 18b to 19 above and satisfy 20a above.
- c) Upon completion of the remediation works required by 19 and 20a above a validation report prepared by a competent person shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The validation report shall include details of the remediation works and Quality Assurance/Quality Control results to show that the works have been carried out in full and in accordance

with the approved methodology. Details of any validation sampling and analysis to show the site has achieved the approved remediation standard, together with the necessary waste management documentation shall be included.

(21) The details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority as part of the reserved matters shall include a full and detailed scheme for ecological mitigation and enhancement across the site. This scheme should include (but not exclusively relate to) the provision of a development free buffer adjacent to the boundary hedgerows. The scheme shall include a timetable for implementation relative to the completion of dwellings hereby approved. Thereafter the approved ecological mitigation and enhancement scheme shall be implemented in full in accordance with the approved timetable and be retained as such thereafter.

(22) The details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority as part of the reserved matters shall include a scheme of works identifying any trees and hedgerows to be pruned or planted and including measures to protect trees and hedgerows during the development works and including works to the existing woodland area on site. Thereafter the approved tree and hedgerow works shall be implemented in full and the tree and hedgerow protection measures shall be retained for the full duration of the construction period.