



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by Thomas Bristow BA MSc MRTPI AssocRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/19/3235957

Blackford, Wilmslow Park North, Wilmslow SK9 2BA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Wilmslow Park (GB) Limited against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 18/6202M, dated 8 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as 'residential development comprising 4, 2-storey dwellings with accommodation in roofspace following demolition of the existing dwellinghouse, Blackford'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the development described in the banner heading above at Blackford, Wilmslow Park North, Wilmslow SK9 2BA, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 18/6202M, dated 8 December 2018, subject to the conditions below.

Preliminary matters

2. Noting the planning history to the site, chiefly a 2018 scheme dismissed at appeal,¹ each proposal must be determined on its merits in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan includes policies of the Council's Local Plan Strategy (LPS), saved policies of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (MBLP), and of the Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan (NP).² Any conflict between development plan policies must be resolved in favour of the latest to be adopted.
3. I have also had regard to various other material considerations including the National Planning Policy Framework, the Planning Practice Guidance, and the Council's Design Guide for the Wilmslow Parks (the NPPF, PPG and SPG respectively).³ NPPF paragraph 213 sets out that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted prior to its publication. There is neither indication, nor contention, that the Council are unable to demonstrate a five year land supply of deliverable housing sites relative to needs (5YHLS).⁴

¹ Ref APP/R0660/W/17/3189085.

² The LPS adopted in July 2017, the MBLP in January 2006, with the NP supported at referendum on 10 October 2019. The Council's emerging site allocations and development management plan is yet to reach a stage of development such that its policies may be accorded significant weight.

³ The SPG dated June 2004.

⁴ With reference to NPPF paragraphs 67, 73 and 11.d).

Policy context

4. In summary, and amongst other things, LPS policies SD 2 and SE 1, in a similar vein to relevant elements of NPPF paragraph 127, seek to ensure that development integrates appropriately with local character and appearance, reinforcing local distinctiveness. Notwithstanding the value of delivery from small and medium sized sites set out in NPPF paragraph 68, consistent with the principles of good design above, saved MBLP policy DC41 sets out how infill housing development should integrate appropriately within its surroundings (including as regards density and relationship to neighbours).
5. NP policy TH4 concerns development proposed in the three Wilmslow Parks, the same area as covered by the SPG. Policy TH4 sets out how development should take account of density, building lines, landscaping, and in respect of Wilmslow Park particularly, the semi-wooded character of the area. It also sets out how a 'direct visual connection between existing and proposed dwellings and the road should be retained in all schemes'. The NP incorporates a distilled version of the SPG at Appendix 7.

Main issue

6. Against the background above, the main issue is the effect of the development proposed on local character and appearance. That was similarly one of three principal issues on which the 2018 appeal turned, albeit that the scheme is now for four rather than six dwellings.

Reasons

7. Blackford is a grand early-to-mid twentieth century property featuring arts-and-crafts references. It is set within an expansive and mature plot of approximately 0.46ha. Accessed via Wilmslow Park North, Blackford falls towards the western fringes of Wilmslow Park. Wilmslow Park North rises from the weir a short distance away following a contour of the valley. On account of the changing landform, the plot is levelled above an embankment curving around the southern boundary of the site. The topographical survey shows the embankment as some six metres high towards the south of the plot and about two metres towards the common boundary with the plot of neighbouring Woodbank (plan 9742_T:200:1:1).
8. The SPG and NP Appendix 7 describe how Wilmslow Park originated as private parkland, with Victorian properties thereafter sold off and redeveloped incrementally. By consequence the area retains a heavily wooded character, with occasional expansive views of the natural landscape along the River Bollin. Understandably the natural and sylvan qualities of the area are highly valued by many nearby residents. The embankment around the plot of Blackford, containing a number of fine trees and established vegetation, contributes to that character. I saw that it serves to almost entirely obscure the existing dwelling from views along Wilmslow Park North. In recognition of its value, certain trees there are protected via two Tree Preservation Orders dating from 1965 and 1991 (TPOs).
9. The proposal is to demolish Blackford and to erect four dwellings of varying sizes. They would be served by a curved access making use of the existing crossover to Wilmslow Park North, albeit with some improvements. The scheme

would amount to a change from just over two dwellings per hectare (dph) to around nine, inherently affecting the character of the site.⁵ I am told that the proposed 'plot ratio' would be comparable to the unsuccessful scheme in 2018.⁶ There is a particularly low residential density in this specific location.

