



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 23 October 2019

Site visit made on 23 October 2019

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/W/19/3228837 96 Greenfield Road, Flitton, Beds MK45 5DR

- 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 Mr Sabatier and Ms Lynn against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref CB/18/03326/OUT, dated 30 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 37 dwellings and associated access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 37 dwellings and associated access at 96 Greenfield Road, Flitton, Beds MK45 5DR, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CB/18/03326/OUT, dated 8 January 2019, and subject to the schedule of conditions to this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application is submitted in 'outline' including access details, with layout, scale, landscaping and appearance reserved for future consideration. However, an indicative site layout¹ is provided to show how the proposal could be accommodated at the site. I have considered this layout on the basis of the land use principle issues associated with the site accommodating 37 dwellings.
3. As agreed at the event, accompanied with representatives of the main parties I visited the two dwellings either side of the host property at the request of their respective occupiers. I also undertook an accompanied visit of the appeal site, I then continued my visit unaccompanied from along adjacent roads, the playing fields and a public footpath (FP18) which runs from Sands Road to Greenfield Road and passes the southern boundary of the site, and I also visited Flitwick.
4. Based on the signed 'Supplemental Statement of Common Ground' the main parties agree that for the purposes of this appeal the Council can demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.
5. The Pre-Submission version of the emerging Central Bedfordshire Local Plan 2015-2035 (the eCBLP) was submitted to the Secretary of State in April 2018. Examination commenced on 21 May 2019 and was completed in July 2019.

¹ Proposed site plan – Drawing No. SK 01 Rev P3

Based on the signed Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) the main parties are in agreement that given its stage of preparation, and in accordance with paragraph 48 of the revised National Planning Policy Framework 2019 ('the Framework'), at this time, ahead of the outcome of the examination only limited weight can be given to the document whose consistency against the Framework is yet to be confirmed. I have no reason to disagree with this agreed position.

6. Representatives of Flitton and Greenfield Parish Council confirmed at the Hearing that the Emerging Flitton and Greenfield and Pulloxhill Neighbourhood Plan is at pre-referendum stage. Accordingly, I afford this limited weight in decision making terms.

Main Issues

7. The Council's second reason for refusing the appellants' application relates to the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing and financial contributions towards local infrastructure.
8. At appeal, under the provisions of S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 a planning obligation in the form of a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) was provided. At the Hearing the main parties agreed that subject to some minor modifications a signed and completed UU would address this particular reason for refusal. Duly a signed and completed UU has been provided after the Hearing². This signed and completed UU reflects the heads of terms and trigger points agreed with the Council. I shall return to this later on in my Decision.
9. Based on the foregoing, the main issues are: i) whether the location of the site is suitable for housing with regard to its accessibility to shops, services and facilities; and, ii) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Background

10. Based on the SoCG the main parties agree that the most important policies for the determination of the application are CS2, CS7, CS14, DM3 and DM4 of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies November (2009) (CS). However, there is disagreement over the weight which should be attached to Policy DM4 of the CS.
11. Policy DM4 of the CS, through the identification of settlement envelopes, largely differentiates the built-up areas of settlements from the open countryside beyond. This Policy also identifies forms of development that will generally be acceptable within settlements and essentially discourages development within the countryside. Policy DM4 of the CS therefore, in part protects the countryside for its own sake and in that regard departs from the approach advocated in the Framework, by not recognising different levels of protection for landscapes and the countryside's intrinsic character and beauty.
12. It is also evident from the supporting text for Policy DM4 of the CS and Annex G of the CS that settlement envelopes have been drawn not only to protect countryside for its own sake, but also to prevent the coalescence of

² Unilateral Undertaking dated 13 March 2020

settlements and to assist with the operation of the development strategy stated in Policy CS1 of the CS. That strategy being to direct most new housing to larger more accessible settlements, an approach which is consistent with national policy.

