



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020

by Gareth Wildgoose BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/20/3253255

Glebe House, Kennel Lane, Windlesham GU20 6AA

- 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 Mr Christopher Clarke against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/2289/FFU, dated 2 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing dilapidated detached garage and erection of replacement relocated detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing dilapidated detached garage and erection of replacement relocated detached garage at Glebe House, Kennel Lane, Windlesham GU20 6AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/2289/FFU, dated 2 September 2019, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Main Issues

2. The main issues of the appeal are:
 - Whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), including the effect on openness and the purposes of including land within it;
 - Whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character, appearance and significance of the Church Road/Kennel Lane Conservation Area, and;
 - If the proposal is inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

Whether the proposals would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt

3. The appeal property is within the Green Belt and comprises a large two storey detached house that sits behind boundary treatments adjoining Kennel Lane (B386). The boundary consists of a mix of fencing and brick walls closest to the pedestrian entrance, together with adjoining tall hedging which encloses the garden along the highway frontage. To the western extent of the site beyond

the enclosed garden, and prior to an adjoining public footpath that separates a neighbouring bungalow (The Post Lodge), is a vehicular access. It has an associated area of hardstanding and an existing detached garage building with timber walls and a felt roof located close to the western boundary. The garage is currently in a condition of disrepair, and as a result, vehicles are alternatively parked on the hardstanding. On-street parking was also evident on the highway frontage where a post box and bus stop are located.

4. The proposal seeks to demolish the timber garage and replace it with a larger detached double garage building in a different position close to the existing hedge alongside the boundary with Kennel Lane. The submitted plans indicate that the floor level of the building would be slightly higher than existing land levels with an upward slope to the garage doors.
5. The Council in making its decision did not identify conflict with a policy or policies relating to development in Green Belt in the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2011-2028 (CS&DMP), adopted February 2012 or the Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan (WNP). Instead, the Council referred to conflict with national policy as set out in the Framework - published in February 2019. The Framework indicates that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
6. Paragraph 145 of the Framework indicates that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt unless the proposal meets one of its listed exceptions. The listed exceptions include part (d), the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces. The Framework does not include a specific definition of 'materially larger'. In that regard, the Council have referred to a 30% increase in floorspace and volume being the maximum increase considered acceptable. However, the source of such a guideline is not before me and, therefore, I necessarily afford it little weight. To my mind, the assessment of 'materially larger' is necessarily a more objective exercise based upon the physical dimensions that are most relevant for assessing the relative size of the existing and replacement buildings taking account of the circumstances of the particular case.
7. It is common ground that the existing garage to be demolished has dimensions of approximately 5.5m by 5.2m with a resultant floorspace of around 28.6 sq.m. When those dimensions are taken together with the front gabled element with a maximum roof height of 3.6m and its enlarged eastern side section, the existing garage has a volume approaching 97 m³.
8. In contrast to the above, there is some dispute between the parties over the specific floor area of the replacement garage. However, based upon the annotations on the submitted plans, the replacement building would measure around 7m by 6.2m with a resultant floorspace of 43.4 sq.m - an increase of 14.8 sq.m or approaching 52% when compared with the existing building to be removed. In that regard, the replacement building would be 1m wider (an approximate 19% increase) with an additional depth of 1.5m (an increase of around 27%) The floor area of the replacement building, when taken together with its hipped roof design with a maximum height of close to 5m, would result in a total volume of around 119 m³. It would, therefore, consist of an increase of 22 m³ or approaching 23% when compared with the existing garage.