10. The dwellings proposed at plots 1 and 2, along with their garages, would encroach forward of the existing dwelling on site relative to Wilmslow Park North. That would result in a more discernible building line; Blackford, is presently set centrally within the site at an offset angle. Summarising the scale and linear form of six dwellings proposed in 2018, the previous Inspector described how that scheme would have resulted in an incongruous 'consolidated bulk'.
11. By consequence of the arrangement of dwellings proposed, the principal area of useable outside space at plots 1 and 2 would be next to the embankment around the plot. That is in contrast to a standard arrangement whereby more spacious elements of gardens tend to be located to the rear of properties. Additional residential paraphernalia may, I accept, affect the existing character of the site. I also acknowledge that four dwellings off a shared access is not a commonplace arrangement nearby. Many of those who have made representations on the proposal express concern that such a 'gated' form of development might lead to the piecemeal erosion of local character over time.
12. I have some sympathy with local residents regarding pressures for development and increased residential density in the surrounding area (for example along Adlington Road). A number of representations before me make the point that additional development is unnecessary to achieve the housing requirement in the LPS or to demonstrate a 5YHLS. In that context an unsuccessful appeal for four dwellings at Bryancliffe nearby has been brought to my attention as an apparently comparable example of where a greater intensity of residential development was found to be unacceptable.⁷ However, in my view, the development proposed would integrate appropriately with local character and appearance for the following reasons.
13. Firstly Blackford has an atypically spacious plot. From the plans before me it appears broadly comparable to that of neighbouring Garth Heights, a complex of 14 properties. It is also more expansive than that associated with Woodbank, the neighbouring property the other side. During my site visit I was unable to identify other properties set in comparably generous plots; there is by contrast generally a higher prevailing density (as is the case along York Crescent, Bollinwood, and Fairford Way). In my view the plot ratio that would result would be in line with the prevailing layout of development across the Park. Moreover, both relatively and absolutely, a residential density of nine dph is low. It is also around a third lower than the scheme proposed at Bryancliffe.⁸
14. The proposal would affect the natural characteristics of the site, including by virtue of alterations to site access as detailed in the supporting technical note and plans (WB/18654/TN01 Rev A, SCP/18654/SK01, M2808.11D). Access improvements entail the most significant implications for embankment trees

⁵ (1ha/0.46ha)*4.

⁶ The footprint of the dwellings proposed representing around 15% of the individual plots proposed.

⁷ Ref APP/R0660/W/18/3209120.

⁸ The site area there being stated in the application form to be 0.30ha.

protected via TPOs. However it is important to quantify the effects of the proposal in that regard (given the prevailing character of the area, and implications for natural screening of the development proposed).