13. In light of the above, while Policy DM4 of the CS is not wholly consistent with the Framework, for the purposes of the determination of this appeal moderate weight should be attached to it. I have also had regard to a number of appeal decisions put forward by the main parties and this approach to Policy DM4 CS is similar to that taken by other Inspectors, particularly in the more recent decisions in light of the revised Framework.
14. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling known as 96 Greenfield Road and land associated with it. This includes the garden/parking areas associated with the dwelling and an existing vehicular access from Greenfield Road which continues to the south-west of the property and also serves the larger rear element of the site. The rear part of the site is broadly rectangular in shape and is in equestrian use. With the exception of a stable block, some field shelters and an outdoor manège, the remainder of this area is open grassland used as a paddock.
15. The majority of the site is outside the settlement envelope for Flitton and Greenfield. On the available evidence the proposal does not meet any of the exceptions for development referred to under Policy DM4 of the CS, therefore the proposal is contrary to this policy.

Accessibility to shops, services and facilities, and character and appearance

16. Greenfield Road along with High Street link the main clusters of built development associated with the settlements of Greenfield and Flitton. Within these settlements are two public houses, lower school, village hall and recreation ground, along with a nearby industrial estate. The site also lies about 3km from the nearest major service centre of Flitwick, which includes a wider range of shops and services and a railway station.
17. Footpaths to the nearby settlements are not continuous on both sides of the highway and therefore some crossing of roads is necessary, these roads and footpaths are also largely unlit. Nonetheless, some improvements to the pedestrian access from the site entrance to the Village Hall is proposed. Along with this, local footpaths and roads from the site would allow safe and convenient access to some nearby facilities, such as the village hall, recreation ground and bus stops by walking, which would generally be accessed during daylight hours. In particular, the nearest bus stops are located on High Street approximately 350m walking distance from the access to the site. From these bus stops there are regular buses Mondays to Saturdays to and from Flitwick. The daily service to Flitwick is supplemented by a separate less frequent service. I also see no strong reason why the local roads would be unsuitable for cycling.
18. The Council has referred me to a range of guidance on suitable walking distances to facilities including public transport nodes. However, based on the above observations, my visit, and having regard to the site's rural location in the context of paragraph 103 of the Framework, I consider that future occupants of the proposed development would have reasonable access to a range of shops, services and facilities to meet their day-to-day needs without

relying solely on private motor vehicles. The provision of a Travel Plan by condition would also support this objective.

19. The main parties agree that the site is not allocated or designated in the eCBLP and does not form part of a designated landscape. However, it does fall within area 6B, Mid Greensand Ridge, as designated by the Landscape Character Assessment, 2015 (LCA). The overall strategy is to conserve and enhance the landscape of the Mid Greensand Ridge (6b). The LCA also identifies that the area comprises villages with a consistent traditional intact character, which remain vulnerable to development and settlement expansion and the loss of individual identity. Along with the playing fields to the south-west the site also forms part of a green buffer between the back of the settlement and open countryside beyond.
20. The site is predominantly screened from public views by development along Greenfield Road and Sands Road and therefore only glimpsed views of it are available from along these roads. Although the site adjoins open playing fields to the south-west, the common boundary is a combination of fencing and landscaping. This creates a degree of enclosure and separation which filters inter-visibility between the site and the playing fields, and parts of Greenfield Road. Also, from these areas the site is viewed in the context of existing built development which partly flanks the site.
21. Similarly, although the site is visible from a section of FP18, views from along here are limited to those of the existing development which flanks the site, along with the village hall and parking and play areas located off Greenfield Road. From the fields south of FP18, the site is largely screened by established hedgerows. Furthermore, the site comprises managed grassland incorporating existing structures and is comparatively smaller than surrounding fields. Consequently, its contribution towards the Mid Greensand Ridge landscape is limited. Additionally, based on the above reasons, the sites overall contribution towards the openness and rural character and appearance of the countryside is modest.
22. The site would be accessed off Greenfield Road between existing dwellings, which are generally in a linear arrangement along this part of the road and Sands Road to the north-east. As such, the proposal would introduce development in depth from the road. Notwithstanding this, there are examples of this type of arrangement in various forms in the area, including cul-de-sacs as highlighted in the appellants' evidence. Most notably, I have been provided details for a scheme for 24 dwellings on land along Greenfield Road, directly opposite the site, which was under construction at the time of my visit. I acknowledge that the circumstances in which this and other schemes nearby were approved may have been different to those in the appeal before me, as is its form and extent. Nonetheless, as I observed on the ground these contribute towards the settlement's evolving identity and the varied character and appearance of the area.
23. While the quantum of development proposed would change the character and appearance of the site, in the context of adjoining built development the effects of this would be limited. Moreover, the indicative site layout suggests that it would be possible to incorporate a landscape buffer adjacent to FP18 and the provision of open space and landscaping along part of the boundary with the playing fields. I do not doubt that an appropriate landscaping scheme would

