



Appeal Decision

Site visits made on 14 and 22 November 2017

by N A Holdsworth MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/17/3181468

1 Pinewood Poultry Farm, Pinewood Road, Havering-atte-Bower, Romford, RM4 1PH

- 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 Ms Christine Jones against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1753.16, dated 17 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is demolition of 15 commercial storage units. Change of use to residential to include the creation of 5 detached dwellings, 3x4 bed and 2x3 bed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of 15 commercial storage units. Change of use to residential to include the creation of 5 detached dwellings, 3x4 bed and 2x3 bed at 1 Pinewood Poultry Farm, Pinewood Road, Havering-atte-Bower, Romford, RM4 1PH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P1753.16, dated 17 October 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the attached schedule of 18 conditions.

Main Issue

2. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and any relevant development plan policies; and
 - Whether, if necessary, satisfactory provision is made to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on local education infrastructure.

Reasons

Green Belt

3. The appeal site is located in the Green Belt. At present there is a single residential dwelling and 15 buildings formerly used in association with a historic poultry farm on the site, together with other smaller outbuildings. In recent years these buildings have been used as business units. Whilst the lawfulness of the existing use is disputed by third parties, it is clear from the officers report that the Council consider that the use of the site as a poultry farm ceased in excess of 25 years ago, and that there have been a series of

commercial uses in the various buildings up to the present day. It regards the site as previously developed land, and having considered the evidence before me and the definition in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I agree with this assessment.

4. The Framework makes clear that substantial weight must be given to any harm to the Green Belt, with the fundamental aim of planning policy in relation to such areas being to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Policy 7.16 of the London Plan March 2015 ("London Plan") supports the protection of the Green Belt in London, in accordance with these objectives. Policy DC45 of the Havering Core Strategy adopted 2008 ("Core Strategy") shares similar aims insofar as it promotes uses that fulfil Green Belt objectives; however this development plan policy predates the publication of the Framework and is not entirely consistent with it. As such, the weight that I will attribute to this policy is limited to the extent that it is consistent with the Framework.
5. The sixth bullet point of paragraph 89 of the Framework is relevant to the appeal. This states that the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites, which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development, is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
6. The 5 single storey residential buildings would replace the existing commercial buildings on the site. Whilst due to their pitched roofs the maximum ridge height of the proposed buildings at around 5.7 metres would exceed that of the existing structures on the site, this increase in height would be very minor, and confined to small parts of the roof areas of the proposed dwellings. The main bulk of the proposed buildings would rise to a similar height to the existing commercial buildings on the site.
7. Whilst the individual proposed dwellings would be larger than any of the existing commercial buildings, they would be fewer in number and there would be a greater amount of undeveloped space between them. Whilst the proposed buildings would appear as a cluster, the same can be said of the existing commercial buildings on the site. Importantly, the total floor area of buildings on the site would reduce from around 1780 sqm to around 851 sqm, and the total volume of built form would reduce from around 5,509 cubic metres to around 3,135 cubic metres. Considering the development in its totality, I consider that the increase in height would not be significant, and would be compensated by the overall reduction in built form, both in terms of volume and footprint. Consequently, there would be no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.
8. The existing buildings comprise timber and metal structures that were originally used in association with a poultry farm. It is evident that the buildings have been in place for a considerable amount of time and can reasonably be regarded as permanent structures. Whilst the Council maintain that the buildings and associated hardstanding exhibit an agricultural vernacular, I disagree with this view. To a casual observer these densely laid out utilitarian buildings would be more likely to be regarded as having an industrial appearance. Whilst the existing development is interspersed with areas of grass which provide visual relief, this would also be the case under the

proposed development, which, for the reasons set out above, would also represent a decrease in the total amount of buildings on the site.