15. Application Ref 18/6202M was supported by an initial Arboricultural Report.⁹ That identified 54 trees and five groups of trees potentially affected by the development proposed (both protected and not). The proposal is now supported by a second Arboricultural Report.¹⁰ The findings of both are essentially aligned, aside from the treatment of trees identified as T11 and T12 (by the northern limits of the plot near Oak House, to which I will return). Both Reports have been prepared with reference to British Standard 5837:2012.¹¹ That represents industry-standard guidance as to how the value of trees may be assessed, the extent of their theoretical root protection areas quantified (RPAs) and how safeguards may be put in place during construction.
16. Of the 54 trees potentially affected, six are proposed to be removed on account of their condition rather than to facilitate the development proposed.¹² Any expansive plot with mature trees will require periodic maintenance. None of those proposed for felling contribute significantly to the natural character of the site on account of their arboricultural quality, scale or significance relative to others nearby. The initial Report identified a further 35 specimens or groups to be removed to facilitate the development proposed, the second Report 33 (now exempting T11 and T12).
17. However the RPA of T12 would be encroached into by the patio proposed at plot 4, albeit to a limited extent. Similarly the theoretical RPAs of T42 and T43, close to the site access and proposed refuse storage, would also be transgressed. However T12 and T42 are sycamores, which are moderately tolerant of root loss.¹³ Groundworks to lay a patio, provide access, or to create a solid base for refuse storage are typically less intrusive than the creation of foundations. Although T43 is a mature beech, a type of tree which typically has a poor tolerance of root reduction, G4, T42, T41 and T40 are between it and the altered access proposed. Their root systems will, in all likelihood, have served to limit the presence of T43 roots close to the site access proposed to be widened. Subject to taking a sensitive approach to digging out, as shown on plan MY564/BWPN/TREE/03G, I am satisfied that the wellbeing of T12, T42 and T43 could be safeguarded.
18. The second Arboricultural Report indicates that only five trees proposed for removal are currently protected via TPOs.¹⁴ The Council's officer report instead indicates that eight protected trees and one group would be affected.¹⁵ The difference likely arises on account of the density of trees along the embankment. However in either eventuality only two trees protected via TPO fall within 'category B' as defined in BS 5837:2012, i.e. representing specimens of 'moderate quality'. The proposal would preserve a significant number of

⁹ Murray Tree Consultancy, Ref PM/FUL/04/12/18.

¹⁰ Dated June 2019, Ref PM/FUL/11/06/19.

¹¹ Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Recommendations.

¹² T10, T26, T29, T40, T41, T52, with T28 having already fallen over, none of which I saw are significant to the character of the site on account of their quality, scale or significance relative to others nearby.

¹³ Matheny, N., and Clark, J. R. (1998) Trees and Development: a Technical Guide to Preservation of Trees During Land Development, International Society of Arboriculture.

¹⁴ Paragraph 5.1.2. sets out those specimens to be T47, T50, T51 and two trees from group G4.

¹⁵ Including T39, albeit presently with indications of poor health.

trees on site, including all accorded BS 5837:2012 category A, i.e. of 'high quality' along the site frontage.¹⁶ Moreover new planting is proposed as part of the landscaping scheme (plan M2808.06G). That includes several new trees along the site embankment and within the site, effectively offsetting any loss. In that context the direct effect of the proposal would be highly limited, particularly as new planting matures over time. The proposal would not therefore meaningfully affect the contribution of the appeal site to the natural qualities of its surroundings.

19. In addition to the landscaping scheme referred to above, the proposal is supported by a Tree Constraints Plan and Shadowing Plan (M2808.05E, M2808.10C). They relate to 'some reservations' expressed by the Inspector in 2018 regarding the extent of shading that would result from embankment trees given their situation to the south of the dwellings proposed, and potential implications for pressure to arise to fell or lop trees over time.
20. However the Constraints Plan and Shadowing Plan show that the dwellings proposed for plots 1 and 2 would be some twenty metres or so away from the nearest trees. Similarly, with reference to the approach in BS 5837: 2012 for calculating shading geometry, around two metres would be maintained between the likely extent of overshadowing resulting from embankment trees and the nearest elevations of those dwellings.
21. The appeal site also levels off at above the embankment, and as such the presence of trees nearby is likely to be less perceptively significant. Moreover individuals who would choose to live here would, in all likelihood, do so because of the value that they placed on the wooded character of the area. As such any future pressure in respect of removing trees or reducing canopy coverage is likely to be highly limited. In any event the protections accorded via TPOs would remain.
22. Following my reasoning above, the proposal would result in an acceptable level of density. In addition to broadly maintaining the natural character of the site, as far as appreciable from public vantage points, in my view significant implications for indirect pressures to trees would not arise. Residential paraphernalia could be limited by virtue of removing certain permitted development rights via condition. At their closest, the dwellings proposed would be set some 20 metres back from the pavement (plan M2808.15A). By consequence the dwellings proposed would be largely screened from view from nearby vantage points. There may be some fleeting views from elsewhere along the River Bollin, however at a significant distance and also inevitably through trees flanking the opposite side of Wilmslow Park North.
23. In my view there is a tension in NP policy TH4. That policy sets out both how 'all new residential development should reflect the existing built form', but equally advocates the maintenance of 'a direct visual connection between existing and proposed dwellings and the road'. As reasoned above there is no clear visual connection between Blackford and Wilmslow Park North. To fault the proposal for not creating such would be tantamount to requiring development to conflict with prevailing natural character. By consequence, in

¹⁶ T33, T36, T37, T38, T43.

this instance, it is not unacceptable for the dwellings proposed to be largely obscured from view.