overtime mitigate the effects of the development from localised views. This would also provide a suitable buffer between the proposed built development and the open areas beyond the boundary of the site and would also support the rural character of the area. This landscape approach is consistent with the advice from the Council's own Landscape Officer, and also presents opportunities to enhance the landscape qualities of the site.

24. Notwithstanding the limited opportunities for frontage development, a cul-de-sac arrangement which is not significantly at odds with the density of development in the area would assimilate with the varied urban grain of the locality. The suggested inclusion of open space, ponds and landscaping which could be secured via conditions and the reserved matters would also create a strong identity for the development. Most notably, development at the site would not extend beyond existing housing along Greenfield Road or Sands Road. This, along with the adjacent protected playing fields would limit any coalescence with Greenfield.
25. Views of the development from dwellings adjoining the site would be available, in particular from upper floors. Such views are not protected and specific concerns in respect of outlook could be addressed at reserved matters stage.
26. For the above reasons, I conclude that the location of the site is suitable for housing with regard to its accessibility to shops, services and facilities by means of transport other than the private motor vehicle, and based on the indicative layout and subject to conditions and reserved matters, development could be achieved at this location without harming the overall character and appearance of the area. I therefore find no conflict with the design aims of the Framework and CS Policies DM3 and CS14 which amongst other things require that developments contribute positively to creating a sense of place, respect local context, the varied character and the local distinctiveness of Mid Bedfordshire's places and spaces. Furthermore, there would also be no conflict with the accessibility requirements of Policy CS14 of the CS and the Framework.

Benefits of the scheme

27. The appeal scheme provides for 37 new dwellings, 35% of which would be affordable units. Three of the proposed plots would be allocated for custom build open market units, which would contribute towards local need for this type of housing. The Council can demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and is also meeting the areas affordable housing requirements. I also acknowledge that the schemes contribution to affordable housing is to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Nonetheless, the Government's objective is to also significantly boost the supply of homes, which the proposal would assist with. Overall, such housing provision should still be afforded moderate positive weight in the determination of this appeal.
28. Based on the appellants' Socio-Economic Statement the proposal would have economic benefits in the short to medium term through the provision of jobs and local purchasing during the construction period. Once complete the development would increase the local population, thus increasing spending levels in local businesses and services. This in turn will help maintain Flitton and also support nearby settlements. As these benefits are directly attributable to the scheme before me, I therefore attach moderate weight to these given the scale and nature.

29. Subject to the proposed conditions and reserved matters, the proposal would be capable of bringing some biodiversity benefits and publicly accessible green infrastructure. Even though the biodiversity enhancements are a policy requirement, this would still be directly attributable to the proposed scheme and weighs in favour of it. However, I attach limited positive weight to this as the benefit would only be modest in nature.