9. The Council consider that the separate and distinct residential use of the site would differ from the present commercial uses in that it would have a more developed and formalised character and appearance. It is argued that this would be apparent in the fenestration of the residential buildings and the creation of defined curtilages with domestic paraphernalia, formalised access arrangements and designated parking areas. However, the urbanisation of the site has already occurred with the historic change of use of the site to its existing business use. Furthermore, the existing use also has the potential for commercial parking and associated paraphernalia to be placed on the open land surrounding the existing commercial buildings. This was apparent at the time of my first site visit, and is also evident on some of the photos provided of the site in the application documentation.
10. As such, I find that the replacement of a previously developed commercial use with the residential use proposed would not result in harm to the character and appearance of this part of the Green Belt. Given the existing appearance and use of the site, the proposed redevelopment would not conflict with the objective of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. In other regards, considering the existing appearance and use of the site the proposed development would have a neutral effect on the purpose of checking the unrestricted sprawl of large-built up areas; preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another, preserving the setting and special character of historic towns; and assisting in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. As such, there would be no conflict with any of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, as set out in paragraph 80 of the Framework. Furthermore, for the reasons set out above, the proposal would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.
11. Consequently, the proposed development would not be inappropriate development, and there would be no harm to the Green Belt. The development does not therefore conflict with policy DC45 of the Core Strategy, Policy 7.16 of the London Plan, nor the relevant parts of the Framework which seek to prevent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Consequently, there is no requirement for the appellant to demonstrate very special circumstances to justify the development.

School place demand.

12. Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Core Strategy state that, where necessary to meet the objectives of sustainable development payments from residential developers for the capital infrastructure of schools will be required to meet the demands generated by residential development. Whilst these policies pre-date the Framework, they remain broadly consistent with paragraph 203 which states that planning obligations may be sought in order to mitigate impacts of new development. Policy 8.2 of the London Plan states that development proposals should address strategic as well as local policies in planning obligations. Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (CIL) requires that planning obligations must meet tests which are set out in Paragraph 204 of the Framework.

13. The Council requires a payment of £30,000 to help address a shortfall of school places which exists across the Borough. In calculating this figure, it points to the evidence base contained in "*Technical Report 1: Assessment of Infrastructure Costs (2013)*" and "*Technical Report 2: Viability Assessment (2013)*" which formed part of its previous Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Although the SPD is now out of date insofar as the pooling of contributions is concerned, the evidence on which it was based remains relevant. The Technical Reports advise that a contribution of £6000 per dwelling is required for education contributions. Contributions relating to education infrastructure are not currently funded through CIL.
14. Whilst no specific project has been identified by the Council which would be directly related to the development, it is clear from the evidence that the monies would be spent on providing additional school places. The Council says that it would pool this contribution for a specific project to expand an existing school or provide a new school. With regard to Regulation 123 of CIL, the Council has confirmed that it will ensure, through its monitoring arrangements, that no more than five contributions would be put towards a specific infrastructure project. The Council recognises that the payment would not cover the full cost of the project and other funding sources would be required. As such, in this case I am satisfied that the contribution sought by the Council would be used on a site specific infrastructure project as opposed to general infrastructure in the wider area.
15. The appellant does not dispute the need for such a planning contribution. A unilateral undertaking has been provided with the appeal and the Council have confirmed that it meets the objectives of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Core Strategy by providing for a contribution of £30,000 plus monitoring and legal costs towards primary and secondary school places. I consider that the measures in the undertaking are necessary, related directly to the development and fairly related in scale and kind. As such they would accord with the provisions of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and the tests for planning obligations set out in the Framework. In coming to this view I have also had regard to the other appeal decisions cited by the Council where other Inspectors have found similar payments within the London Borough of Havering would be justified¹.
16. As such, through the provision of the unilateral undertaking satisfactory provision is made to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on local education infrastructure. There is no conflict with policies Policy DC29 and DC72 of the Core Strategy and policy 8.2 of the London Plan.

Other Matters

17. The Council accept that the existing buildings on the site have an established commercial use. Consequently, there is significant potential for noise and disturbance to arise from them, even if at present the use of the site is limited. I therefore consider that the noise and disturbance generated by vehicular movements, artificial light or the activities of future residents of 5 additional residential buildings is not likely to be greater than that which arises from the existing cluster of commercial buildings on the site.

¹ APP/B5480/W/16/3160652, APP/B5480/W/16/3161272, APP/B5480/W/16/3161677, APP/B5480/W/16/3161974, APP/B5480/W/16/3164542, APP/B5480/W/16/3165731, APP/B5480/W/16/3165666, APP/B5480/W/17/3168250.