9. When having regard to the above, the physical dimensions of the proposal would result in a replacement building which would be significantly, and therefore materially, larger in size and scale than the existing building in terms of the relevant measures of floorspace, footprint, height, width and built volume. Consequently, although the building would be in the same use as the building it would replace, to my mind it would fall within a reasonable definition of being 'materially larger'. It follows that the proposal would not fall within the exception at part (d) of paragraph 145 of the Framework.
10. In reaching the above findings, I have taken account of Counsel advice and case law¹ drawn to my attention by the appellant when seeking to justify that a conclusion on such matters should not be based on calculations alone and that a visual assessment of the scale, mass and bulk of the proposal can be taken into account. In that regard, I acknowledge that the hipped roof design seeks to minimise the bulk and massing of the proposed building in a different location within the site. Nonetheless, in this case, the design and increase in the physical dimensions of the replacement building, when compared with the existing garage, would undoubtedly result in an overall scale that would be materially larger. Such a judgement reflects a point of fact relating to the physical dimensions and proportions of the respective buildings. Consequently, whether the proposal would have a resultant impact in visual terms or upon Green Belt openness are not influential considerations upon such a judgement and are necessarily considered separately.
11. The other listed exceptions under paragraph 145 of the Framework also include part (c), where the extension or alteration of a building does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. In that respect, the proposed garage would not be attached to Glebe House. Furthermore, it has a significant separation distance from the dwelling and lies on a hardstanding area which is subdivided from the main garden area of the property. It follows that, as a matter of fact and degree, it falls outside of a reasonable definition of a normal domestic adjunct and cannot be considered to constitute an extension to the original building. Consequently, it does not fall within the listed exception at part (c) of paragraph 145 of the Framework.
12. Paragraph 145 of the Framework also includes an exception for 'limited infilling in villages' at part (e). However, the site lies within a broadly linear grouping of buildings along Kennel Lane that are beyond the main village envelope and outside of the defined village boundary of Windlesham. Therefore, it reasonably falls outside of a village for the purposes of the exception under part e). The only other listed exception under paragraph 145 of the Framework that could be relevant is part g). The relevant part of the exception relates to 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:– not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development;...'. As the site lies outside of a built-up area, the developed land where the existing garage is located and its immediate hinterland where the replacement garage is proposed to be sited, would meet the definition of previously developed land in Annex 2 of the Framework.

¹ Including: Turner v SSCLG & East Dorset Council [2016] EWCA Civ 466;
R (on the application of Samuel Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster) and others) (Respondents) v North Yorkshire County Council (Appellant) [2020] UKSC 3; &
Surrey Homes Ltd v Secretary of State for Environment [2000] 8 WLUK 181 (CO/1273/2000)

13. Notwithstanding the above, the proposal would introduce a replacement building of an increased size and scale in a location within the hardstanding area where no building is currently present. When approaching along Kennel Lane from the west and passing the access, due to its siting, height and proportions, it would be a noticeable feature despite the presence of adjoining hedge screening along the highway frontage. The hardstanding where it would be located is largely surrounded by trees, vegetation and boundary treatments subdividing it from the main gardens of the dwelling. Nonetheless, it currently offers a limited degree of openness and sense of space between those features and the existing garage. Consequently, the development would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development and does not fall within the exception at part (g) of paragraph 145.
14. In reaching the above findings, I have taken into account that the proposed removal of the existing garage of itself would result in a limited increase in the openness of the site towards its western extent which would be observed when passing the access point. However, the submitted plans indicate that the footprint of the building would be replaced by guest parking spaces on the hardstanding area where the presence of parked vehicles may of itself reduce any benefits in that respect. In any case, the limited impact on openness of the presence of a larger detached garage in the position proposed would not be fully offset by the limited improvements to openness arising from the removal of the existing garage. Consequently, the proposal would have a greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. Nonetheless, in this case, there would be little resultant harm given the visual containment afforded by surrounding boundary treatments along the highway frontage, to each side and at the rear resulting in a very localised effect confined to limited views along Kennel Lane.
15. Notwithstanding the above, as the proposal would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt it also would not meet the criteria of certain other forms of development that are also not inappropriate in Green Belt as listed in paragraph 146 of the Framework. The presence of the building in the location proposed would not encroach further into the countryside or harm the other purposes of Green Belt listed at paragraph 134 of the Framework. However, the absence of harm in those respects is a neutral factor.
16. I conclude that the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is harmful by definition, when having regard to the Framework. There is an associated greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt than the existing garage, albeit that there would be little resultant harm given it would be confined to the immediate context due to the visual containment of the site.

Character and appearance - Church Road/Kennel Lane Conservation Area

17. The Church Road/Kennel Lane Conservation Area in Windlesham is a predominantly residential area with some local facilities and services focussed in a broadly linear arrangement around those roads and a section of School Road. It is in an otherwise open rural setting in the Green Belt that lies beyond the main built envelope of the village. The character and significance of the Conservation Area is derived from the architectural and historic character of the informal groupings of a variety of buildings within a verdant setting that is distinctive from the more open fields in their wider surroundings.
18. Glebe House comprises a large two storey detached house in a distinctive L-shaped arrangement with a painted brick façade and tile roof set in a generous

plot on the southern side of Kennel Lane. It lies amongst a diverse range of properties which include differences in scale, form, type, layout, building lines and plot sizes, with a mix of open frontages and buildings partially screened by hedging. The Church Road/Kennel Lane Conservation Area Character Appraisal, March 2000, identifies that although the property is not a listed building or subject to local listing - it is an 'other building of interest'. Notwithstanding the passage of time since the preparation of that document, I observed that the property and its associated hedging and curtilage trees make a positive contribution to Kennel Lane in so far as it forms part of the historic and verdant character and significance of the Conservation Area.