Other Matters

30. The signed and completed UU includes obligations relating to the on-site provision of 35% affordable housing (13 units) in accordance with the requirements of Policy CS7 of the CS. Further, the UU would secure financial contributions in respect of education and leisure. Based on the Council's evidence these obligations and financial contributions are all directly related to the development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development and are in place to mitigate the effects of the development where appropriate. Therefore, the UU accords with Policy CS2 which requires developers to make infrastructure contributions to ensure that new developments address their effects on the infrastructure provisions (education and leisure) within the Council's area. The UU also complies with the tests set out in the Framework, the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and with Regulation 122 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).
31. I have noted concerns raised by third parties in relation to flooding in the local area. Based on the appellants' Flood Risk Assessment and subject to securing the requirements therein by condition, I am satisfied that satisfactory drainage solution can be achieved for the site without any adverse effect on the surrounding area.
32. With regard to highways implications, a scheme for 37 dwellings would increase the number of vehicles using the local highway network. Nonetheless, there is little technical evidence before me to suggest that this along with other developments in the area would have an adverse impact on the existing network with regard to highway capacity and safety. My views on this matter are supported by the lack of objection from the highway authority.
33. If the development were to proceed then the S106 agreement financial contributions would mitigate its effects on local schools and, I have not been provided with any clear evidence that the existing health infrastructure and facilities are insufficient to cope with demand arising from the proposal.
34. Based on the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, the site has few features of wildlife interest and does not appear to host any species of interest, either protected or of conservation concern. Nonetheless, subject to an Ecological Enhancement Strategy (EES) which could be secured by a condition, any biodiversity interests of the site would be protected and enhanced. There is no substantive evidence that development of the site would adversely impact Centenary Wood.
35. I have taken account of the concerns raised by local residents in respect of the effects of the development on their living conditions. Although, such matters would be considered in detail when considering the reserved matters, based on the location of existing development relative to the site, and having regard to the indicative site layout, I see no reason why development which safeguards

the living conditions of neighbours in respect of overlooking and privacy, could not be achieved at the site.

36. The additional residential activity including vehicle movements would result in increased noise, vibrations and disturbance. However, given the modest scale of the scheme (37 dwellings) and its compatibility (residential use) this would not be unusual or significant enough to harm the living conditions of neighbours. Additionally, there is little substantive evidence about the potential for conflict between future residents at the site, and noise and disturbance associated with the use of the adjacent playing fields and village hall.
37. Whilst most construction works result in some level of inconvenience, to an extent this can be managed by a condition requiring a Construction Environmental Protection Plan (CEMP).
38. I have taken account of appeal decisions where Inspectors have found the accessibility of other sites in the area to be poor. I have also had regard to schemes in the area where Inspectors have concluded that those would harm the character and appearance of the area. I am also aware that other schemes for residential development in the area have been refused by the Council, some of which have also been dismissed on appeal. Nonetheless, I have considered the proposal before me on its merits having regard to the specific circumstances of the site and the evidence before me. As such, the other examples before me do not alter my findings on the main issues.

Conditions

39. The main parties agreed a list of suggested conditions in advance of the hearing as set out in the SoCG. These formed the basis of discussion at the event. In imposing conditions, I have had regard to the Framework and the PPG.
40. In addition to the standard conditions controlling the commencement of development and the submission of reserved matters, I consider it reasonable to require the details to broadly conform to those provided in the indicative site layout, given the importance of such details in avoiding harmful impacts in relation to those matters relevant to character and appearance.
41. Conditions requiring the provision of the access, internal roads, visibility splays, and off-site highway works are necessary to ensure the accessibility of the site and safety of highway users. The requirement of a Travel Plan is necessary in the interests of promoting sustainable modes of travel.
42. Noting the concerns raised by local residents, I agree that a condition to minimise the disruption caused by construction activity on neighbours by requiring a CEMP is both necessary and reasonable. Conditions requiring approval of surface and foul drainage details are necessary to avoid local flooding and pollution, respectively. Having regard to CS policies DM1 and DM2, I agree that it is reasonable to require a proportion of energy sources to be renewable or low carbon and for water efficiency measures to be provided within the development.
43. In the interests of safeguarding the living conditions of neighbours and future occupants, conditions for the provision of fire hydrants and to deal with on-site contamination are necessary. For the reasons already given an EES is necessary.