18. The new buildings would be located at a higher level than number 2 Pinewood Road ("No.2"), however this is also true of the existing buildings on the site, as they rise with the topography of the land. The bulk of the new buildings would be set away from the boundary with No.2. Overall, I consider there would be sufficient distance between the new buildings and No.2 to prevent any harm to living conditions occurring through loss of light, loss of privacy or any overbearing effect. The site is otherwise well screened, and the development is located a significant distance away from other residential properties in the surrounding area.
19. The site is surrounded by a wooded country park and nature reserve, and detached properties with large gardens. The existing commercial use of the buildings is wholly at odds with these quiet and tranquil surroundings. By contrast, the proposed development would provide detached single storey dwellings with large gardens that reflect the prevailing residential development found along Pinewood Road and the buildings facing the B175. As such, when compared to the existing situation, the development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
20. Pinewood Road is an unmade access track that principally serves pedestrian, equestrian and vehicular traffic to the nearby country park; along with traffic from the existing commercial use and other residential properties. The 5 residential units would generate some vehicular movements along Pinewood Road, however, I consider that this is not likely to be greater than that which arises from the existing cluster of commercial buildings on the site. Off street parking would be provided within the development itself. No objections to the development are raised by the Highway Authority, and I am also of the view that the proposal is acceptable in highways terms.
21. The site is located close to a nature reserve. A protected species survey submitted at the application stage identifies that the site is currently used by foraging badgers, which is also reflected in the consultation responses from interested parties. Whilst no latrines or digging by badgers was found on the site or within 30 metres of its boundaries, several 'snuffle holes' were present in the short grass. The Council consider that the effects of the development on badgers could be dealt with via a condition that requires the construction site, boundary fencing and external lighting to be maintained in accordance with the recommendations of paragraph 5.2 of the submitted protected species survey. On the evidence before me, I agree that this would be necessary to ensure that disruption to badgers during the construction process is appropriately managed, having regard to paragraph 118 of the Framework and the guidance set out in Circular 06/2005 *"Biodiversity and Geological Conservation- Statutory Obligations and their impact within the planning system"*.
22. This appeal deals with the circumstances of the redevelopment of previously developed land within the Green Belt. Any future development proposals within the surrounding area would be considered on their own merits. As such, concern that the development could inspire other, similar proposals in the surrounding area is not a valid planning reason to prevent the development.
23. The appellant states the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, and the Council do not provide any evidence to contest this. The proposed development would result in five additional residential units on previously developed land. As such, it would fulfil the

economic role of sustainable development, principally by providing jobs within the construction process. It would also fulfil the social role of sustainable development by providing additional housing within close proximity to local services where there is at present an under supply. The development would complement the character and appearance of the surrounding built environment, and would not result in any harm to biodiversity. As such, it would also achieve the environmental role of sustainable development. My reasoning in this decision makes clear that the proposal would not comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and there are no policies in the Framework that indicate development should be restricted. Considering paragraphs 49 and 14 of the Framework, I consider that the proposed development comprises sustainable development and the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies to the granting of planning permission.

Conditions

24. Pre commencement conditions are necessary and justified on this occasion to protect existing trees on the site throughout the construction process [1], and to provide landscaping [2] to ensure the appearance of the development is acceptable in relation to the character and appearance of the area. Given that the site is located in a residential area, it is necessary to require further details on how the construction process is to be managed, to protect the living conditions of surrounding residents throughout the construction process. The two conditions relating to construction management and wheel washing facilities suggested by the Council have been amalgamated in to one pre commencement condition [3]. This condition incorporates the suggested requirements of the Council where I consider they meet the tests of reasonableness and necessity having regard to the tests set out in paragraph 206 of Framework, also having had regard to the scale of the development and the characteristics of its location.
25. Given the existing use of the site, a contamination survey is required and this should be undertaken prior to any works commencing so the risks of contamination are fully evaluated, and any necessary remediation is carried out. This is to ensure that future residents of the development do not experience harm as a consequence of land contamination [4]. Whilst I am satisfied on the basis of the information provided that the development is acceptable in respect of the main issues in this appeal, no surveys of existing and proposed site levels have been provided. These are necessary to ensure that the finished appearance of the development is acceptable, and the effect on the living conditions of occupants of surrounding residential buildings is acceptable. Such surveys must take place prior to works commencing to ensure the finished appearance is appropriate compared with the existing position, and as such a pre commencement condition in respect of these matters is also justified [5].
26. I have found in my reasoning above that the development is acceptable partly on the basis that the existing structures on the site will be demolished and it is necessary to ensure that these structures are fully removed before the construction of the new buildings begins [6]. Conditions are necessary to ensure that car and cycle parking, together with refuse storage are provided and maintained for the lifetime of the development [7], to ensure the appearance of the development is acceptable, and also to ensure the effect on

the surrounding highway network is acceptable. Conditions are also necessary to ensure that the finished appearance of the development is of a standard that reflects the prevailing character and appearance of the area, and any external lighting proposed has an acceptable appearance and does not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupants of surrounding residential buildings [8,9 and 10].