24. In themselves, the dwellings proposed would be of a scale, design, and feature materials which are, consistent with others around the Park. The Council do not object to their appearance in those terms. As shown on plan 18156 (PL) 101, the dwelling proposed for plot 1, where there is least level change between the pavement and site, is a storey-and-a-half in height. All dwellings would have a multi-faceted form, including steeply pitched roofs with different profiles and elevations set at varying planes. Their design would, in my view, serve to break up their visual bulk, representing a significant improvement to the unrelieved form proposed via the 2018 scheme. The heights of the dwelling proposed would be comparable to that of Blackford as it stands, lower than surrounding trees, and also broadly consistent with a hypothetical line drawn between the ridges of Woodbank and Garth Heights (if adjusted to reflect the changing landform)(plan 18156 (PL) 401).
25. There is moreover some variety to the arrangement or layout of dwellings nearby. Various properties share the single access to Garth Heights (including Nos 1 to 4 Parklands and Oak House). Merlin's Moon is set behind Newcroft, the property neighbouring Woodbank. A number of closes and crescents have been created over time within the Park, as explained in the SPG. Given that the plot of Blackford is something of an exception in terms of scale, there is no real potential for the development proposed here to set an adverse precedent elsewhere. Furthermore LPS policy PG 1 expresses development requirements as minima; it does not prevent opportunities to support acceptable schemes.
26. For the above reasons the scheme would, in my judgement, integrate appropriately with local character and appearance. Consequently, having had regard to the SPG, no conflict arises with the relevant provisions of NP policy TH4, LPS policies SD 2 or SE 1, saved MBLP policy DC41, or of NPPF paragraph 127. That conclusion is arrived at subject to the imposition of suitably-worded conditions in various respects, as explained subsequently.

Other matters

27. I have taken careful account of the points raised by those nearby, in addition to the matters addressed above. They include concerns over the potential loss of amenity to neighbours with regard to the separation distances recommended in saved MBLP policy DC38 to ensure privacy, effects in respect of highway and pedestrian safety, and in terms of the effect of the proposal on ecology. As shown on plan M2808.11D, in many respects the spacing between the dwellings proposed and neighbouring properties complies, or is at the threshold of, the recommendations in table 4 supporting policy DC38.
28. There is, however, limited spacing between the dwellings proposed at plots 2 and 3 and neighbouring Garth Heights, and saved MBLP policy DC41 recommends greater separation distances if appropriate to particular circumstances. However the west-facing elevation of the dwelling proposed for plot 3 contains only one modest first floor window serving an ensuite, a functional rather than main habitable element of that property. The first floor west-facing windows and balcony proposed at plot two are at an acute angle relative to Garth Heights rather than square-on.

29. More broadly I have set out above how the residential density proposed would be comparable with that nearby. There is also a level change between the appeal site and neighbouring properties, reducing the potential for direct overlooking. From plots 1 and 2 the natural aspect is broadly south-eastwards along the Bollin Valley rather than towards neighbouring properties. There is also established hedging encircling the plot and occasional trees, which will further reduce the potential implications of the scheme in terms of overlooking.¹⁷ On balance, I am not of the view that unacceptable effects to the amenity of those nearby would result.
30. I accept that the proposal would result in an additional intensity of use of the access, at a curve of Wilmslow Park North, with little on street parking provision in the immediate vicinity. However the vehicular movements associated with a net addition of three dwellings in an established residential area would be relatively modest. As also shown on plan M2808.11D, subject to access alterations referenced earlier in this decision, suitable visibility of oncoming traffic would be achieved with reference to the stopping sight distances in table 7.1 of the Government's Manual for streets calibrated with reference to observed vehicle speeds here (as set out in technical note WB/18654/TN01 Rev A). As noted in the Council's officer report, on-site parking provision would also accord with the parking standards in appendix C to the LPS.
31. Whilst the proposal would result in some tree loss, suitable protection for birds could be secured via an appropriately worded condition. There is no indication that the appeal site is within an area specifically protected on account of biodiversity. Moreover separate protections apply for the protection of ecology, including birds and bats.¹⁸ My finding in those respects, whilst arrived at independently, align with the position of the Council.¹⁹ As such no other matter is sufficient to alter my reasoning as regards the overall acceptability of the development proposed.