44. I have not imposed suggested requirements for finished floor levels, materials to be used for external construction, along with the details of boundary treatments and refuse and recycling storage facilities, as these are matters that would be dealt with at reserved matters stage.
45. Conditions 4-9 which prevent any development approved from commencing until they have been complied with, are considered fundamental to the development hereby approved. It is necessary for them to take the form of 'pre-commencement' conditions in order to have their intended effect. Where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision, I have altered the conditions to better reflect the relevant guidance.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

46. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that decisions on planning applications should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
47. Based on my considerations the only objection to the development is its location outside the settlement boundary. Despite this, and for the above reasons, there would be no conflict with the overall aims of Policy DM4 of the CS. Indeed, in principle there would be no actual manifestation of harm caused by the proposed development and hence there would be no sensible purpose served by refusing planning permission. Moreover, in this case the identified conflict with Policy DM4 of the CS would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the aforementioned benefits of the proposal and the compliance with the Framework taken as a whole.
48. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Aqbal
INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Victoria Davies
Simon Andrews
Mike Lake

DLA Town Planning Limited
DLA Town Planning Limited
DLA Town Planning Limited

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Phillip Hughes BA (Hons) MRTPI,
FRGS Dip Man MCIM

PHD Planning Chartered Town Planners

INTERESTED PERSONS

Bob Rishton
Mark Gates

Flitton and Greenfield Parish Council
Flitton and Greenfield Parish Council

Jacqui Stevenson
Pat Mason
Christine Ward
Matthew Liddle
Peter Coppock
Lesley Smith
Nick Thompson
David Clark

Local resident
Local resident
Local resident
Local resident
Local resident
Local resident
Local resident
Local resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT OR AFTER THE HEARING

1. Copy of signed Supplemental Statement of Common Ground
2. Copy of completed Unilateral Undertaking dated 13 March 2020
3. Appeal decision: APP/P0240/W/18/3208772 – Old Farm, Clophill Road, Maulden, Bedford, MK45 2AA
4. Copies of CS Policies CS2 and CS7

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1. Approval of the 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. Applications for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of two years from the date of this permission. The development shall begin no later than one year from the approval of the final reserved matter.
3. The reserved matter shall be generally in accordance with the principles for the development of the site as set out in the submitted Proposed site plan – Drawing No. SK 01 Rev 3 and shall include:
 - provision of turning facilities for 11.5m long waste collection vehicles;
 - minimum visibility splays for internal road junctions of 2.4m measured along the centre line of the side road along the channel of the through road;
 - car and cycle parking in accordance with Central Bedfordshire Design Guide September 2014 or any other documents that replace it.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any dwelling.

4. No development shall commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall include details of:
 - Construction activities and timing, including the delivery of materials;
 - Plant and equipment, including loading and unloading;
 - Construction traffic routes and access/egress to be used by construction vehicles;
 - On-site provision for construction worker and contractor parking;
 - Site compounds, offices and areas to be used for the storage of materials;
 - On-site wheel cleaning facilities;
 - Dust mitigation and suppression measures;
 - A timetable to show phasing of construction activities to avoid periods of the year when sensitive wildlife could be harmed (such as the bird nesting season);
 - Protection measures for all retained trees and landscaping including details of protective fencing and its position relative to all retained trees and hedgerow;
 - Waste management proposals;
 - Contact details for site manager and details of management lines of reporting to be updated as different phases come forward;
 - Details of consultation and complaint management with neighbours;
 - Details for the monitoring and review of the construction process including traffic management (to include a review of the CEMP during development)

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved CEMP.