19. In contrast, I observed that the existing detached double garage is in a deteriorating condition in terms of its structure and materials. The existing garage is close to nearby trees and largely screened by hedging from distance views within the Conservation Area when approaching the site due to its set back position from the highway edge. However, when passing the access to the hardstanding area it is a dilapidated and conspicuous feature which now significantly detracts from the character and appearance of the immediate Kennel Lane street scene. Whilst it has a much more limited impact on the significance of the Conservation Area when taken as a whole, to my mind, the removal of the existing garage would make a positive and beneficial contribution to the conservation of the heritage asset.
20. The replacement double garage would be sited in a different and more screened position adjacent to a boundary hedge when passing the access point. Notwithstanding my findings in relation to Green Belt considerations, the replacement garage although larger in terms of scale, bulk and massing and in a different perpendicular alignment relative to the road, would not appear overly prominent or dominant where noticeable in the access gap between or above the hedging. The limited visual prominence of the garage would be assisted by its lower land levels than Glebe House, the significant separation distance to the dwelling and the extent of intervening screening provided by hedges and trees.
21. When having regard to the above, the proposed garage would not look out of place in the surrounding context of a mix of detached two-storey properties, bungalows and terraced dwellings. Those properties include examples of larger detached outbuildings on the opposite side of Kennel Lane that are perpendicular to the road in close proximity to the highway frontage with upper sections of roofs glimpsed above boundary hedging in a similar manner to the proposal. The assimilation of the proposed building would also be assisted by use of painted render with brick plinths and slate tiled roofs which would complement Glebe House subject to agreement of the precise materials by condition. Consequently, the proposed garage would not of itself have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area.
22. In reaching the above findings, I have taken into account that the Council have expressed concern about the potential loss of the well-established hedge along the highway frontage (identified as Group 4 in the submitted Tree Survey). However, I note that the Council's Arboricultural Officer did not offer specific concerns in that respect. Furthermore, based on my observations, the evidence in the Tree Survey and the submitted plans, I am satisfied that the hedge would only need to be cut back to provide working space, but otherwise would be retained with no significant harm to its root system. Furthermore, the

appellant has indicated an intention to improve the hedge with additional under-planting and I am, therefore, satisfied that a landscaping scheme could be secured by condition to at least mitigate the effects of the cut back required and even potentially enhance the health and longevity of the hedge. The recommended protection measures during periods of construction as set out in the Tree Survey such as fencing and ground protection are necessary to ensure retention of the hedge prior to completion of the replacement garage and are capable of being secured by condition. When having regard to those safeguards and the privacy benefits for the hardstanding forecourt that the existing hedge provides, I have no reason to consider that it would be removed in the future.

23. The proposed garage would be erected on existing hardstanding within the root protection area (RPA) of a good quality Fir tree (T6) and a high-quality Swamp cypress (T2) which have a positive contribution upon the character and appearance of Kennel Lane. The use of specialist foundations, together with the associated construction methodology (including use of a compressed air tool for the excavation of the piles) and protection measures as set out in the Tree Survey so as to accord with BS5837:2012 would preserve the health and longevity of those trees, when taking account of the distance to the trunk of each tree. A Horse chestnut (T1) and Scots pine (T8) closer to the highway frontage also make a positive contribution to the verdant setting and although the development would be outside of the RPA of those trees, the protection measures in those locations are also necessary to prevent damage during the construction phase. The removal of low-quality Holly (T3), Pine (T5) and Spruce (T7) trees to facilitate the development is acceptable as it would have little effect on the verdant nature of the site and surroundings, whilst removal of those trees from the RPAs of T2 and T6 would likely benefit the long-term health and longevity of those higher quality trees.
24. The Council have referred to a planning application having been previously refused for a replacement garage under application ref: 06/1067 in a similar position to the proposal. However, the full details of that scheme are not before me. In any case, I necessarily determine the proposal before me on its own merits relative to the evidence submitted as part of the appeal and the current development plan and national policy context.
25. When having regard to all of the above, as the site is in a Conservation Area, Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. In that respect and with regard to paragraph 192 of the Framework, I have found that the development would make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, and that it would sustain and enhance the significance of the heritage asset. This arises from the proposal's enhancement of the character and appearance of the Kennel Lane street scene within the Church Road/Kennel Lane Conservation Area in Windlesham.
26. It follows that I conclude that the development would preserve and enhance the character, appearance and significance of the Church Road/Kennel Lane Conservation Area in Windlesham. The development is not, therefore, contrary to Policy DM9 and DM19 of the CS&DMP or Policy WNP2.1 of the WNP, together with the associated guidance in the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance, adopted September 2017. The policies when taken together, and amongst other things, seek high quality design which respects

and enhances the local and historic character of the environment with regard to scale, materials, massing, bulk and density and protect trees and other vegetation worthy of retention, including conservation and enhancement of heritage assets. The policies are consistent with the Framework.