27. A condition restricting working hours to weekday daytimes and Saturday morning is necessary to protect the living conditions of occupants of surrounding residential buildings in the course of construction works [11]. The wording of the Council's suggested condition in this regard has been adapted to be less prescriptive. I have also adapted the wording of the Council's suggested condition relating to surface water drainage to require the developer to undertake an assessment of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system, in accordance with current Government guidance [12]. This is necessary to ensure that satisfactory provision in relation to surface water drainage is provided in respect of the completed development.
28. Given that the site is located within the Green Belt and one of the purposes of national planning policy in relation to the Green Belt is to keep land permanently open, I consider that a condition removing permitted development rights in respect of the enlargement of the proposed buildings and creation of ancillary structures within their garden areas is exceptionally justified on this occasion [13]. This means that any future extensions to the proposed buildings would fall under planning control. A condition preventing the installation of windows within the flank walls of the proposed buildings is necessary to prevent overlooking and therefore protect the living conditions of future residents [14]. The Council have suggested a condition which requires compliance with optional Building regulation requirement M4 (2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' [15]. The appellant has not disputed the need for this condition, and I consider such a requirement is justified on the grounds that it would meet the objective set out in policy DC7 of the Core Strategy which requires new residential development to be built to lifetime homes standards. A condition requires that measures set out in the approved plans relating to the protection of Badgers is adopted to ensure the development has an acceptable effect on protected species [16], in addition to conditions necessary to ensure compliance with statutory requirements [17] and in the interests of certainty [18]. I have reviewed the wording of all conditions suggested by the Council and where necessary altered them to ensure compliance with Government's policy on planning conditions as set out in paragraph 206 of the Framework.
29. Whilst Policy DC63 of the Core Strategy requires applicants to adopt the principles and practices of the 'Secured by Design' Award Scheme, no evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the design would not accord with that policy or the nature of any further information required. As such, it would not be reasonable to impose a condition requiring 'Secure by Design' compliance. Conditions requiring the installation of unspecified renewable energy systems would not meet the test of precision and no evidence has been put forward to demonstrate why they would be necessary to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms. Conditions requiring compliance with optional building regulations relating to water efficiency would not be justified as the Council has not identified a specific development plan policy which enacts them. The

connection of the site to the mains drainage network is a private matter for the developer to pursue with the relevant utility provider.

Conclusion

30. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Neil Holdsworth

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a scheme for the protection of the retained trees (the tree protection plan) and the appropriate working methods (the arboricultural method statement) in accordance with paragraphs 5.5 and 6.1 of British Standard BS 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations (or in an equivalent British Standard if replaced) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme for the protection of the retained trees shall be carried out as approved.

[In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars.]

- 2) No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and shrubs on the site, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for the protection in the course of development. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised within the scheme shall be carried out in the first planting season following completion of the development and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 3) 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:
 - i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing where appropriate, depicting a readily visible 24 hour contact number;
 - v) wheel washing facilities, including a method statement for washing construction vehicles accessing the site and measures to prevent mud being deposited on Pinewood Road and the surrounding road network.;
 - vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
 - viii) delivery, demolition and construction working hours.