5. No development shall take place until an Ecological Enhancement Strategy (EES) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The EES shall include the following:
 - Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed development

informed by a review of the ecological assessment;

- Review of the potential and constraints;
 - Detailed designs(s) and/or working method(s) to achieve the stated objectives;
 - Extent and location/area of proposed works on appropriate scale plans;
 - Type and source of materials to be used where appropriate, e.g. native species of local provenance;
 - Timetable for implementation demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of development;
 - Persons responsible for implementing the works;
 - Details of initial aftercare and long term maintenance and management.
- The EES shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be retained and maintained thereafter.

6. No development shall commence until a detailed surface water drainage scheme, to manage surface water run-off from the development for up to and including the 1 in 100 year event (+40%cc) and a maintenance and management plan for the scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The discharge rate from the development will be limited to 1 in 1-year rate, or an appropriate rate as agreed by the Bedford Group of Internal Drainage Boards. The final detailed design shall be based on the agreed Drainage Strategy by EAS (Ref:1636 Final 1, August 2018) and DEFRA's Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (March 2018) and shall be implemented and maintained as approved. Maintenance will ensure the system functions as designed for the lifetime of the development. Any variation to the connections and controls indicated on the approved drawing which may be necessary at the time of construction would require resubmission of those details to the local planning authority.
7. No development shall commence until details of a foul water drainage for the proposed dwellings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The respective dwellings shall not be occupied until the foul drainage works for that dwelling have been carried out in accordance with the approved details. The approved foul water drainage system shall thereafter be retained.
8. Notwithstanding the detail shown on Access Design Plan 23455_08_080_01, no development shall commence until a scheme for off-site highway works to provide (a) a dropped kerb crossing point across Greenfield Road and (b) a 2.0m metre wide footpath alongside the south side of Greenfield Road between the entrance to the site and Greenfield Village Hall has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the off-site highway works have been constructed in accordance with the approved details. The approved off-site highway works shall thereafter be retained.
9. No development shall commence until a scheme of measures to source 10% of the energy demand for the development from renewable or low carbon sources and to ensure the development achieves water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day (105 litres for internal use plus 5 litres for external use) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details and the respective dwellings shall not be occupied until

the approved measures for that dwelling have been implemented. The approved measures shall thereafter be retained.

10. No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicular access (including pedestrian access points and visibility splays) has been constructed in accordance with the approved details shown on Access Design Plan 23455_08_080_01. The visibility splays shall for the perpetuity of the development remain free of any obstruction.
11. No dwelling shall be occupied until the internal access roads and footpaths have been constructed and provided in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
12. No dwelling shall be occupied until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Travel Plan shall include details of:
 - Predicted travel to and from the site and targets to reduce car use;
 - Details of existing and proposed transport links, to include links to both pedestrians, cycle and public transport networks;
 - Proposals and measures to minimise private car use and facilitate walking, cycling and use of public transport;
 - A timetable for the implementation of measures designed to promote travel choice;
 - Plans for monitoring and review, annually for a period of five years;
 - Details of cycle parking provision in accordance with the Council's guidelines;
 - Marketing and publicity for sustainable modes of transport to include site specific welcome packs, which shall include:
 - Walking, cycling, public transport and rights of way information. Site specific travel and transport information;
 - Travel voucher incentives;
 - Details of relevant pedestrian, cycle and public transport routes to/from and within the site;
 - Copies of relevant bus and rail timetables;
 - Details of the appointed Travel Plan co-ordinator.

The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved.

13. No dwelling shall be occupied until a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants within the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any dwelling requiring a fire hydrant shall not be occupied until this has been installed in accordance with the approved details. Thereafter the fire hydrants shall be retained as approved in perpetuity.
14. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, then no further development shall be carried out until an investigation strategy and risk assessment and, where necessary, a remediation strategy and verification plan detailing how this unexpected contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No part of the development shall be occupied until the measures identified in the approved remediation strategy and verification plan have been complete and a verification report

demonstrating completion of the approved remediation works and the effectiveness of the remediation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.