Conditions

32. In addition to securing commencement within the relevant statutory period, I have imposed conditions requiring compliance with the supporting plans, that proposed landscaping is implemented, that trees on site are dealt with in line with the second Arboricultural Report and that a woodland management plan related to the site embankment is put in place (conditions 2, 3, 4 and 5). Those conditions are necessary for certainty, to ensure that the proposal is implemented as assessed above, and integrates suitably with character and appearance with regard to the policy context in paragraph 26 of this decision.²⁰
33. It would, however, be unreasonable to require monitoring, including fortnightly, of adherence to the approach in the second Arboricultural Report as the Council propose. That would place a disproportionate burden on undertaking the

¹⁷ Including that identified as H3 between the appeal site and Garth Heights in the second Arboricultural Report, stated to be around eight metres or less in height.

¹⁸ The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended, and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 as amended.

¹⁹ Paragraph 5.2 of the Council's case at appeal sets out that 'the proposed use of the site is likely to have a minimal impact upon matters relating to highway safety and residential amenity and therefore the appeal scheme is acceptable in these and all other regards'.

²⁰ In the context of the duty upon me under section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

development proposed (which must in any event accord with condition 4). Similarly it is unnecessary to impose a distinct condition specifying that agreed external materials are used; they are specified on plan 18156 (PL) 300.

34. As set out in paragraph 27 above, the proposal is at the threshold of certain MBLP policy DC38 recommendations, and even relatively minor alterations to the dwellings proposed or the construction of incidental outbuildings may affect local character given the sensitivity of this location to change. Consequently, with regard to relevant elements of the PPG and for similar reasons as conditions 2, 3, 4 and 5 it is justifiable to withdraw certain permitted development rights via condition 6.²¹ With reference to NPPF paragraph 127. f), in order to minimise disruption during construction to those nearby, I have imposed condition 7 requiring that development proceeds in accordance with an agreed construction and environmental management plan.
35. I am statutorily required to have regard to conserving biodiversity,²² and NPPF paragraph 170. d) sets out how decisions should seek to minimise impacts in that regard. It is therefore necessary and reasonable to impose condition 8 to avoid disturbance arising from construction to nesting birds. However, given the separate provisions of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 in that respect, it is not necessary for the appellant to confirm that nests have been vacated (as the Council have suggested).
36. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Building Regulations 2010 as amended in respect of wastewater, in line with the supporting drainage strategy and drainage hierarchy in the PPG, it is nonetheless appropriate to specify that appropriate and separate surface water and foul drainage provision is made via condition 9. However it is not appropriate to require that development should, under certain circumstances as ventured by the Council, be carried out to the satisfaction of the relevant statutory undertaker.²³ In line with NP policy LSP1 and with regard to NPPF paragraphs 105 and 108, it is further necessary to impose condition 10 requiring that electric vehicle charging point provision is made.
37. Paragraph 5.3 the Government's Statutory Guidance related to Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 as amended explains that the starting assumption is that land is not contaminated unless there is reason to consider otherwise. That is similar to the position set out in the PPG.²⁴ As reasoned above Blackford falls within an established residential area, historically a private estate. There is no substantive evidence to indicate that the site is likely contaminated, or that the importation of materials would render it so. Development must, in any event, comply with the relevant provisions of Building Regulations 2010 as amended in that regard.²⁵ As such the contamination conditions proposed by the Council are not necessary.
38. Conditions 7 and 8 must necessary apply before any development hereby permitted is undertaken, as any development has the potential to generate dust, noise, disturbance, or to affect nesting birds. With reference to section

²¹ PPG reference ID: 21a-017-20190723.

²² Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2000 as amended.

²³ See PPG Reference ID: 21a-016-20140306 in that context.

²⁴ In particular reference ID: 33-007-20190722.

²⁵ Currently referenced in Approved Document C, Site preparation and resistance to contaminants and moisture.

100ZA of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended, the appellant has agreed to the terms of those conditions. In imposing conditions I have had regard to the tests in the NPPF, the PPG and the requirements of statute. Accordingly I have amended the wording of certain conditions proposed, and combined some, without altering their aims.

Thomas Bristow

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 18156 (PL) 001, 18156 (PL) 010, 18156 (PL) 101, 18156 (PL) 102, 18156 (PL) 103, 18156 (PL) 104, 18156 (PL) 105, 18156 (PL) 300, 18156 (PL) 401, 18156 (PL) 402, M2808.05E, M2808.06G, M2808.11D.
- 3) Before any of the dwellings hereby permitted is first occupied, the landscaping scheme set out in approved plan M2808.06G shall have been carried out. Any planting which, within a period of five years after implementation, is removed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or defective shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of similar species, size and number as originally planted.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approach set out in the Arboricultural Report prepared by Murray Tree Consultancy dated June 2019, Ref PM/FUL/11/06/19 and the associated Tree Protection Plan Ref MY564/BWPN/TREE/03G.
- 5) Before any of the dwellings hereby permitted is first occupied, a woodland management plan shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority in line with approved plan M2808.05E. The woodland management plan shall include details of a management strategy, long term objectives, plan of operations and future maintenance for the wooded embankment fronting Wilmslow Park North for a minimum of ten years in accordance with Forestry Commission and UK Forestry Standard standing advice. The woodland management plan shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the agreed details.
- 6) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (or any other order amending, or revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modifications), none of the following shall be undertaken in respect of the dwellings hereby permitted (Class A, enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse; Class B, additions etc. to the roof of a dwellinghouse; Class C, other alterations to the roof of a dwellinghouse; Class D, porches; Class E, buildings etc. incidental to the enjoyment of a dwellinghouse).

- 7) No development hereby permitted shall take place before a Construction and Environmental Management Plan ('CEMP') has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority which shall include details of measures to minimise and mitigate the effects of undertaking the development proposed in respect of air quality, noise and disturbance as set out below:

Air quality. A scheme detailing dust suppression measures and arrangements to monitor emission of dust arising from construction.

Noise. Mitigation in respect of noise and vibration, including a piled foundation method statement if such foundations are required, limit levels and monitoring arrangements in line with British Standard 5228: 2009, Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites (Part 1: Noise, and Part 2: Vibration).

Disturbance. A specification of all plant and equipment to be used during construction, details of construction traffic routing, along with days and hours of construction works.

The CEMP shall also include details of arrangements for the prior notification of the occupiers of potentially affected properties and of the responsible person (such as a site manager) who can be contacted in the event of complaint. In addition there shall be no burning of any materials on site. The agreed CEMP shall be adhered to throughout construction.

- 8) Before any demolition, vegetation clearance or groundworks takes place between the bird breeding season of 1 March to 31 August in any year, a survey prepared by an appropriately qualified individual shall have been undertaken to check for nesting birds. Where any active nests are found on site, a four metre exclusion zone shall be maintained around any active nest identified, within which no development shall take place other than outside of the bird breeding season.
- 9) Before any of the dwellings hereby permitted is first occupied, drainage shall have been provided in line with drawing 19-3642 DR01, with foul and surface water drainage accommodated by separate systems. Surface water shall be drained in accordance with the hierarchy of drainage set out in the Planning Practice Guidance Ref ID: 34-020-20140306 (or subsequent iteration).
- 10) Before any of the dwellings hereby permitted is first occupied, at least a single electric vehicle charging point per dwelling shall have been provided (to mode or type 2 connector, independently wired to at least a 30 Amp spur to enable a minimum of 7kW charging provision, or to the closest equivalent standard given electrical infrastructure limitations). Once provided all charging points shall thereafter be retained.