Other considerations

27. Glebe House has previously been served by the existing detached double garage as parking provision. However, I observed that its current state of disrepair limits its use for such purposes with a resultant increase in demand for parking on the existing hardstanding within the forecourt and overspill parking on-street for visitors. As per my previous findings, the removal of the existing dilapidated garage and replacement with the proposed double garage would benefit the Kennel Lane street scene and in doing so would enhance the character, appearance and significance of Church Road/Kennel Lane Conservation Area in Windlesham. The Framework advises that great weight be given to an asset's conservation when assessing the impact of a proposed development on its significance. Taking such an approach into account, to my mind, it is reasonable in the particular circumstances of this case to afford considerable weight to the contrary situation of localised benefits to the Kennel Lane street scene that would contribute to an enhancement to the significance of that part of the Church Road/Kennel Lane Conservation Area in Windlesham.
28. In reaching the above findings, I have taken into account that substantial repairs to the existing garage to improve its appearance and functional use would appear to be difficult due to its structural condition, shallow foundations and relatively close proximity to the trunk of the Swamp cypress tree (T2). Furthermore, it is evident that the proportions of the existing garage building fall considerably below parking spaces suitable for modern vehicles as reflected in Policy WNP4.1 of the WNP that seeks new residential developments with garaging to have minimum internal dimensions for a single space in a garage of 3m wide by 7m long with an unobstructed entry width of 2.3m. In that respect, although the policy does not specifically apply to the proposal, it is somewhat understandable that a materially larger building closer to those dimensions to accommodate the parking of modern vehicles has been pursued. Furthermore, the overall height increase is to accommodate those dimensions whilst minimising excavations required in the RPAs of retained trees, and includes a higher floor level with a root protection layer below so as to safeguard the health and longevity of the high and good quality trees which positively contribute to the verdant Conservation Area character and setting.
29. It is also reasonable that a double garage of equivalent dimensions could not be accommodated in a similar position as the existing garage due to the proximity to T2. In that regard, necessary excavations for pile foundations closer to that tree would not be suitable due to the likely harm to its root system. An equivalent replacement building to the proposal in a similar position toward the boundary would also be closer to the highway edge with insufficient space to open and enter the garage without overhanging and partly obstructing the highway. Such an arrangement could increase the risk of accidents and collisions for and with passing vehicles, and, therefore, is not a feasible alternative to achieve the benefits arising from the proposal.
30. The removal of the existing garage would require the reinstatement of hardsurfacing of the forecourt to enable it to be laid out and used for guest

parking and/or as a turning area for the garage. As the footprint of the existing garage is within the RPA of T2, a condition should necessarily ensure a suitable method of removal of the garage and reinstatement of hardstanding to ensure it would not harm the root system and therefore, the condition of the high quality tree. The associated benefits of being able to secure an appropriate method of removal of the existing garage to protect T2 as part of the proposal are afforded significant weight. The feasible options for reinstatement of hardstanding include permeable surfaces which could improve the infiltration to the existing root system of T2 and therefore, could enhance its health and longevity. However, those possible benefits are necessarily afforded only limited weight as the full details required by a condition would be for subsequent approval.

31. The proposal also has potential benefits relative to the current situation by providing a more convenient turning space within the site for vehicles to enter and exit the access in forward gear when visitor spaces are not occupied. There would be associated benefits to the safe use of the access by reducing the frequency of vehicles reversing out of the existing access where visibility on the outside of the bend is often constrained by on-street parking in the nearby lay-by and occurs close to where pedestrians cross between the public footpath and the footway on the opposite side of the B386. However, the potential benefits to highway safety are afforded only limited weight as there is no specific evidence of accidents having previously occurred due to use of the existing access and because the utilisation of guest parking spaces would likely encourage reversing from the access to still take place, albeit less frequently.
32. When compared with the existing garage, the proposal would also have benefits for the security of appellant's vehicles through reintroducing functional garage spaces. In doing so, it would also have the potential to reduce the demand for on-street parking for visitors through provision of guest spaces. A reduced demand for nearby on-street parking arising from Glebe House would have some benefits for occupiers of neighbouring properties that lack their own off-street parking provision and as a matter of convenience utilise the limited capacity of parking within the layby along the highway frontage. The benefits in those respects, however, are afforded only limited weight based on the scale of development proposed.
33. The location of the garage is adequately distanced from neighbouring properties to prevent any impact upon the living conditions of their occupiers in terms of outlook, light or privacy. However, the absence of concern in that respect is a neutral factor.