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

- 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the developer has submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority the following land contamination reports:
- a) A Phase I (Desktop Study) Report documenting the history of this site, its surrounding area and the likelihood of contaminants, their type and extent incorporating a Site Conceptual Model.
 - b) A Phase II (Site Investigation) Report if the Phase I Report confirms the possibility of a significant risk to any sensitive receptors. This is an intrusive site investigation including factors such as chemical testing, quantitative risk assessment and a description of the site ground conditions. An updated Site Conceptual Model should be included showing all the potential pollutant linkages and an assessment of risk to identified receptors.
 - c) A Phase III (Risk Management Strategy) Report if the Phase II Report confirms the presence of a significant pollutant linkage requiring remediation. The report will comprise two parts:
 - Part A - Remediation Scheme which will be fully implemented before it is first occupied. Any variation to the scheme shall be agreed in writing to the Local Planning Authority in advance of works being undertaken. The Remediation Scheme is to include consideration and proposals to deal with situations where, during works on site, contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified. Any further contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval.
 - Part B - Following completion of the remediation works a 'Validation Report' must be submitted demonstrating that the works have been carried out satisfactorily and remediation targets have been achieved.
 - d) If during development works any contamination should be encountered which was not previously identified and is derived from a different source and/or of a different type to those included in the contamination proposals, then revised contamination proposals shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority; and
 - e) If during development work, site contaminants are found in areas previously expected to be clean, then their remediation shall be carried out in line with the agreed contamination proposals.
- 5) No development shall take place until the following information shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
- i) a full site survey showing: the datum used to calibrate the site levels; levels along all site boundaries; levels across the site at regular intervals and floor levels of adjoining buildings;

- ii) full details of the proposed finished floor levels of all buildings and hard landscaped surfaces.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 6) No works of construction in relation to the erection of the new dwelling houses hereby permitted shall take place until all of the existing buildings have been demolished.
- 7) No dwelling shall be occupied until details of a) car parking spaces on the basis of two per dwelling, b) cycle parking facilities and c) refuse and recycling storage facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The respective car parking spaces, cycle parking facilities and refuse and recycling storage facilities must be laid out prior to the first occupation of the residential dwellings hereby approved, in accordance with details submitted and approved under the terms of this condition, and shall thereafter be kept free of obstruction and available at all times for these intended purposes.
- 8) No development above the ground adjacent to the proposed buildings shall take place until samples of all external facing materials to be used in the construction of the proposed buildings 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.
- 9) No development above the ground adjacent to the proposed buildings shall take place until details of all proposed boundary treatments (including those surrounding the site and between the proposed buildings) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved boundary treatment shall be installed prior to occupation of the development and retained thereafter in accordance with the approved plans.
- 10) Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling, external lighting shall be installed in accordance with a scheme of lighting that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the extent of illumination together with precise details of the height, location and design of the lights.
- 11) Demolition or construction works shall take place only between 8.00 am and 6.00 pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00 am and 1.00 pm on Saturdays, and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.
- 12) No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until surface water drainage works shall have been implemented in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Before any details are submitted to the Local Planning Authority an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system, having regard to Defra's non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (or any subsequent version), and the results of the assessment shall have been provided to the Local Planning Authority. Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall:

- i) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
 - ii) include a timetable for its implementation; and,
 - iii) provide, a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.
- 13) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) Classes A to E, no enlargement shall take place to the approved dwellinghouses and no outbuildings or other means of enclosures shall be erected within the garden areas of the dwellinghouses, unless permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has first been sought and obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.
- 14) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), no window or other opening (other than those shown on the submitted and approved plans) shall be formed in the flank wall(s) of the buildings hereby permitted, unless specific permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has first been sought and obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.
- 15) Each individual dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until it has been constructed in accordance with Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations – Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings.
- 16) The construction site, boundary fencing and external lighting shall be maintained and managed in accordance with the recommendations contained within paragraph 5.2 of report “Protected Species Survey of Pinewood Poultry Farm, Havering-atte-Bower by John Dobson B.Sc, Essex Mammal Surveys, December 2016” hereby approved by this permission, from the commencement of development through to its completion.
- 17) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 18) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1489/01 existing site layout, 1489/02E Proposed Site plan, 1489/03C Plot 1 Floor plan, 1489/04C plot 1 Elevations, 1489/06B Plot 2 Floor plan, 1489/07C Proposed elevations Plot 2, 1489/08A Plot 3 Floor plan, 1489/09A Plot 3 Elevations, 1489/100A Block and Location Plan, 1489/10B Proposed layout Plot 4, 1489/11B Proposed elevations Plot 4, 1489/12C Proposed layout Plot 5, 1489/13C Proposed elevations Plot 5. “Protected Species Survey of Pinewood Poultry Farm, Havering-atte-Bower by John Dobson B.Sc, Essex Mammal Surveys, December 2016”.

END OF SCHEDULE