Planning balance

34. The Framework indicates that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
35. Having regard to my previous reasoning, I find that the other considerations in the specific circumstances of this case as previously set out, when taken together, clearly outweigh the substantial weight to be given to the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness. Furthermore, whilst the proposal would have a greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt than the

existing garage - there would be little resultant harm in this case given the effect would be localised to the immediate context due to the visual containment of the site. The cumulative benefits of the proposal as referred to under the other considerations section, therefore, also clearly outweigh the minimal harm to the Green Belt in that respect. Furthermore, when having regard to my conclusions on the main issues, I have identified no other harm or conflict with the Framework or relevant development plan policies. I, therefore, find that the other considerations in this case constitute the very special circumstances necessary in the context of the Framework to support the approval of the development.

36. In reaching the above findings, I necessarily impose conditions suggested by the Council in terms of the standard time limit of the permission and plans compliance in the interest of certainty of the development for which permission is granted. For the reasons previously stated, conditions requiring agreement of materials and hard and soft landscaping details are also imposed. The requirements of the landscaping condition are necessarily pre-commencement to ensure prior agreement of the location and methodology of any groundworks that may be required to be undertaken to remove the existing garage and deliver the landscaping scheme. In the interest of certainty, a reference to details of the scheme including a method whereby surface water from the roof of the building hereby permitted should be diverted through permeable surfaces below the footprint of the building located within the RPA of T2 and T6 as identified on the Tree Protection Plan has been added. I agree with the Council's Tree Consultant that such provisions are necessary to ensure the health and longevity of those trees to prevent drying out of the roots within the related sections of the RPAs.
37. As the evidence before me includes the Tree Survey, the Council's suggested condition requiring submission of a detailed arboricultural method statement is not necessary. As an alternative I have included a condition to ensure that such details as set out in the Tree Survey, which I consider to be acceptable as per my previous reasoning, are implemented during the construction period. In that respect, the landscaping condition also includes an aforementioned requirement to agree and implement specific details relating to removal of the existing garage and reinstatement of hardsurfacing. Whilst I note that the Council's Tree Consultant has suggested that the tree works should be supervised, I am satisfied that a reference to tree works being carried out in accordance with BS 3998: Tree work: Recommendations (or an equivalent British Standard if replaced) would be a more suitable approach to ensure an appropriate safeguard in that respect.

Conclusion

38. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan and the Framework when taken as a whole. Accordingly, the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Gareth Wildgoose

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE

CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
RB/GH/CS01; RB/GH/PL01; and RB/GH/PL02 Rev F.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the method of construction set out relative to BS5837:2012, tree related works and tree protection measures set out in the Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment prepared by Clive Fowler Associates dated August 2019 as submitted with the application and in accordance with the associated Tree Protection Plan and drg.no. RB/GH/PL02 Rev F. The approved scheme for the protection of the retained trees shall be in place before any site clearance or development takes place. The protection measures shall remain in place until completion of all development works and removal of site vehicles, machinery, and materials in connection with the development. All tree work shall be carried out in accordance with BS 3998: Tree work: Recommendations (or an equivalent British Standard if replaced).
- 4) Notwithstanding conditions 2 and 3, no development, including any demolition, earthworks or vegetation clearance, shall take place until full details of a scheme of landscaping, to include the identification of all trees and hedges in the site to be retained as part of the construction phase and for the lifetime of the development hereby approved and details of hard and soft landscape works and earthworks, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details of the scheme should include the detailed approach for removal of the existing garage, including any associated earthworks and reinstatement of hardsurfacing, together with the means by which surface water from the roof of the building hereby permitted will be diverted via permeable surfaces into the root protection areas of T2 and T6 as identified on the Tree Protection Plan. The scheme as approved in terms of hard landscaping and earthworks shall be carried out in full before the first use of the development hereby permitted and retained thereafter. The soft landscaping works shall be carried out in the first planting season following the completion of the development. Any trees, shrubs or plants that die within a period of five years from the completion of the development, or are removed and/or become seriously damaged or diseased in that period, shall be replaced (and if necessary continue to be replaced) in the first available planting season.
- 5) Notwithstanding condition 2, no development above slab level shall take place until full details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and samples.

END OF SCHEDULE